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## Uniqueness

### Obama Wins 1NC

#### Obama will win the election --- major indicators and polls point to a victory.

**West**, **7/12**/2012 (Paul – Tribune Washington Bureau, Obama holds ‘significant lead’ over Romney in new national poll, The Olympian, p. http://www.theolympian.com/2012/07/12/2171777/obama-holds-significant-lead-over.html)

With the election still four months away, President Barack Obama holds "a significant lead" over Republican challenger Mitt Romney, according to a new Pew Research Center poll released Thursday. The national survey, completed July 9, showed Obama outpacing Romney by 50 percent to 43 percent. That's a more substantial gap than most recent surveys have registered, but Obama has held at least a small lead in earlier polling by Pew. The independent polling operation said there had been "no clear trend in either candidate's support" since Romney secured the GOP nomination in early spring. When it comes to fixing the economy - the top issue of the campaign - "Romney has not seized the advantage," Pew's analysis concluded. "In fact, he has lost ground on this issue over the past month." Of potentially greater significance than the overall national figures, Obama continues to lead Romney in battleground states. In the 12 states considered most competitive at this point, the president holds a seven percentage-point edge, 51 to 44, the Pew survey found. A Wall Street Journal survey, released late last month, also showed Obama with an eight-point advantage in battleground states. The national figures found no overall improvement in Romney's standing with voters over the past two months, a period in which Obama has attempted to keep his rival on the defensive with negative ad attacks on his business record and personal wealth. Some Republicans outside the Romney camp have become increasingly jittery about what they regard as insufficient progress by their party's unofficial nominee against a vulnerable incumbent. As the campaign heads into mid-summer, a period in which public attention will be diverted, at least in part, by the Olympic Games in London, Romney has failed thus far to capitalize on deep voter dissatisfaction with the way things are going in the country. At the same time, Obama's job-approval rating has ticked up slightly. In the latest poll, it stood at 50 percent, the first time Pew found that he had reached positive territory on that score since March. Voters were asked which candidate was best suited to fix the U.S. economy, and by a six-point margin they favored Obama over Romney, 48 percent to 42 percent. That's a sharp turnaround from June, when Romney held the advantage on that question by eight points, 49 percent to 41 percent. The Pew poll has a margin of error of plus or minus 2.1 percentage points. A similar shift was reflected among independent voters, a prized target for both candidates, who are now almost evenly divided on who would best improve the economy. In June, Romney enjoyed a 13-point edge among independents on that question. The latest survey, like most polling at this stage of the campaign, did not attempt to narrow the contest down to likely voters. Obama's lead, Pew found, stemmed from the fact that more voters currently identify themselves as Democrats than Republicans, and that virtually identical proportions of each say they will back their party's nominee. Put another way, the results of the survey are yet a further indication that voter mobilization will be crucial in determining the winner of this year's election. Obama has increased his lead among younger voters - historically the least likely to turn out on Election Day. It's now 24 percentage points, down from 34 points in the 2008 election. Independent voters - who typically decide close elections - remain split, with 46 percent favoring Romney and 45 percent supporting Obama, a statistical tie.

### Obama Win – 60%-55%

#### Obama will win – his chances are as high as 60%.

**Sheridan 7-19** (Greg, Foreign Editor, The Australian, OBAMA'S POLITICAL JUDO WILL DELIVER A KNOCKOUT, lexisnexis, dw: 7-19-2012, da: 7-21-2012, lido)

HERE'S the dope. Barack Obama will be re-elected president in November, beating the Republican challenger, Mitt Romney. But it will be a tight race. My guess is the margin will be quite slim. Obama will win in the way George W. Bush beat John Kerry in 2004, and for many of the same reasons. I am in America at the 20th anniversary meeting of the Australian American Leadership Dialogue.. It is a great time to be in Washington, because this is a very live election. Romney still has an excellent chance of winning. Indeed, all the preconditions for an Obama defeat are there. But I rate Obama's chances as about 55 to 60 per cent, and Romney's at 40 to 45 per cent.

### Obama Win – Approval Rating

#### Obama will win --- presidential polling is a good indicator.

**Constitution Daily**, **7/20**/2012 (Historic poll trends give edge to Obama, p. <http://blog.constitutioncenter.org/2012/07/historic-poll-trends-give-edge-to-obama/>)

A review of presidential polling data back to 1948 shows that Barack Obama’s edge in the latest Gallup poll is a positive sign for his re-election chances. But in two past recent elections, candidates with bigger leads than Obama lost hotly contested elections, after their opponents used hard-hitting tactics. Since 1948, candidates who led in early to mid-July polling have won 13 of 16 presidential races in November. Two of the winning candidates who trailed in the mid-summer polls were George W. Bush in 2004 and George H.W. Bush in 1988. Both candidates used aggressive ad campaigns to capitalize on missteps by front runners John Kerry and Michael Dukakis to win the fall election. Recently, some GOP supporters have urged Mitt Romney to adopt harsher attacks on Obama, including more ads that attack Obama’s character and policies. In the most recent Gallup poll, President Obama holds a 47 percent to 45 percent lead over challenger Romney. The third candidate to overcome a mid-summer frontrunner was Harry Truman, who used an old-fashioned grassroots campaign to get past Thomas Dewey in 1948. In two of those three cases, George W. Bush and Truman had “the power of the pulpit” as the incumbent president as an extra way to generate campaign publicity. Also, in 1988 George H.W. Bush was the sitting vice president. ROMNEY MAY NEED TO FIGHT TOUGH But if history is any guide , Romney will have to fight his way past the mid-summer frontrunner.

#### Obama will win – stronger than his approval ratings

**Silver 7/12** (Silver, Nate, runs the Five Thirty Eight NY Times Blog, 07/12/12, Five Thirty Eight NY Times Blog, Why Obama may be stronger than his approval rating, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/12/why-obama-may-be-stronger-than-his-approval-ratings/)

There is a small but reasonably persistent gap between President Obama’s net approval ratings and his head-to-head polls against Mitt Romney. Whereas Mr. Obama’s approval ratings have been almost exactly breaking even for most of the past few months — in fact, they’re very slightly underwater now according to the Real Clear Politics average — he has more often than not enjoyed a slight lead in head-to-head polls against Mr. Romney. Liberals and conservatives tend to interpret this evidence in different ways. For liberals, it may be taken as a sign that Mr. Romney is an especially weak candidate — enough so that many voters who are on the fence about Mr. Obama’s job performance, and even a few who disapprove of it, will be willing to vote for Mr. Obama if Mr. Romney is the alternative. The claim has often been made in recent weeks, for instance (in my view, based on relatively speculative evidence), that Mr. Obama’s attacks on Mr. Romney’s tenure at Bain Capital may have damaged Mr. Romney. Conservatives instead sometimes argue that this is a sign that Mr. Obama has some softness in his numbers. As voters become more engaged with the campaign, Mr. Romney may have a bit of wind at his back if he is able to keep the focus on Mr. Obama’s job performance; the head-to-head polls could fall more in line with Mr. Obama’s approval ratings. Neither of these views is irrational. In support of the liberal position, my research suggests that there can be some predictable-seeming differences between a president’s net approval rating and the result he actually realizes on Election Day, based in part on “candidate quality” factors related to his opponent. For instance, opponents who have especially “extreme” ideologies (who are perceived as being very liberal or very conservative) may allow a president to over-perform his approval ratings, while challengers who are viewed as moderates may get the benefit of the doubt from voters. Elections are perhaps mostly a referendum on the incumbent, but they are not purely so. On the other hand, in support of the conservative position, my research suggests that approval ratings may have some predictive power even once you are also accounting for head-to-head polls, especially early in the campaign. Both of these views, however, leave aside an intriguing piece of evidence. That evidence is Mr. Obama’s favorability ratings. They are net-positive right now, as they have been throughout most of his presidency. Right now, the Real Clear Politics average shows 50.6 percent of Americans with a favorable view of Mr. Obama, versus 45.1 percent with an unfavorable one. That contrasts with his approval ratings, which now show 46.8 percent as approving his job performance and 48.7 percent as disapproving it. In other words, there is a small slice of the electorate, about 4 percent, that has a favorable view of Mr. Obama, but does not approve of his job performance. Given how close the election is, the way they behave in November could be decisive. If the election is a referendum on Mr. Obama based on his approval ratings, it’s going to be very close. He may be a slight underdog, especially since some of the approval ratings polls are of adults or registered voters, which are generally a point or two more favorable to the Democratic candidate than those of likely voters. However, if it’s a referendum based on Mr. Obama’s favorability ratings, his net-positive score (plus 5.5) makes him look like the favorite. Is there evidence on whether approval ratings or favorability ratings are a better indicator of a president’s re-election chances? Actually, there’s not very much of it. Favorability ratings have received much less academic study than approval ratings. There are a couple of reasons for this. First, the two sets of ratings are normally extremely close to each other. Unless you need extreme precision for something, your choice just won’t matter that much. And second, the historical record of approval ratings is a little richer. Pollsters take them somewhat more often than favorability ratings, using somewhat more consistent question wording, and these ratings are archived more completely than the favorability ratings are. So approval ratings tend to be used as a default in studies of the presidency. What I’ll offer here is only some cursory evidence: a comparison of approval ratings and favorability ratings for the past five incumbent presidents who were running for re-election, as taken from the CBS News poll database (most CBS News polls were conducted in conjunction with The New York Times). Five data points isn’t very many, but using both approval ratings and favorability ratings from the same polling organization at least allows for the comparisons to be a bit more apples-to-apples. In the table below, I’ve listed the average net approval ratings and net favorability ratings for each of these presidents, in CBS News polls conducted from Sept. 1 of the election year through Election Day. These are listed alongside the results of the election. Three of these presidents — Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush — had nearly identical approval ratings and favorability ratings. But they diverged by a material amount in two other cases. In 1996, Bill Clinton’s approval ratings (roughly plus 25) were quite a bit stronger than his favorability ratings (roughly plus 14). He won a perfectly solid victory over Bob Dole, but the 8.5-point margin was somewhat more consistent with his pretty good favorability ratings than his very good approval ratings. Consider that Mr. Clinton in 1996 had roughly identical approval ratings to Ronald Reagan in 1984 — but Mr. Reagan’s margin over Walter Mondale was much larger than Mr. Clinton’s over Mr. Dole, perhaps because Mr. Reagan’s favorability ratings matched his lofty approval ratings while Mr. Clinton’s did not. In 1980, Jimmy Carter had bad approval ratings (negative 14 net), but somewhat more forgivable favorability ratings (negative 6). His 10-point loss to Mr. Reagan roughly split the difference between them. There are a few other wrinkles to consider that complicate the analysis. For instance, presidents with very strong or very weak approval ratings tend to have election results that are a little closer to the mean. A president with a plus-40 approval rating isn’t likely to win the election by as many as 40 points. When his ratings are that strong, many of the voters approving him will be of the opposite party, and some of those opposite-party voters will wind up for their party’s own nominee out of partisan loyalty. Ordinarily, the more robust way to analyze this data would be with regression analysis. In this case — with two highly correlated measures tested upon just five data points — regression analysis is not a very powerful tool. Still, I ran those numbers for fun and got an interesting result: Note that the regression coefficient on the approval ratings and favorability ratings is almost exactly the same. What that means is that the best policy in these past elections would simply have been to weight them equally. If you take an average of Mr. Obama’s approval ratings and his favorability ratings right now, based on the Real Clear Politics numbers, you will get a positive rating (approve or favorable) from 48.7 percent of voters, and a negative one (disapprove or unfavorable) from 46.9 percent. The net rating — plus 1.8 percent — almost exactly matches his current standing against Mr. Romney. The Real Clear Politics average of head-to-head polls has Mr. Obama with a 2-point lead on Mr. Romney, while our “now-cast” (which is based only on the polls and does not look at economic factors) has Mr. Obama projected to a 2.1-point lead. Let me emphasize, again, that although this analysis produces a neat-looking result, it’s based on some relatively thin evidence — really just two presidential elections (1980 and 1996) where the two sets of ratings diverged to any appreciable degree. Check back in 2040 or so, and we might be able to answer more definitively which set of ratings has more predictive power, or whether the method of averaging them together is the most sensible choice. Still, it seems as though the small set of voters who take a favorable view of Mr. Obama but do not approve of his job performance are very much worth fighting over for the campaigns. The split between the two sets of ratings may reflect a sensible enough reaction from voters, who have ample reason to be dissatisfied with the direction of the country, but may be more sympathetic to Mr. Obama as some of the problems began before his tenure. If you’re part of Mr. Obama’s campaign, there could be risk in taking a negative tack that might reduce that sympathy factor. At the same time, these results suggest that Mr. Obama doesn’t necessarily need to damage Mr. Romney to win. If voters are judging Mr. Obama based on a mix of his personal qualities and their perception of his job performance, his numbers might be just strong enough to win as it is, without their factoring much about Mr. Romney into their decision. Mr. Romney’s campaign in Boston faces an equally interesting set of choices. Do you explicitly try to appeal to the set of voters who like Mr. Obama personally but take a neutral or negative view of his job performance? There have been times when Mr. Romney’s campaign seemed to adopt this strategy. At times on the campaign trail, Mr. Romney has told voters that he thinks of Mr. Obama as a good man, but that he is just not up to the job of being president. Or do you try to bring down Mr. Obama’s favorability ratings by a couple of points? This is more in line with the advertisement that Mr. Romney’s campaign released on Thursday, which accuses Mr. Obama of dishonesty in how he portrayed Mr. Romney’s tenure at Bain Capital. That strategy seems a bit higher risk — especially as Mr. Romney’s favorability ratings are rather tepid, meaning that he does not necessarily want to give voters an excuse to think of the election as a popularity contest. However, Mr. Obama may be slightly stronger than his approval ratings imply, if not as strong as his favorability ratings suggest. In that case, a higher-risk strategy might be called for, particularly if the small lead Mr. Obama has in head-to-head polls seems to persist for another several weeks.

#### Obama will win the election – approval trends correlate

**Silver 7/11** (Silver, Nate, runs Five Thirty Eight NY Times Blog, 07/11/12, Five Thirty Eight NY Times Blog, July 11: Has Anything Changed in the Presidential Race?, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/11/july-11-has-anything-changed-in-the-presidential-race/)

On the surface, Wednesday seemed to be a pretty good polling day for President Obama. The latest five state polls, including those in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, showed him ahead of Mitt Romney by a margin of at least six points. But our presidential forecast was unmoved – literally. It gives Mr. Obama a 66.1 percent chance of being re-elected, exactly the same number as on Tuesday. Why no change? The reason is pretty simple: the polls were broadly in line with the model’s previous expectations, which had Mr. Obama as a seven-point favorite in Wisconsin, for instance, and five points ahead in Pennsylvania. There were also polls out in Maine and New Mexico, states that sometimes get talked up as battlegrounds, but really aren’t. The model already had Mr. Obama ahead by 14 points and by 12 points in those states. Mr. Obama should be pleased with Wednesday’s polls in one sense. The polls no more than match the model’s expectations. But the model has Mr. Obama a little bit ahead in the national race, putting him up by around two points in the popular vote over Mr. Romney and projecting him to 294 electoral votes to Mr. Romney’s 244. In other words, Wednesday’s polling was consistent with the hypothesis that a Mr. Obama has a small lead in the race. That contrasts with national, but not necessarily state, polls on Tuesday that seemed to show more of a straight-up tie.

### Obama Win – Electoral Votes

#### Obama will win – already has 265 electoral votes, will win Michigan

**Marshall 7-20** (John, Talking Points Memo Editors' Blog, Virginia is the Prize, lexisnexis, dw: 7-20-2012, da: 7-21-2012)

You can't draw a lot from a single poll. But today's Quinnipiac poll showing Romney and Obama dead even in Virginia pushed it back into toss-up territory in the TPM Electoral Scoreboard. And I flag it now because for a while now I've thought that Virginia is the pivotal state in this year's election. Obama can definitely win without Virginia. Not by a lot. But he can win. Our Scoreboard currently shows Obama with 265 electoral votes at least loosely in his column with Michigan, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida and Colorado as toss-ups. Toss in Michigan and he's got it. So it's not so much that Obama has to win Virginia. It's more that it's very hard for me to see how Obama loses if he does win Virginia. Here's my basic argument. I'm pretty confident that Obama will win Michigan both because it's been a blue state for 20 years and because of the Romney/auto bailout issue, although at the moment the PollTracker Average gives him a mere 1 point edge. The key to the last three presidential cycles is that you've got to win Ohio or Florida and probably both to win the presidency. In both 2000 and 2004 it all came down to Bush eking out victories in those two states. Both continue to look extremely tight this year -- with Florida basically dead-even for months and Ohio only slightly leaning to Obama. But if Obama wins Virginia he can lose both Florida and Ohio and he'll almost certainly still going to win. Another way of putting it is that Virginia is one state where 2008 really seemed to change the map rather than just being another state -- like Indiana, for instance -- that just got swept up in the tide. My sense is that the demography of the state really has passed a tipping point. And the economy in the state is relatively strong. So I think Obama still has a very solid shot. But for my money, Virginia really is the state to watch.

### Obama Win – Halloway Prediction

#### Obama will win – Holloway’s prediction

**Mctague 7-21** (Jim, staff, Barrons, Sharp Trader: Obama Will Win, http://online.barrons.com/article/SB50001424053111904346504577532810034930738.html?mod=BOL\_twm\_col, dw: 7-21-2012, da: 7-21-2012, lido)

I'm jealous. Over the years, my election predictions have proven no better than a coin-toss. Quantitative trader Reid Holloway, on the other hand, has called the actual electoral-vote outcome of three of the four past presidential elections. Roll over, Ty Cobb: If Holloway's 2012 prediction holds up, then he'll be batting .800. What's on Holloway's magic viewing screen? The trader, who operates quietly from Litchfield County, Conn., foresees an Obama victory, with 325 electoral votes for the incumbent versus 213 for GOP challenger Mitt Romney. Holloway doesn't relish the outcome; he favors Romney-style self reliance over Obama's Big Government. But Holloway's computer model tells him Obama's victory is all but inevitable. Holloway's election formula is based on one he developed to predict market volatility among the S&P 500's market segments. The market formula is a key tool for Holloway's proprietary trading firm, which is in the sub-$100 million size group. Each market segment has a mean volatility. When a segment's volatility moves to an extreme, his model flags it and predicts when it will revert to its norm. Holloway's political model breaks the national presidential contest into 50 unique state elections. Each state has a philosophical mean. But sometimes a state will shift sharply either to the right or the left. This happened, for example, in 2008, when voters of all political leanings expressed their disdain for President George W. Bush by voting enthusiastically for Obama. Holloway's model measures these mood changes and predicts when a particular state will revert to its political norm.

### Obama Win – Latinos

#### Will Win – Latino votes

**American Prospect Blogs 7-18** (Obama's Successful Play for Latino Votes, lexisnexis, dw: 7-18-2012, da: 7-21-2012, lido)

President Obama can’t win re-election without high support and turnout from Latino voters, and to that end he has aggressively targeted them with ads, speeches, and one bold attempt to unilaterally reform immigration policy as it applies to the children of undocumented immigrants. If the latest poll from Latino Decisions is any indication, this strategy is working. Since June, Obama s Latino support has risen 4 points to 70 percent, while Mitt Romney s support has declined to 22 percent of Latino voters: The poll, commissioned by the Center for American Progress and America s Voice, which advocates for immigration reform, finds Obama with a substantial lead over Romney in all segments of the Latino electorate. He wins 60 percent of Latino independents, 72 percent of Latinos who voted in the 2008 election, and 71 percent of Latinos in battleground states. He even wins 13 percent of Latino Republicans, compared to only 9 percent of Republicans overall. Here s a full chart of the results:

### Obama Win – Swing States

#### Obama will win – he is ahead in the swing states.

**US Daily Review 7-21** (“ Super Professor Predicts 2012 Presidential Winner” lexisnexis, dw: 7-21-2012, da: 7-21-2012, lido)

FacultyRow Super Professor David Schultz predicted today that President Obama will win a re-election by securing between 272 to 300 electoral votes. (He needs 270 to win). Schultz places the odds of a President Obama re-election at 55%. Professor Schultz is known during election time for his expertise in U.S. elections. Currently a professor at Hamline University, Schultz has accurately predicted U.S. Presidents for the past 5 elections. Super Professor Schultz has also authored Politainment: The Ten Rules of Contemporary Politics: A citizens guide to understanding campaigns and elections. According to Schultz, the presidential race comes down to three simple numbers: 10, 10, 270. The presidential race is essentially over in 40 states, with the race for the presidency to be determined by the swing voters in ten states. In those ten states, ten percent of the voters are undecided and they will determine who wins the presidency with 270 electoral votes. Thus, ten percent of the voters in these ten states will determine who gets 270 electoral votes. Schultz says Barack Obama is currently holding on to slight but steady leads in many of the swing states, doing a better job than Mitt Romney in convincing swing voters to support him.

#### Obama will win – represents “the people’s” position, ahead in swing states

**Tomasky 7-15** (Michael, Newsweek/Daily Beast correspondent and editor of Democracy: A Journal of Ideas, Michael Tomasky: Obama Is Winning Because of the Shrinking GOP, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/07/15/michael-tomasky-obama-is-winning-because-of-the-shrinking-gop.html, dw: 7-15-2012, da: 7-21-2012, lido)

Mitt Romney’s present travails must surely seem shocking and offensive to Republicans, both panjandrums and rank and file alike: “His is a great American success story. How can this be bad? The controversy must be all the fault of that evil liberal media and the Democrat Party!” Well, folks, sorry, but it’s not. If you’re willing to spend two minutes scouring the landscape for explanations rather than enemies, it might strike you that outsourcing is a real issue in American life—millions of citizens have been affected by it, and by definition, none of them for the better. That the ongoing Bain saga is such a shock and outrage to conservatives shows me only that conservatives are profoundly out of touch with the moderate center of the country: It helps explain why you selected this man as your nominee, and it further helps explain why he’s losing to an incumbent who, given the current economic conditions, ought to be pretty easy to take out. Supporters stand in 100-degree temperatures to listen to President Barack Obama speak at a campaign event on the College of Fine Arts Lawn at Carnegie Mellon University July 5, 2012 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. (Chip Somodevilla / Getty Images) The race is close, and of course Romney has a decent shot at winning. But the fact is that by every measure, he’s behind. He’s behind, a little, in national polls. He’s behind by more in the swing states. And behind by still more in the electoral college conjectures, where Nate Silver gives Obama 294 votes. Obama leads—narrowly, but outside the margin of error—in Virginia, Ohio, Colorado, and Nevada. If he wins those and holds the usual Democratic states—and yes, he’s up in Pennsylvania, where Romney has been sinking fast; only Michigan is really close—he will have won, even with maybe $1.5 billion thrown at him, a not-particularly close election.

### Election is a Dead Heat

#### The election is a dead heat --- trending toward Romney.

**The Hill**, 7/16/**2012** (Poll: Obama and Romney neck-and-neck in swing states, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/238209-poll-obama-and-romney-neck-and-neck-in-swing-states)

President Obama and Mitt Romney are running neck-and-neck in 12 swing states that will be critical in determining the outcome of the 2012 election, according to a Purple Insights poll released on Monday. Obama won Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin in 2008, and will need to win about half of these in 2012 to secure reelection. According to Purple, Obama leads Romney 47 to 45 percent in these 12 states, maintaining the same 2-point lead he had in the same poll from June, when he led 48 to 46. The poll has a 1.6 percent margin of error. Romney has been dogged by low favorability ratings throughout the election cycle, and that trend continues, according to the Purple Poll, with 49 percent saying they have an unfavorable view of the former Massachusetts governor, versus 41 percent favorable. But there’s bad news for Obama in the swing states as well – 42 percent said the economy was getting worse, against only 28 percent who said it was getting better.

### Obama Lose – Economy

#### Obama will lose --- unemployment numbers will crush Obama.

**CNN Money**, **7/19**/2012 (Election 2012: Economy does Obama no favors, p. <http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/19/news/economy/obama-election/>)

Unless the economy mounts a dramatic turnaround, President Obama will be forced to ask voters for a second term while the unemployment rate sits north of 8%. Any campaign consultant will tell you that's bad news for the incumbent -- and it could get worse. Robust labor market growth in the first three months of the calendar year has given way to three consecutive disappointing jobs reports. The housing market remains tied in knots. And growth is depressingly weak. Europe is mired in an intractable debt crisis that shows few signs of easing. At home, the impending fiscal cliff has the potential to unsettle businesses to the point where they are reluctant to make investments or hiring decisions. The resulting economic outlook -- especially from the Obama campaign's perspective -- is not especially rosy. With only four monthly jobs reports remaining before Election Day, it now seems unlikely that unemployment will drop below 8%. The current unemployment rate is 8.2%. Patrick Sims, a director at Hamilton Place Strategies, said that getting below 8.0% is "not going to happen" by Election Day.

#### Poor job reports will undermine Obama’s election chances --- he needs to improve the economic conditions.

**Epshteyn**, **7/18**/2012 (Boris – Republican political strategist, investment banker and finance attorney living in New York City, Obama’ Can’t Distract Voters From the Flagging Economy, U.S. News & World Report, p. <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/boris-epshteyn/2012/07/18/obama-cant-distract-voters-from-the-flagging-economy>)

Much of the country has been in successive heat waves for the past month, while President Obama and his campaign have experienced a continued pesky cold streak. Not even a victory in the Supreme Court over Obamacare could shake them out of the doldrums. Why? Because the Obamacare decision was followed by a jobs report a week later containing nothing even close to good news. That jobs report was vital because if it had showed economic improvement, it would have given the Obama campaign something to build momentum on. Instead, it served as a reminder to the American voter that while President Obama may have won in the Supreme Court on healthcare he is losing in the fight for economic recovery. Team Obama's response? First, President Obama asked the American public to not "read too much into" the jobs report. I will let the Labor Department address the ridiculousness of that statement. Second, the Obama campaign unleashed a furious ad onslaught. The advertising push however, was not focused on any of the president's accomplishments (Obamacare obviously didn't fit the bill due to its unpopularity), but on the business background of former Gov. Mitt Romney. Whether one believes the attacks are fair or not, and in my humble opinion they are misguided, the bigger issue for team Obama is that they simply do not work. A quick glance at Real Clear Politics's average of polls shows that on the day after the Obamacare decision, President Obama led Governor Romney by 3.8 percent, whereas the lead now is down to an insignificant 2.0 percent—a statistical tie. The numbers in battleground states also generally mirror the national average and stay within the margin of error. President Obama and his team have, notwithstanding his claims otherwise to Charlie Rose, abandoned any notion of "transcendence" or "hope and change" and in return have received nothing but bad polls. There are four more jobs reports before the election on November 6. The economic community tends to agree that they will not be much better than the last. However, in order to have a shot at re-election, President Obama would be well served to make sure that his response is much improved.

Obama Lose – Economy

#### Romney is gaining the lead over the economy.

**The Hill**, **7/18**/2012 (Romney edges ahead in latest national poll, most blame Obama for economic downturn, p. <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/238823-romney-edges-ahead-in-latest-national-poll-most-blame-obama-for-economic-downturn>)

Mitt Romney holds a narrow lead over Barack Obama in the latest national poll, with the Republican challenger edging the incumbent president 47-46 percent. And nearly two in three voters - 64 percent - say his policies have contributed at least partially to the economic downturn, according to a survey released Wednesday by CBS News and the New York Times. That's evidence that Republican attacks on the president's record are likely resonating, and represent a double-digit increase from a similar question asked by Gallup last month. In general, Romney seemed to be buoyed by American's increasing pessimism about the economy. Less than a quarter of those surveyed said the economy was improving — 24 percent — down from a third of Americans in April. Meanwhile, three in 10 Americans say the economy is getting worse, and fewer than four in 10 approve of President Obama's handling on the economy. Perhaps most concerning for the president, the presumptive Republican nominee now holds a 49-41 percent advantage among voters asked who would best handle the economy,

#### Economy prevents Obama from winning

**Cafferty 7/19** (Cafferty, Jack, CNN reporter, 07/19/12, CNN, Should the Economy prevent President Obama from winning a second term, http://caffertyfile.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/19/should-the-economy-prevent-president-obama-from-winning-a-second-term/?hpt=hp\_t2)

Storm clouds are gathering for President Barack Obama. The latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows Mitt Romney with a 1-point lead over Obama with 4% of voters undecided. And when asked about the economy, the difference is even more glaring. Romney holds an 8 percentage point lead over the president. Just 39% of those surveyed approve of the president's handling of the economy. That's down from 44% in April. More bad news for the president: In the crucial battleground of Virginia, Romney has closed a 12-point gap with Obama, and the two are now tied, according to the latest Quinnipiac University poll. In 2008, Obama became the first Democrat to win that state since 1964. Suffice to say that if there is no significant improvement in the economy - and it better start soon - Obama could have problems in Virginia and elsewhere. The jobs picture remains bleak. Unemployment has been above 8% for 41 consecutive months now. Forty-one months. This morning, first-time jobless claims jumped sharply - up 34,000 from the previous week. A new Gallup Poll shows Americans overwhelmingly say creating "more or better jobs" is the most important thing the government can do to jump-start the economy. That’s why some of the president's words and actions aren't helping much. Many took issue when Obama said, "If you've got a business, you didn't build that. Somebody else made that happen." Then there's the president's "jobs council." It hasn't even met for six months. The White House says Obama has "obviously got a lot on his plate" while Republicans suggest he's had time in the past six months to attend more than 100 fundraisers and play golf 10 times.

### Obama Lose – Latino Turnout

#### Low Hispanic voter turnout jeopardizes Obama’s election.

**Carrasquillo 7-13** Adrian Carasquillo NBC Latino Online. “Latinos, youth not as excited about voting in 2012 election” http://nbclatino.com/2012/07/13/latinos-youth-not-as-excited-about-voting-in-2012-election/

President Obama may have a lot to worry about if a new poll on voting intentions ends up reflecting voter turnout in November. According to a Gallup poll released today, only 64 percent of registered Latino voters say they will definitely vote this fall, which is 14 percent lower than the current national average of 78 percent of Americans. In the fall of 2008, Hispanic turnout intentions were eight points below the national average. If the voting intentions were to hold, Hispanic voters would be one of the groups with the lowest expected turnout, along with 18- to 29-year-olds. Fifty-eight percent of U.S. registered voters aged 18 to 29 say they will “definitely vote” this fall, well below the current national average. If turnout among Latinos and young voters is low, Obama’s chances at reelection will suffer, as they make up two important parts of his expected coalition. Recently, the battle over quantifying the state of the Latino vote broke out into the open, as polls which came out on the same day, had differing breakdowns for Obama and Romney. A Quinnipiac poll said Romney had seen gains among Hispanics, registering at 30 percent support for the first time, but experts told NBC Latino the poll had a number of problems. Later, the Pew Research Center came out with their poll which showed Obama at 65 percent support and Romney at 25 percent. Gallup says its voting intention scale is just one of seven items it uses to assess the likelihood to vote in its complete likely voter model, so they will have a better idea of voter intentions in the fall.

### Romney Win – Fundraisers

#### Romney is ahead in fund raising --- will win him the election.

**The Portland Press Herald**, **7/10**/2012 (Election 2012: President trails Romney in June fundraising sum, p. http://www.pressherald.com/news/nationworld/president-trails-romney-in-june-fundraising-sum\_2012-07-10.html)

President Obama has fallen behind Republican Mitt Romney in monthly fundraising totals and may now be the underdog in the 2012 money race, given the juggernaut he faces of conservative groups with unlimited contributions at their disposal. The trend has set off at least a mild sense of panic at the Obama campaign, which warned donors on Monday: "We will get beat if this continues." The Romney campaign announced Monday that it raised an eye-popping $106 million last month in conjunction with the Republican National Committee, compared with just $71 million announced by Obama and the Democratic National Committee. The gap, at $35 million, is wider than it was in May, when Romney and his party allies raised $17 million more than the Democratic side. The momentum shift marks a change in fortunes for Obama, whose 2008 victory was propelled by a breathtaking fundraising operation that brought in $745 million by Election Day, much of it fueled by grass-roots donations. In September 2008 alone, Obama and the DNC brought in $193 million.

### Romney Win – Likely Voters

#### Romney will win – has an edge from likely poll voters.

**Silver 7/19** (Silver, Nate, runs the Five Thirty Eight NY Times Blog, 07/19/12, Five Thirty Eight, Does Romney have an edge from likely voter polls, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/19/does-romney-have-an-edge-from-likely-voter-polls/)

Is Mitt Romney’s position more advantageous than some polls imply? That’s what Mark Blumenthal of The Huffington Post suggested in a column on Wednesday. He noted that many of the polls out now were conducted among registered voters. But when pollsters switch over to likely voter models, which account for their estimate of how likely each respondent in the survey is to vote, as the election draws closer, they may be expected to show slightly more favorable results for Mr. Romney, enough to potentially matter in a close election. I mostly agree with Mr. Blumenthal. In fact, our forecast model builds in a “likely voter adjustment” — it is already shifting those registered voter polls a bit toward Mr. Romney. But it would also be possible to overestimate how much difference this might make. In the past six presidential election years, the shift to likely voter models has always helped the Republican candidate, but the difference has also always been small, usually amounting to a net of one or two percentage points in the margin between the two candidates.

### Romney Win – Momentum

#### Romney is gaining momentum on Obama.

**The Hill**, **7/19**/2012 (Overnight Campaign: New message, new momentum, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/other-races/239087-overnight-campaign-new-message-new-momentum)

TOP STORY: Romney building a campaign message off Obama’s building remark Mitt Romney appears to be gaining some traction with his latest campaign message: hammering President Obama over the president's suggestion that the success of private enterprises are dependent on public infrastructure and programs. Republicans have seized on a moment during a town-hall speech last week where Obama, discussing infrastructure like roads and highways, argued that "if you’ve got a business — you didn’t build that. Somebody else made that happen."

### Romney Winning Swing States

#### Romney winning most swing states – mainstream polls wrong

**Chambers 7/16** (Dean Chambers, an Internet journalist and commentator on Examiner.com, 7.16.12, Clarity Digital Group, LLC, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-leads-most-key-swing-states)

Romney actually leads in most of the key swing states, but that might not be indicated in some of the polls and projections done by or based on those done by the mainstream media. But an analysis of the best available polling data indicates a Romney lead in most of those states. Many of the mainstream media polls are showing results favoring President Obama overall and in swing states. Often these polls are inaccurate because they survey registered voters rather than more statistically reliable method of polling likely voters, and often they over sample Democrat voters. The recent Washington Post/ABC News poll sampled voters on a faulty assumption that Republican voters make up just 24 percent of the electorate when Rasmussen's very accurate and exhaustive surveying indicates that 35.4 percent of the electorate are Republicans.

### AT: Gay Marriage

#### Economic issues outweighs gay marriage --- it’s a low priority for voters.

**Polman**, 5/16/**2012** (Dick – staff writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, Op-ed: Gay marriage no longer a hot-button issue, North Iowa Today, p. http://www.northiowatoday.com/?p=20640)

To borrow a phrase from the poet T.S. Eliot, it’s likely that the gay marriage issue will impact the 2012 presidential race not with a bang, but a whimper. Barack Obama’s seven historic words (“same-sex couples should be able to get married”) would have been unthinkable just eight years ago, and that’s the point. Full equality for gay people is the new normal. It’s the majority sentiment in the polls, a trend that will only strengthen with time. As the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said, “The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.” There has been much commentary, these past few days, about how the president’s remarks were politically risky, especially in an election year. I disagree. Obama felt comfortable coming out on gay marriage after calculating that such a stance carried little political risk. Granted, social and religious conservatives will be energized by his remarks, to the point where they’ll squelch their qualms about Mitt Romney. But the same is true on the left side of the spectrum. Obama’s liberal base is just as likely to shake off its disappointment in Obama and hail him for taking a giant step into the 21st century. The people who care most fervently about the gay marriage issue, pro and con, will probably cancel each other out at the ballot box. And these fervent folks are only a small percentage of the electorate. The vast majority of voters, while increasingly willing to accept married gays in their midst, don’t even care about the issue. It barely registers on their list of priorities. Gallup poll editor Frank Newport wrote Thursday: “We ask Americans to name the most important problem facing the country. Two-thirds mentioned some aspect of the economy. Less than 1 percent specifically mentioned issues relating to gay rights or gay marriage.” That’s no surprise. If Obama goes down, it won’t be because he voiced personal support for marriage equality. What matters this year are the kitchen-table issues, not the specter of gay spouses at neighboring kitchen tables. The very fact that so few people take umbrage is itself stark evidence of social progress.

### October Surprise – Iran Strikes Cause Obama to Lose

#### Israel will attack Iran before the election --- causes Obama to lose.

**Ezzatyar**, 3/8/**2012** (Ali – contributor to The Reaction, director of the steering committee to establish the Berkeley Program of Entrepreneurship and Democracy in the Middle East, An October Surprise: Will Israel Attack Iran?, The Moderate Voice, p. <http://themoderatevoice.com/140939/an-october-surprise-will-israel-attack-iran/>)

To the contrary, and more importantly, this is the most temperate climate for an Israeli attack on Iran we have seen. There are some obvious reasons, such as unprecedented Iranian isolation, Iran’s reportedly nearing critical stages in its nuclear development, and recent accusations of assassinations of Israelis abroad. But there is something much more profound from an Israeli perspective. A plurality of Israelis believe that Barack Obama is the least Israel-friendly president in American history. They harbor suspicions about his intentions in the region and generally believe he may abandon Israel in ways unprecedented to presidents before him. An attack on Iran this year is unquestionably dangerous to Obama’s reelection. There is no scenario where a unilateral attack by Israel will not **hurt Obama’s chances**. We probably do not need to discuss how a failed attack, the most likely scenario of a unilateral Israeli strike according to most analysts, would be disastrous for U.S. interests and the president personally. But even a successful Israeli attack would wreak havoc on financial markets, on American interests in the region, and portray Obama as a man with no control over a key region for U.S. interests. This is the most likely scenario for an unlikely Republican win in November 2012. Even if the American public is critical of an Israeli strike, the hawkish Republican candidate-turned-president, who has been distinguishing himself all year long on the principle of being forceful with Iran, comes to power with Israel’s interests in mind. It is win-win for Israel. If Israel waits long enough to ensure there is no sanction from an Obama administration for its attacking Iran, but not until after the elections themselves, it can both perform an operation it has been planning for years, and one which it sees as vital to its long-term survival, while supplanting the president of its largest benefactor that it wants to see gone anyway. Could Israel be planning an October, or perhaps August / September surprise? It wouldn’t be the first time Iran has been used to win a U.S. election. (Remember this one?) The odds of an Israeli attack on Iran are the highest they have been in ten years.

#### Iran strikes would be an overwhelming political loss for Obama.

**Herz**, 4/2/**2012** (Douglas - , If Israel Attacks Iran, Obama Loses Presidency, American Thinker, p. <http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/04/if_israel_attacks_iran_obama_loses_presidency.html>)

Much controversy has arisen recently about the Obama administration leaking details of Israel's planned raid on Iranian nuclear sites by using Azerbaijan as a staging area. The reason for the leaks is simple: if Israel attacks Iran, Obama will lose the presidential election this fall, and BHO will do anything to prevent that from happening. If Israel were to attack Iran to destroy its nuclear weapons capability, Iran would retaliate by attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz as it has often threatened. The U.S. Fifth Fleet patrolling the area would likely be called upon to keep the Strait open, and expanded American military involvement in the region could not be ruled out. World oil and financial markets would be roiled. Israel would be hit with a barrage of rockets and international condemnations. And relations with strategic competitors such as China and Russia would hit the deep freeze. President Obama would have many 3AM telephone calls to deal with. But the real pain for Obama would come from the political price he would pay as Americans saw gasoline prices skyrocket (again), dead and wounded U.S. soldiers and sailors coming home from the Middle East (again), plummeting financial markets (again), possible terror attacks on U.S. soil (again), and internet disruptions from Iranian cyberwar. No president could survive politically from such a series of calamities. Thus president Obama is desperate to delay any Israeli attack on Iran until after the November elections, even to the extent of foiling Israel's near-term military plans.

### October Surprise – Iran Strikes Cause Obama to Win

#### Israeli attack will cause Obama to win the election riding a wave of patriotism.

**Bulliet**, 2/16/**2012** (Richard – Professor of History at Columbia University, Bomb Iran, Elect Obama, Middle East Online, p. <http://www.middle-east-online.com/english/?id=50696>)

An Israeli attack on Iran sometime this spring would be an unmitigated disaster. If it should occur, however, it could ensure President Barack Obama’s reelection. Shouldn't Republican election strategists, therefore, be urging Benjamin Netanyahu’s government to hold its fire? On April 24, 1980, an attempt to rescue the Americans being held hostage by Iran failed dismally. President Jimmy Carter bore the burden of the debacle, which contributed greatly to his defeat at the polls later that year. Yet if the rescue had succeeded, Carter probably would have won reelection. A gutsy presidential decision and the successful completion of a difficult mission would have enthralled the American public, Obama’s operation against Osama bin Laden’s Pakistani hideout on May 2, 2011, produced precisely this effect. President Obama will not initiate a war with Iran during the coming year. President George W. Bush attacked Iraq on the supposition that Saddam Hussein had an arsenal of WMD. Bush was wrong, and his decision to go to war weighed heavily in the minds of the voters who put Obama in office. Unless Iran tests a nuclear device, Obama will avoid following Bush’s example. An unprovoked preemptive attack would lose him the support of his liberal base. A unilateral Israeli attack, however, could be an election opportunity. If the Iranians respond only against Israeli targets, Obama will surely weigh in diplomatically on the Israeli side. But American military action would hinge on the exact nature of the Iranian counterstrike. Rocketing by Hezbullah and Hamas, for example, would challenge the United States less than a ballistic missile attack directly from Iran. But what if Iran attacked American targets, most probably naval forces in the Persian Gulf? It is next to certain that Obama would order devastating retaliation against Iranian air defenses and naval targets. The Osama bin Laden raid and subsequent operations against Somali pirates have shown this side of Obama. Under the threat of a major American counterstrike, why would Iran respond to a unilateral Israeli attack by going after the US Navy? Three reasons: First, Iranian leaders have said that Tehran would interpret an attack by Israel as an attack by the United States. They believe that no Israeli attack is possible without American foreknowledge and tacit support. This is consonant with the Iranian belief that Saddam Hussein invaded Iran in 1980 at the behest of the Americans. Second, American targets are more abundant than Israeli ones. Missiles launched from Iran or lobbed over the border by Iranian proxies are likely to do little damage to Israel. American military targets are much easier to find and offer the hope of a spectacular victory if a major US ship is sunk, as well as boots-on-the-deck derring-do to stoke Iranian patriotism. Third, an Iranian response against a US target, followed by a massive American counterstrike, would generate enormous patriotic support for Obama. Americans would see it as payback, at long last, for the hostage crisis. As a result, Obama would cruise to reelection. And a second Obama term in office would be much more attractive to the Iranian government than a shift to a more ardently pro-Israeli Republican administration. Iran could hope that a second term Obama with proven military credentials would be more likely to negotiate war issues than an incoming Republican president eager to show his muscle. From a Republican perspective, a powerful American response to an Iranian attack on a US naval vessel is the worst possible outcome of a unilateral Israeli strike. Obama would be reelected, and no one could accuse him of not standing up for America. The book October Surprise published by Dr. Gary Sick in 1991 argued that the Reagan presidential campaign secretly conspired with the Iranian government to ensure that the embassy hostages would not be released until Jimmy Carter left office. Though most reviewers dismissed the theory, the logic behind it still applies. Republican foreign policy specialists would be well advised to confidentially press the Israelis to hold off attacking until there is a Republican president. This assumes that the Israeli leadership would prefer a Republican to four more years of Obama. Here, then, is the dilemma for the three parties. Iran should logically plan on attacking US assets if Israel strikes before the presidential election. This would trigger an American counterstrike but gain Iran a potentially reasonable bargaining partner in a lame duck Obama second term. If Israel strikes unilaterally after an Obama electoral victory, however, Iran should avoid retaliating against the United States. This might forestall an American military response. For Israel, the choice is between attacking soon and living with four more years of Obama, or waiting until the election in hopes of a more supportive Republican presidency. A Democratic victory, of course, would make the wait seem in vain. From an American perspective, an Israeli attack before the election should be seen as an opportunity. If Iran strikes American targets in response, Obama counterattacks and rides to electoral victory on a wave of American patriotic feeling. An Israeli attack after an Obama re-election, on the other hand, would allow the United States to take more measured countermeasures so as to improve the post-attack negotiating climate.

## Uniqueness Prodicts

### Election Markets Best

#### Market predictions are the most accurate source

**Berg et. al, 2008** (Joyce E. Berg, Associate Professor of Accounting and Pioneer Hibred Research Fellow at the Tippie College of Business, director of the Iowa Electronic Markets, Forrest D. Nelson, Professor of Economics and Tippie Research Fellow at the Tippie College of Business, and Thomas A. Rietz, Associate Professor of Finance and Hershberger Faculty Research Fellow at the Tippie College of Business, April-June, 2008, Prediction Market Accuracy in the Long Run, International Journal of Forecasting, Volume 24, Issue 2, p. 298)

The results above suggest that predictions from markets dominate those from polls about 75% of the time, whether the prediction is made on election eve or several months in advance of the election. To assess the size of the advantage, in addition to its frequency, we computed the average absolute error for both polls and markets on each day a poll was released. The mean error for polls across all 964 polls in the sample was 3.37 percentage points, while the corresponding mean error for market predictions was 1.82 percentage points.19 This advantage persisted for both long term and short term forecasts. Using only those dates more than 100 days prior to the election, the poll error averaged 4.49 percentage points and the market error averaged 2.65 percentage points. Polls conducted within 5 days of the election had an average error of 1.62 percentage points, while the corresponding market prediction error average was 1.11 percentage points.20 5. Concluding remarks Previous research has shown the absolute and relative accuracy of prediction markets at very short horizons (1 day to 1 week). The evidence we present in this paper shows that the markets are also accurate months in advance, and do a markedly better job than polls at these longer horizons. In making our comparisons, we compare unadjusted market prices to unadjusted polls, demonstrating that market prices aggregate data better than simple surveys where the results are interpreted using sampling theory. Thus, our evidence not only speaks in predicting U.S. Presidential election outcomes, but also offers insight into the likely predictive accuracy of markets in settings where there is not a long history of similar events or a clear model for adjusting survey results.

#### Market predicts are accurate

**Berg et. al, 2008** (Joyce E. Berg, Associate Professor of Accounting and Pioneer Hibred Research Fellow at the Tippie College of Business, director of the Iowa Electronic Markets, Forrest D. Nelson, Professor of Economics and Tippie Research Fellow at the Tippie College of Business, and Thomas A. Rietz, Associate Professor of Finance and Hershberger Faculty Research Fellow at the Tippie College of Business, April-June, 2008, Prediction Market Accuracy in the Long Run, International Journal of Forecasting, Volume 24, Issue 2, p. 286)

Here, we extend the research studying whether prediction markets can serve as effective forecasting tools in elections. Prediction markets are designed and conducted for the primary purpose of aggregating information so that market prices forecast future events. These markets differ from typical, naturally occurring markets in that their primary role is as a forecasting tool instead of a resource allocation mechanism. Beginning in 1988, the faculty at the Henry B. Tippie College of Business at the University of Iowa have conducted markets designed to predict election outcomes.1 These markets, now known as the Iowa Electronic Markets (IEM), have proven accurate in forecasting election vote shares the evening and week before elections. Here, we show that these markets dominate polls in forecasting election outcomes, well in advance of the elections.

Election Markets Best

#### 2004 proves market predicts are accurate.

**Jones 2008** (Randall Jones, professor of political science at the University of Central Oklahoma, April-June, 2008, The State of Presidential Election Forecasting: The 2004 Experience, International Journal of Forecasting, Volume 24, Issue 2, p. 312)

Futures markets for presidential elections attracted considerable attention in 2004. These are online markets in which traders buy and sell contracts at prices that represent the market's estimate of the likely outcome of a given election. Most prominent are the Iowa Electronic Market and Intrade.com. The Iowa market was launched in 1988 by the business college at the University of Iowaas an educational tool (Berg, Forsythe & Rietz, 1997; Berg, Forsythe, Nelson & Rietz, in press). Intrade, a commercial service based in Ireland, entered the field more recently, but offers a greater variety of election contracts and has a larger trading volume. The Iowa market – the focus of this analysis – includes two categories of presidential election contracts: winnertake-all contracts, in which those who bet on the winning candidate receive the full payoff; and vote-share contracts, in which the winners' payoff equals only the share of the vote received by the winning candidate. The vote-share market is of greater interest to forecasters, because the trading price of these contracts becomes an estimate of the percentage vote likely to be garnered by a given candidate. The forecast errors for Bush vs. Kerry vote-share contracts in 2004 are reported in Table 1. The underlying contract data are weekly averages of each day's average contract price. As the table shows, in every week but four, during the 34 weeks before the election, the forecast error of the average prices of the Bush contract was less than 1%. That is, as early as the week of March 9–15, when it became clear that Kerry would be the Democratic nominee, the November election outcome was able to be predicted by the Iowa market with great accuracy. Even during the summer months, June through mid-August, when the polls encountered their largest weekly forecast error, averaging 2.0%, the Iowa market's Bush contract maintained its high level of accuracy, with an average weekly error of less than 0.5%. For the two weeks immediately prior to the election, the average weekly error dropped to 0.25%. In short, in 2004 the Iowa market was a highly effective predictor of the presidential election outcome in both the long term and the short term.

#### Studies prove the market can predict the election better than polls.

**Silver 2008**( Boris M. Silver, CEO of Sport Interactivia, 8/14/2008, US Presidential Election Markets 08, p. <http://borismsilver.wordpress.com/2008/08/14/us-presidential-election-markets-08/>)

Prediction markets and betting markets tend to be an interesting comparison to traditional polling. I pulled up a research paper from The University of Iowa which runs the Iowa Election Markets as a way for people to bet real money on the outcomes of the election. The IEM is regulated by the US government and setup as a research study tool. The abstract of their April/June 2008 paper reads:

We gather national polls for the 1988 through 2004 U.S. Presidential elections and ask whether either the poll or a contemporaneous Iowa Electronic Markets vote-share market prediction is closer to the eventual outcome for the two-major-party vote split. We compare market predictions to 964 polls over the five Presidential elections since 1988. The market is closer to the eventual outcome 74% of the time. Further, the market significantly outperforms the polls in every election when forecasting more than 100 days in advance.

### Favorability Polls Best

#### Link only goes one way --- voters will remember unpopular things candidates do.

**Russell**, 3/29/**2012** (Kevin, The Way Too Early 2012 Presidential Election Prediction, Pragmatic Progressivism, p. http://pragmaticprogressivism.wordpress.com/2012/03/29/the-way-too-early-2012-presidential-election-prediction/)

Yes, it’s still late March. However, it seems like the presidential race has its 2 major participants: President Obama and Mitt Romney. While he hasn’t officially won yet, it is very hard to imagine a scenario with Romney not as the Republican nominee. Plus, there are plenty of indicators available to form some type of prediction for the general election. In this post, I will discuss some of these indicators, and explain why I disagree with the mainstream idea that this will be a close election. Perhaps the most important poll when predicting the next president is each candidates’ favorable and unfavorable ratings. No president in recent history has won the president election with a higher unfavorable than favorable rating. While voters certainly can change from viewing a candidate favorably to unfavorably after more media attention is devoted to that candidate and voters learns more about the candidate. But, logically, it doesn’t seem that this change would work in the reverse direction. Once a voter finds out something that he/she doesn’t like about the candidate, it is very difficult to forget that information. Unfavorable ratings always increase as the election becomes more heated, with more mudslinging and more focus on the candidates’ negatives.

### Gallup Poll Best

#### The Gallup poll is accurate

**Wharton**, 11/14/**2007** (Polling the Polling Experts, Knowledge at Wharton (University of Pennsylvania), p. http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1843)

When it comes to polls, not all are created equal. The most reliable? "Surveys conducted by professional polling organizations on a periodic basis which repeatedly ask the same question -- such as, 'Do you intend to buy a car in the next three months?' -- are fully scientific and useful," says J. Michael Steele, Wharton professor of statistics. "Even though we really don't know what a person means when he says 'yes,' we can make hay out of the fact that last year, 15% said 'yes' and this year only 5% said 'yes.'" An example of a polling company that fits this profile is the Gallup organization and the Gallup Poll, considered a leading barometer of public opinion.

### Lichtman Best

#### Lichtman’s method is unblemished

**Jones 2008** (Randall Jones, professor of political science at the University of Central Oklahoma, April-June, 2008, The State of Presidential Election Forecasting: The 2004 Experience, International Journal of Forecasting, Volume 24, Issue 2, p. 317)

In 1981, Allan Lichtman and a collaborator developed a technique for forecasting presidential elections based on an assessment of 13 important factors or “keys”, thought to have consistently influenced the outcome of elections since 1860. These statements are worded so as to favor the candidate of the incumbent president's party. For example, “The economy is not in recession during the election campaign” (Key 5); “The incumbent administration effects major changes in national policy” (Key 7); or “The incumbent party candidate is charismatic or a national hero” (Key 12). As is evident, each statement operates as a switch that is either on or off—true or untrue. If Lichtman determines that five or fewer statements are false, then the candidate of the president's party is predicted to win. If six or more are false, the president's party is expected to lose (Lichtman, 1996). Lichtman's technique is based on the referendum theory of elections, focusing nearly exclusively on the incumbent party. Some of the keys provide an assessment of the incumbent president's performance in office; other keys assess the incumbent party's choice for its current candidate. Taken together, the keys provide a comprehensive list of factors on which to judge the incumbent party. For the 2004 election only four of the indicators were false, a favorable forecast for President Bush. By correctly predicting a Bush victory, Lichtman maintained his unblemished forecasting record using this technique, beginning in 1984. Lichtman usually releases his forecasts about a year before the election. For 2004, his preliminary forecast was published on 25 April 2003, a remarkable 18-month lead time (Lichtman, 2003).

### AT: Lichtman

#### Lichtman is wrong and the ‘key system’ is a bunch of subjective bullshit

**Benoit 1996** (William Benoit, professor of communication at University of Missouri-Columbia, et al., 1996, Campaign ’96, p. 10-12)

However, he goes on to make the striking argument that “The fact that the outcome of every election is predictable without reference to issues, ideology, party loyalties, or campaign events allows us reasonably to conclude that many of the factors most commonly cited in explaining election results count for very little on Election Day.’ He also asserts that “Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars and months of media attention lavished on them, general-election campaigns don’t count” (p.5, emphasis added). Lichtman concludes that “effective government, not packaging, image making, or campaigning” (p. 159) is what matters. Although we do not endorse packaging (by which we mean development of misleading images of candidates), and we do not stress the importance of image over issue, we reject Lichtman’s claim that campaigns don’t matter, based on the evidence he presents for his claim, as well as evidence we offer to the contrary here in this book (e.g., the preface, Chapter 10 on general television spots, or Chapter 12 on presidential debates). We also argue that several of his keys are in fact influenced, if not determined, by campaign messages. First, even if his keys can predict election outcomes, that does not prove other factors are in fact irrelevant. For example, it might be possible to predict a child’s success in school from such factors as parents’ income, the number of books in the child’s home, or amount of time parents read to their child. Such a prediction would not constitute proof that the child’s studying or the teacher’s instruction did not matter. Second, the keys to the White House is an empirically-derived set of factors (developed out of pattern recognition work), not a conceptually or theoretically-driven model. Any empirically-derived system is limited by the campaigns that constituted it. A new election could easily turn on another factor that wasn’t important in previous years. Lichtman assumes that because this system explains past elections, it will also explain all future ones. However, the situation facing presidential candidates is changing. For those who agree that campaigns matter, new technology (e.g., for targeting television spots, tracking polls, and distributing information on the World Wide Web) alters what candidates can do and what means are available to them. Another factor that seems important is the shift away from partisan party loyalty as the number of independent voters continues to rise. The tremendous amount of soft money available to recent campaigns is yet another important factor. If the situation facing candidates changes in important ways—and we’ve identified just three differences—then the “keys” to the White House will change, and the keys that may have explained past elections are unlikely to work so well in the future. Third, most of these keys are subjective, so his assertion that the keys explain all those elections is questionable. For example, how does the analyst determine whether there has been a “serious” contest for the incumbent party nomination (Key 2)? Key seven asks whether the incumbent administration has produced “major changes in national policy” How does one know if a change was major or minor? “Changes” is plural: how many major changes must an incumbent administration enact to consider this key fulfilled? In the eighth key, what qualifies as “social unrest” and how long must it persist to be count as “sustained”? The ninth key is scandal. In 1996, some would have said Clinton sustained at least one major scandal, but others would reject this assessment of affairs. How can one be sure if there was a major scandal or not? Keys 10 and 11 both speak of “major” successes or failures in foreign or military affairs. How serious must they be to count as “major”? The last two keys use “charisma” (not an objectively quantifiable characteristic) and “hero.” Again, consider one of the candidates from 1996. We don’t know anyone who would deny that Bob Dole was a hero during World War II. But it is not obvious that everyone considered him a hero in 1996 (isn’t there a difference between being a hero and having been a hero?). So, was Dole a hero in the 1996 campaign or not? Most of the keys are so subjective that they do not neatly and decisively account for all campaign outcomes. Lichtman brushes aside the criticism that the keys are subjective, asserting that using the keys “merely requires the kind of informed evaluations that historians invariably rely on in drawing conclusions about past events” (p. 14). We do not find this dismissal compelling. Astonishingly, Lichtman admits that one of the co-authors of this approach predicted a Bush victory in 1992 because that writer (DeCell) judged that only four keys weighed against Bush. Lichtrnan’s own forecast, made later in the year guessed that six keys weighed against Bush and Lichtman predicted a Bush loss. Clearly, when two co-authors using the same approach judge the keys differently and make conflicting predictions, this system is subjective and not as predictive as Uchtman would have us believe. Lichtman admits that five elections (1888, 1892, 1912, 1948, and 1992) “hinge on the calling of a single key” (p. 16). This system is far too subjective to function as evidence that other factors are irrelevant. Furthermore, we argue that campaigns do matter. As mentioned above, the preface, Chapter 10 (on general campaign television spots), and Chapter 12 (on presidential debates) all present evidence of the impact of campaign messages (see also Holbrook, 1996).

### National Polls Best

#### National polls are the best indicator of the winner. It deals with outliers and partisan hackery.

**Bernstein**, 7/8/**2012** (Jonathan – political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post blogs Plum Line and PostPartisan, Five myths about swing states, Tampa Bay Times, p. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/five-myths-about-swing-states/1239046>)

1 Swing-state polls are the key to predicting the winner. In fact, the opposite is true, especially this far from November. Generally, elections are determined by a "uniform swing." That is, if the Republican candidate does a little better overall, then he's going to do a little better in close states such as Ohio and Nevada, too. So even though the candidates will spend most of their time and money in the states they expect to matter most, it won't make much difference. Any candidate who wins the popular vote by at least 3 percentage points is certain to win the electoral college, and any candidate who wins the popular vote by as much as a full percentage point is overwhelmingly likely to win the electoral college. So the best way to follow the election is to read the national polling averages. National polls have a key advantage: There are a lot more of them, so we're less likely to be fooled by the occasional outlier. And the frequency of national polls, conducted by the same handful of firms, means informed readers can catch any obvious partisan tilts in the results and interpret them accordingly.

### Polls Accurate

#### Media use of polling data lowers turnout for the underdog, regardless of accuracy

**Rove, ’08** (Karl Rove, former senior adviser and deputy chief of staff to President George W. Bush, 30 Oct 2008, “Don't Let the Polls Affect Your Vote,” Wall Street Journal [New York, N.Y] : A.17., <http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/399131155/>

137FACB82174D1EBD3E/14?accountid=10422)

Polls can reveal underlying or emerging trends and help campaigns decide where to focus. The danger is that commentators use them to declare a race over before the votes are in. This can demoralize the underdog's supporters, depressing turnout. I know that from experience. On election night in 2000 Al Hunt -- then a columnist for this newspaper and a commentator on CNN -- was the first TV talking head to erroneously declare that Florida's polls had closed, when those in the Panhandle were open for another hour. Shortly before 8 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, Judy Woodruff said: "A big call to make. CNN announces that we call Florida in the Al Gore column." Mr. Hunt and Ms. Woodruff were not only wrong. What they did was harmful. We know, for example, that turnout in 2000 compared to 1996 improved more in states whose polls had closed by the time Ms. Woodruff all but declared the contest over. The data suggests that as many as 500,000 people in the Midwest and West didn't bother to vote after the networks indicated Florida cinched the race for Mr. Gore. I recall, too, the media's screwup in 2004, when exit-polling data leaked in the afternoon. It showed President Bush losing Pennsylvania by 17 points, New Hampshire by 18, behind among white males in Florida, and projected South Carolina and Colorado too close too call. It looked like the GOP would be wiped out. Bob Shrum famously became the first to congratulate Sen. John Kerry by addressing him as "President Kerry." Commentators let the exit polls color their coverage for hours until their certainty was undone by actual vote tallies. Polls have proliferated this year in part because it is much easier for journalists to devote the limited space in their papers or on TV to the horse-race aspect of the election rather than its substance. And I admit, I've aided and abetted this process.

### Polls Inaccurate

#### All polls are flawed --- multiple reasons.

McCabe’ 4 (Mike McCabe, Graduate of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, with degrees in journalism and political science. “Ignore all those polls!” <http://www.wisdc.org/proxy.php?filename=files/bmb%20%28imported%29/bmb40oct04.pdf> )

News stories about polls are a prime example of how news organizations unduly focus on who is winning the horse race rather than providing information voters can use to make up their own minds. Worse¶ yet, the polls are illegitimate. They are deeply flawed barometers of public opinion. Polling has been crippled by the rise of cell phone¶ use. Telephone surveys are the staple of public opinion polling, and pollsters rely on something¶ called “random digit dialing” to conduct their¶ questionnaires. That means they use computer technology to randomly dial telephone numbers from¶ published telephone directories.¶ The problem is that cell phone numbers are not¶ published in those directories. So the large – and¶ rapidly growing – ranks of cell phone users are¶ excluded from these “representative” samplings of¶ the public. The opinions of many young people in¶ particular are not captured by pollsters because of¶ this problem.¶ Accurate polling is further disabled by the growing¶ revolt against telemarketing. The public’s hatred of¶ nuisance phone calls has inspired millions to put¶ their names on no-call lists. This phenomenon wasn’t¶ caused primarily by public opinion polling firms but¶ it affects them profoundly. It used to take maybe four¶ or five calls to find someone willing to participate in¶ a poll. Now pollsters will privately acknowledge that¶ it can take 20 calls or more to find a willing¶ participant.¶ That makes the people answering the pollsters’¶ questions oddballs by definition – they are doing¶ something that 19 out of 20 people refuse to do. It¶ also makes your average poll anything but random something that 19 out of 20 people refuse to do. It¶ also makes your average poll anything but random¶ and hardly representative.¶ The final, insurmountable challenge for public¶ opinion pollsters is trying to identify people who¶ will actually vote. Ask 10 people if they plan to¶ vote in the next election, and probably at least¶ seven or eight will insist that they will. Then on¶ election day you find out three or four of them¶ were fibbing.¶ Recently a national polling firm conducted a threeday¶ survey of “likely” voters and found President¶ Bush leading John Kerry by 15 percentage points.¶ A day later, the same polling firm started another¶ four-day survey and this time found the race to be a¶ dead heat. The pollster said the results show “voter¶ opinion is unsettled.”¶ No way are voters that unsettled. What these¶ results really show is that polls provide no¶ meaningful insight into what voters are thinking.¶ Despite vexing social and technological changes¶ that seriously undermine the legitimacy of the¶ polling industry, gauging public opinion and predicting how voters will behave still is being¶ passed off as science. In truth, it’s closer to palm¶ reading or the daily horoscope.¶ The media can do something about the fraud that¶ public opinion polling has become. They can stop¶ reporting the pollsters’ findings.¶ If the media won’t do that, voters should take the¶ polls with more than a few grains of salt. Or better¶ yet, ignore them altogether. They are worthless.

#### Polls historically inaccurate—Bush vs. Gore election

**Rove, ’08** (Karl Rove, former senior adviser and deputy chief of staff to President George W. Bush, 30 Oct 2008, “Don't Let the Polls Affect Your Vote,” Wall Street Journal [New York, N.Y] : A.17., <http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/399131155/>

137FACB82174D1EBD3E/14?accountid=10422)

Some polls are sponsored by reputable news organizations, others by publicity-eager universities or polling firms on the make. None have the scientific precision we imagine. For example, academics gathered by the American Political Science Association at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington on Aug. 31, 2000, to make forecasts declared that Al Gore would be the winner. Their models told them so. Mr. Gore would receive between 53% and 60% of the two-party vote; Gov. George W. Bush would get between just 40% and 47%. Impersonal demographic and economic forces had settled the contest, they said. They were wrong.

Polls Inaccurate

#### Polls are inaccurate—limited survey sample, false responses, bad methodology

**The Economist, ’08** (The Economist, Oct 25, 2008, “United States: Poll, baby, poll!; Prediction,” The Economist, http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/223992350/137FACB82174D1EBD3E/20?accountid=10422)

The volatility of polls give good cause to wonder. Each day, a slew of new ones hits the American press, but they very seldom agree. Polls this week, for instance, showed Mr Obama with a lead as great as 14 percentage points or as small as zero. One way that polls can be wrong, some say, is because of the high percentage of young people without landlines. Polling organisations usually call landlines, because federal regulations targeting telemarketers makes it illegal to dial mobile numbers automatically. But after a recent study by the Pew Research Centre, a non-partisan opinion research group, found that the exclusion of "mobile-onlys" (who are mostly young and pro-Obama) could introduce a bias into survey data, many polling organisations now feel pressure to invest the money and time to have humans call more mobile phones. Still, only some of them do so, and to differing extents, which could help explain the wide variation in polls on any given day. Another concern that has attracted much attention is that polls may show a lead for Mr Obama that will not hold true in the actual vote, because some respondents want to appear politically correct even though they will not vote for a black candidate. This phenomenon, usually called the Bradley effect, is highly controversial, and many people dispute its relevance to the 2008 election, arguing it has not been demonstrated in elections involving black candidates in the past decade. (Indeed, some say the so-called Bradley effect did not even apply to Tom Bradley, an African-American, who ran for governor of California in 1982.) Even if the Bradley effect does not yield a drastically different election result than polls forecast, it is entirely possible that an "Obama effect" might, should he drive supporters to vote in even greater numbers than pollsters anticipate. Polls are most likely to be misleading because of bad methodology. While every poll should strive to get a representative sample of likely voters, many fail. Online surveys are notoriously biased, because respondents are self-selecting. Postal surveys have low response rates, and in-person telephone polls are cripplingly expensive to do. Some polling organisations, like Rasmussen Reports, weight the responses of less represented groups more heavily. But most experts consider this a sloppy way to compensate for a biased poll.

#### Media questions accuracy of automated polling

**Bialik, ’08** (Carl Bialik, staff writer for the Wall Street Journal, 01 Aug 2008, “The Numbers Guy: Press 1 for McCain, 2 for Obama,” Wall Street Journal [New York, N.Y]: A.8, <http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/399101705/137FACB82174D>

1EBD3E/27?accountid=10422)

Mr. Leve blames policies against automated polls on competitive pressure felt by established pollsters, and the media that sponsor them. But the media cite legitimate concerns: There's the aforementioned problem of the 12-year-old boy, and worries that the poll is fielded by whoever happens to answer the phone, making its sample selection not truly random because it favors the kind of person likely to be home. "There is just so little control," says J. Ann Selzer, whose polling firm, using live interviewers, ranks alongside SurveyUSA in the accuracy ratings. "The dog could be answering the questions." Local TV stations' use of automated polling "doesn't mean it's an acceptable methodology," says Prof. Traugott, co-author of "The Voter's Guide to Election Polls," and a professor of political science and communications studies at the University of Michigan. "It means they're doing the best they can with what they've got to spend."

#### Conventional polling methodology flawed

**Bialik, ’08** (Carl Bialik, staff writer for the Wall Street Journal, 01 Aug 2008, “The Numbers Guy: Press 1 for McCain, 2 for Obama,” Wall Street Journal [New York, N.Y]: A.8, <http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/399101705/137FACB82174D>

1EBD3E/27?accountid=10422)

Meanwhile, conventional polls are hardly reaching a truly random sample these days. Response rates have fallen below 20% in many cases, and it's hard to know whether the other 80% who aren't home or refuse participation are like those who do respond. Most pollsters aren't dialing cellphones. And traditional pollsters don't always randomly select respondents from within households. Some, such as the respected Pew Research Center, ask for the youngest male or youngest female at home, because younger people -- particularly males -- are typically underrepresented in polls.

Polls Inaccurate

#### Survey samples are always biased—high non-response rates

**Rotfeld, ’07** (Herbert Jack Rotfeld, Author of Adventures in Misplaced Marketing, Former editor of Journal of Consumer Affairs, and Auburn University Alumni Professor, Summer 2007, “Mistaking Precision for Reality,” The Journal of Consumer Affairs 41. 1, pg. 187-191, http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/195912370/137FAF90E2EA5ED4BF/2?accountid=10422)

For a better metaphor, a sample of people is like taking an x-ray of one part of a body as a basis for concluding about bone structure for the entire skeleton. Bones of different size and shape are not randomly distributed in the body as different types of people are not randomly found in cities, states, or the country. Every sample frame has bias and distortions, while the people selected for the sample from that frame add additional biases by not being available for the interviewers or not responding if they are. To further invalidate a biological metaphor, consumer research is not a straightforward test, like that of DNA matching or blood levels of alcohol. Though telepathy is not among interviewers' talents, they ask respondents their opinions and beliefs hoping the answers are true. As a simple test of frame error of all random sample telephone polls, ask your students how many of them own telephone land lines. Probably few do. Specific estimates vary-it is difficult to argue one has an exact measurement of people who avoid being measured-but articles in various business magazines generally agree that less than a third of people under the age of twenty-five have an available directory-listed nonmobile phone by which they can be contacted for a telephone survey. Nonresponse rates for all survey research studies are now extremely high and getting worse, especially as the increasingly popular caller ID and answering machines allow people to screen calls to avoid pollsters, telemarketers, and academic researchers. Admittedly, the tendency to present precision as the sole basis for assessing research information has driven the teaching of social science or business research for many years. Textbooks on research methods devote limited attention to qualitative research biases, with a majority of chapters and, one assumes, the resulting class time, on statistical data analysis. For many academic journals, as in the news reports, statistical precision statements are the primary focus of attention as if that alone states how close the data represents reality. In journals other than JCA, the nonstatistical biases may be a quick list of "limitations" at the end of the paper that readers could easily ignore. Yet these qualitative biases impact how the study can be interpreted and what can be validly concluded from findings. As part of the statement of how the study might not represent reality, they should be integrated into any discussion of the implications or conclusions, or sometimes part of the explanation of the research method, but they should never be relegated to a special section or listed at the end. All data needs to be approached with skepticism. All findings need to be interpreted.

### Rasmussen/Survey USA Best

#### Automated polls used by Survey USA and Rasmussen are more accurate than traditional polls

**Bialik, ’08** (Carl Bialik, staff writer for the Wall Street Journal, 01 Aug 2008, “The Numbers Guy: Press 1 for McCain, 2 for Obama,” Wall Street Journal [New York, N.Y]: A.8, <http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/399101705/137FACB82174D>

1EBD3E/27?accountid=10422)

There are some presidential polling numbers you won't see on the nightly network news broadcasts. Yet, they have proved themselves to be every bit as accurate as other, widely reported polls -- in some cases, more so. These shunned polls, however, are conducted by computer rather than by a person, so they don't make the cut with many of the big mainstream media, nor with polling experts. One prominent polling textbook, by Paul J. Lavrakas and Michael Traugott, refers to these surveys as Computerized Response Automated Polls -- insulting acronym intended. The critics have legitimate complaints about such polls, including that a 12-year-old boy can convince a computer, but probably not a live interviewer, that he's a 37-year-old woman. But in these times of slashed media-polling budgets, declining response rates and the migration to cellphones, most polls are far from theoretically pure. Watching the survey sausage get made isn't pretty. Excluding only computer-assisted polling numbers seems arbitrary and leaves gaps in our knowledge about the presidential election. The automated-polling method, says Charles Franklin, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin and co-developer of the poll-tracking site Pollster.com, "can prove itself through performance or it can fail through poor performance, but we shouldn't rule it out a priori." The automated polls, or IVRs for interactive voice response, work like this: Respondents hear a recorded voice -- sometimes of a local TV-news anchor, sometimes of a professional actor -- that greets them and asks if they're willing to take part in a quick survey. Then they're asked to enter their political preferences and demographic information using their keypad, e.g., "Press one for John McCain or two for Barack Obama." Automated polls can cost as little as one-tenth the equivalent, live-interview phone poll. The cost advantage builds when a poll is repeated, identically, to track opinion over time -- for instance, in the two-man race for president that will dominate the news cycle for the next three-plus months. As a result, automated polls are beginning to crowd out the rest. They made up more than one-third of published polls during the Democratic presidential primary and nearly two-thirds of statewide polls pitting Sens. McCain and Obama against each other so far this year, according to Prof. Franklin. Their accuracy record in the primaries -- such as it was -- was roughly equivalent to the live-interviewer surveys. Each missed the final margin by an average of about seven points in these races, according to Nate Silver, the Obama supporter who runs the election- math site fivethirtyeight.com. "I think the networks are being snobbish and probably a little bit protectionist about their own polling outfits," he says. SurveyUSA, which pioneered these polls, has an impressive record for accuracy. The company ranks second among more than 30 pollsters rated by Mr. Silver. Its own report card shows it ranking at or near the top in predictive power for recent national election cycles. That may seem like a newspaper naming itself the best newspaper, but SurveyUSA is transparent in its ratings methods and competitors haven't offered alternative ratings. SurveyUSA founder Jay Leve launched the report cards to counter criticism of his methods. Yet, after conducting such polls for 16 years, he still finds himself defending them. That's because, by policy, the national news divisions of CBS, NBC and ABC won't air results from automated polls, even as many of their local affiliates sponsor and air SurveyUSA polls. The Associated Press, the New York Times and the political publication the Hotline also exclude them. (The Wall Street Journal doesn't have such a policy, according to a spokeswoman. Fox News, which like the Journal is owned by News Corp., also airs them.) Scott Rasmussen, president of Rasmussen Reports, says that he believes that automated polls have arrived: "We get coverage on the cable networks and on the Internet, and that's really what our game is."

Rasmussen/Survey USA Best

#### Automated polls, used by Rasmussen Reports, inspire honesty and are more accurate

**Bialik, ’08** (Carl Bialik, staff writer for the Wall Street Journal, 01 Aug 2008, “The Numbers Guy: Press 1 for McCain, 2 for Obama,” Wall Street Journal [New York, N.Y]: A.8, <http://search.proquest.com/abiglobal/docview/399101705/137FACB82174D>

1EBD3E/27?accountid=10422)

Recorded polls, however, offer several advantages. Interviewers are selected because their voices inspire trust (SurveyUSA uses local TV anchors; other automated pollsters use actors or, in the case of Rasmussen Reports, women 30 to 40 years old with Midwestern accents). Politicians' names are pronounced correctly and identically each time, and responses entered correctly are recorded correctly. There also is evidence that automated polls inspire honesty, particularly on sensitive topics. Stephen Blumberg, who conducts polls for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, says that in tests, people responding with touch tones instead of by voice were more likely to admit they had multiple sex partners, or traded sex for money or drugs. Accepting responses by touch tones may have a particular advantage this election, says Mr. Lavrakas, former chief methodologist at Nielsen Media Research, because it may extract more-honest responses from white respondents about their intent to vote for Sen. Obama. "Ultimately the proof is in the pudding, and those firms that use IVR for pre-election polling and do so with an accurate track record should not be dismissed," he says.

### Rasmussen Biased

#### Rasmussen polls biased to Republicans

**Kelley**, **7/2** (Jeremy P. Kelley, staff writer for the Dayton Daily News, 02 July 2012, “View voter polls warily: Pollsters say they work to make surveys more accurate. - Results can vary from week to week.,” Dayton Daily News, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1022925200/137FB21E8A1595D7BF6/6?accountid=10422)

Rasmussen has been accused by some Democrats of skewing his polls in favor of Republicans. Rasmussen Reports and Gallup Poll are the two organizations that release daily tracking polls on the presidential race. In the past two weeks, Rasmussen's results have been more favorable to Romney than Gallup's have, on 13 of 14 days. Rasmussen said it's a sampling issue, as Gallup Poll surveys only registered voters, while Rasmussen uses the less certain "likely voters."

### AT: Pew Research Center

#### Pew polls are biased and slanted toward the Democrats.

**Geraghty**, 7/13/**2012** (Jim – regular contributor to the National Review, Why Are So Many Pollsters Oversampling Democrats?, National Review, p. <http://www.nationalreview.com/campaign-spot/309347/why-are-so-many-pollsters-oversampling-democrats>)

My regular correspondent Number-Cruncher checks in, groaning about the latest Pew poll and that organization’s strange habit of including an unrealistic percentage of Democrats in their sample. The latest one from Pew poll is a shining example of why our side gets so frustrated with polls. Every time a Pew poll comes out, the numbers appear out of whack. Of course if you are a number-cruncher and look to the cross-tabs, the results are clearly flawed. Pew, to its credit, tells us its history since 1988. Basically in 1988 they did a good job, calling the race almost perfectly, possibly even overestimating Bush support by 0.4% (keep in mind they round so 50-42 could be 7.6%). But since then, their results have been downhill. Starting in 1992, EVERY Pew poll appears to lean to one direction — always towards the Democrat, and by an average of more than 5 percentage points. Worse this is a reflection of the “final” poll which even the Democratic firm, Public Policy Polling, usually gets right. October 1988 — Bush 50 Dukakis 42; Actual Result Bush +7.6 (Call this one spot on.) Late October 1992 — Clinton 44 Bush 34; Actual Result :Clinton +5.5 (Skew against Republican candidate +5.5) November 1996 — Clinton +51 Dole 32; Actual Result Clinton +8.5 (Skew against Republican candidate +10.5) November 2000 — Gore 45; Bush 41 (Skew against Republican Candidate +3.5) November 2004 — Kerry 46; Bush 45 (Skew against Republican Candidate +3.4) November 2008 — Obama 50 McCain 39 (Skew against Republican + 3.8) After being wrong in the same direction so consistently, wouldn’t you think that Pew might attempt to adjust their sampling techniques to adjust their techniques to avoid under-sampling Republican voters? Keep in mind the polls I have highlighted are the last polls in the race. I find it interesting that not one of their poll statisticians came out and said, ‘Boss, these results look whacked out because the electorate is going to be more than 24 percent Republican, and self-identified Democrats aren’t going to outpace Republicans by 9 percentage points.’ The Democrats couldn’t even reach that margin in 2008 . . . and you wonder why so many people think Obama is going to win. Didn’t Einstein once say the definition of insanity was “doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results”. So I ask are the people at Pew insane or just biased?

## Links

### Transportation 1NC

#### Massive public opposition to funding transportation infrastructure

Council on Foreign Relations, June **2012** (Road to Nowhere: Federal Transportation Infrastructure Policy, p. 5)

WHAT THE PUBLIC WANTS Though Americans share Obama’s enthusiasm for making infrastructure improvement a priority, nationwide opinion polls suggest they oppose typical options for funding it. A 2011 Rockefeller Foundation poll found that nearly 80 percent of voters agree that “in order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.”15 Two out of three voters believed improving the country’s transportation infrastructure is “highly important.” **Yet similar margins do not want to have to** pay for it: 71 percent oppose increasing the gas tax, 64 percent oppose new tolls on existing roads and bridges, and 58 percent oppose paying more for each mile driven.

### Generic Transportation Links

#### Voters don’t want to spend money on transportation infrastructure --- this evidence assumes poor economic conditions.

**Bernstein**, 11/01/**2010** (Andrea – Director of the public radio Transportation Nation project, Wariness about spending on transportation and infrastructure accompanies voters to the polls, Transportation Nation, p. http://transportationnation.org/2010/11/01/wariness-about-spending-on-transportation-and-infrastructure-acompanies-voters-to-the-polls/)

It’s been a rough election season out there. Unless you’ve crawled into a cave for the last three months, you know the airwaves have been flooded with ads calling candidates everything from thieves to hooligans to rogues and everything in between. But the sour voter mood isn’t just about advertisements — it’s about reduced circumstances, drastic cuts in local government services, higher taxes and fees, fewer jobs, and dramatically higher health care costs — despite health care reform and an $800 billion stimulus bill. Or as one Florida election volunteer Marcia told me in a largely African American neighborhood in Tampa last week: “People are disappointed,” she said. “They thought they were going to have this magic wand that I’m going to save my home because we have Obama as President. And I’m going to have a job because we have Obama as President.” But then, people lost their jobs, and they lost their homes. “Where’s the change?” retired Hoovers vacuum worker Alice Prestier asked me in Canton, Ohio. Or, more bitterly, as one Colorado contractor told me in Loveland, Colorado: “I don’t need to spend $2,000 to support every illegal f\*\*\*\*\*g Mexican in this country. Nor do I need to keep busting my ass for this government. You know, my son can’t ride the bus to school anymore. He’s got to walk two miles to school, explain that to me! You know, why does education have to go, but yet we can support illegals, we can piss money away on stuff that doesn’t’ matter, a health care plan that will never work?” All of which has created a wary public, seemingly unwilling to spend on big transit projects like the ARC tunnel, high speed rail, or even roads. Even though the President has bracketed this campaign season with a call for $50 billion in additional spending on roads, rails, and airports and the distribution, last week, of some $2.5 billion in high speed rail grants, kitchen-table cut backs have spilled over into an attitude about government spending. Where once voters seemed to have faith that large infrastructure projects would create jobs, both in the long and short terms, they now worry that worthy as projects may be, there simply isn’t enough money to spend on things like new transit tunnels, high speed rail systems, or even roads.

#### Transportation infrastructure relies on a gas tax hike --- sparks massive public opposition

**Ekins**, 1/6/**2012** (Emily – Director of Polling for Reason Foundation, 77 Percent of Americans Oppose Gas Tax Increase, 58 Percent Favor Tolls Instead, Reason Foundation, p. http://reason.com/poll/2012/01/06/77-percent-of-american-oppose-gas-tax-in)

As the number of people using roads and highways steadily increases, cars have also become more fuel-efficient, thus reducing the amount of gas purchased per person. This is good news for consumers; however, transportation spending is largely funded from gasoline taxes, and those receipts are decreasing. The recent Reason-Rupe poll asked Americans how they would prefer to fund transit going forward. Gas Tax Policymakers have considered increasing the federal gas tax, currently 18.4 cents per gallon in efforts to close the spending-funding gap. Yet 77 percent of Americans oppose raising the federal gas tax. Part of the aversion may be a concern that the government will **not spend the tax dollars effectively**—65 percent of Americans think the government generally spends transportation funding ineffectively.

Generic Transportation Links

#### Despite support for transportation infrastructure, the public thinks spending is inefficient and unaccountable

**Bradley, Ridge and Walker**, July **2011** (Bill – former Pennsylvania Governor, Tom – former Secretary of Homeland Security, and David – former U.S. Comptroller General from 1998 to 2008, Road to Recovery: Transforming America’s Transportation, Carnegie Report, p. http://carnegieendowment.org/2011/07/11/road-to-recovery-transforming-america-s-transportation/3e1h#4)

Unaccountable spending is undermining America’s long-term strategic priorities, and the nation’s infrastructure is crumbling. Failure to reform the transportation system risks deepening the United States’ dependence on oil, eroding economic competitiveness, and increasing climate disruption. Waiting to make real improvements only drives up future costs, whereas responsible policies can improve transportation and reduce the national deficit today. The Leadership Initiative for Transportation Solvency is dedicated to developing a nonpartisan solution to fund a better transportation system in the United States. Former U.S. senator Bill Bradley, former Pennsylvania governor and secretary of Homeland Security Tom Ridge, and former U.S. comptroller general and current president of the Comeback America Initiative David Walker led an intensive analysis to find politically realistic measures to fund and fix the U.S. transportation program. In recent years, the U.S. surface transportation system added more than $100 billion annually to the national deficit, including deferred maintenance. The United States is one of only a handful of countries in the world where revenues raised to support the federal transportation system do not cover costs. Revenues represent just 62 percent of federal surface transportation expenditures, while all other members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the group of developed economies, more than cover 100 percent of their transportation expenditures through user taxes—and sometimes several times over.1 Also, the practice of deferred maintenance unnecessarily contributes to this burden by increasing the cost of system upkeep to as much as $800,000 per lane mile over the life of the road.2 There are tangible economic benefits from the transportation system apparent in the ability of households and firms to access markets. But the benefits are waning. The rate of economic return from investment in highway infrastructure in the United States has been approaching the long-term interest rate (cost of capital) since the 1990s. Once the rate of economic return meets the long-term interest rate, it becomes equally beneficial to keep invested capital in the private sector,3 a clear signal that those investments could be without merit. At that point, the system no longer delivers the benefits necessary to justify public funding. While a 2011 national public opinion poll found that 79 percent of the public agrees that “in order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date,” in the same poll 64 percent of the public felt that federal spending on transportation infrastructure is “inefficient and unwise.”4

Generic Transportation Links

#### Despite support for transportation spending, voters refuse to pay for it.

**Weinberg**, 2/17/**2011** (Ali – writer for NBC, Poll: Support for infrastructure spending, but not paying for it, First Read on NBC News, p. <http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2011/02/17/6075671-poll-support-for-infrastructure-spending-but-not-paying-for-it?lite>)

Democrats, Republicans, and independents would all support new government spending on U.S. transportation infrastructure, but are not interested in footing the bill themselves, according to a new poll.

The survey, conducted by Democratic polling firm Hart Research and Republican firm Public Opinion Strategies, was released days after President Obama submitted his 2012 budget request, which includes $53 billion over six years towards high-speed rail projects and $30 billion a year to fund a national infrastructure bank. The survey found wide bipartisan support for legislators to seek common ground on infrastructure improvements: 71% of all respondents -- including 74% of Democrats, 71% of Republicans and 69% of independents -- said they wanted elected officials to work together on the issue. Support was also strong among respondents who identified themselves as part of the Tea Party, an affiliation that connotes a strong anti-government spending attitude, with 66% supporting infrastructure investment. “The bipartisan, or even tripartisan, nature of the issue comes through loud and clear," said Jay Campbell of Hart Research, who, along with Public Opinion Strategies, conducted the poll for state-centric think tank the Rockefeller Institute. This support also extended into specific policy proposals that would control how transportation dollars are spent. In the poll, 90% supported the idea of holding all levels of government accountable for making sure infrastructure projects stay on time and budget, as well as allowing local regions to have a greater say in how transportation funds are used in their area. Even some spending increases, like more competitive grants for transportation projects and money for developing public transportation systems and bike paths, were met with high approval numbers. “There is a tolerance for more spending in this area as long as there's a demonstration that it's going to be spent wisely,” said Republican pollster Bill McInturff of Public Opinion Strategies. But support plummeted to 40% when respondents were asked if they would support replacing the per-gallon gasoline tax, which has stayed at the same level since 1993, with a fee based on the number of miles driven. While a gas-tax hike would be a quick way to increase revenue, its unpopularity among voters means it’s unlikely to become a reality in Congress, Campbell said. “This is really the rock and a hard place for lawmakers,” he said. “Voters say our infrastructure is lacking, they say it should be modernized, they say it should be improved, but they resist paying for it.”

#### The economic climate makes transportation spending an unattractive option.

**Slone**, September **2009** (Sean – Transportation Policy Analyst at the Council of State Governments, Increasing Public Awareness of Infrastructure Costs & Finance, p. http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/TIA\_infrastructure\_cost.pdf)

Some observers in recent years have said the condition of the nation’s infrastructure is such that a major effort is needed along the lines of building the interstate highway system or putting a man on the moon. But America today is in a far different place than when Roosevelt captured the imagination of the American people with a map of linked highways or when John F. Kennedy kicked the space race into high gear. The nation’s competing priorities—including health care reform and others—seem to dim the prospects for the major transportation overhaul many say is needed. Hammond said the goals should be a bit less ambitious during what is a potentially transformative moment for the nation’s infrastructure.

“That’s not where transportation is right now,” she said. “If there’s a transformation point, it’s how to optimize the use of the system, use every inch of pavement that you have in the best way that you can for freight and people movement and then how do you encourage, incentivize and provide options for people not to have to drive alone everyday to work through central Puget Sound.” But that’s just not a sexy issue, she said. In what may be a difficult year to accomplish significant transportation spending at the state level, it may be necessary for proponents to simply ride out the recession **until the political and economic climate is more favorable** toward additional infrastructure investment.

### Generic – No New Infrastructure

#### Public supports improving current infrastructure not new infrastructure.

Pennsylvania Economy League, October **2006** (Investing in Transportation: A Benchmarking Study of Transportation Funding and Policy, p. 66)

Transportation-related infrastructure

In an August 2006 IssuesPA/Pew poll, respondents perceived transportation-related infrastructure to be the biggest infrastructure problem. Respondents believed their regions will lack sufficient funding to meet demands in the future. And 69 percent put the focus on efforts to repair and upgrade existing roads, bridges and public transportation systems, rather than building new. This is consistent with the generally held belief among stakeholders and officials that the state’s system of roads and bridges is primarily complete. Stakeholders expressed that maintenance or needed replacement of existing infrastructure to bring it into a state of good repair should be the priority, while new capacity should be considered at the margins only, where there is clear demand.

#### The public does not want to spend on new infrastructure --- prefers improvement of old ones.

**Davis**, 6/15/**2009** (Stephen Lee – Deputy Communications Director for Transportation for America, What do Americans really think about spending on transportation?, Transportation for America, p. http://t4america.org/blog/2009/06/15/what-do-americans-really-think-about-spending-on-transportation/)

Spending money on public transportation or other transportation options won’t prevent us from repairing and maintaining our existing roads and bridges. In fact, our roads and bridges aren’t in poor shape because we don’t spend enough on roads overall — it’s because we’ve neglected to maintain our existing roadways and instead spent taxpayer dollars on more new roads and highways, whether or not these were the best investments of our transportation dollars Regardless of where we’ve spent money in the past or “what we used to do,” people are ready for something different. Rather than asking Americans if we should “take” money from roads, what happens when you ask Americans a more basic questions: “Where should we spend our transportation money?” Earlier this year, Transportation for America and the National Association of Realtors did just that in our own poll. (Background on the poll here and here). The bottom line? An overwhelming majority of Americans believe restoring existing roads and bridges and expanding transportation options should take precedence over road-building alone. Given that the U.S. population will increase by one-hundred million people by 2050, which of the following transportation approaches do you prefer to accommodate this growth? Build and improve rail systems, such as commuter rail, light rail, and subways Build new highways and freeways Not sure 75% 20% 5%

### Generic – Spending

#### Transportation infrastructure triggers hot button election issues like the economy and spending.

**Quinter**, 6/13/**2012** (Joshua – Principal Lawyer at Kaplin Stewart, Will A Permanent Federal Highway Appropriations Bill Ever Get Passed, p. http://www.pennsylvaniaconstructionlawyer.com/2012/06/will-a-permanent-federal-highway-appropriations-bill-ever-get-passed.shtml)

Given that it is an election year, the rhetoric will likely increase. Action by Congress to pass the highway transportation bill - particularly since it appropriates money in an election year where the economy and government spending will be a hot button issue -seems very unlikely. The introduction of a 10th stopgap measure in to the conversation in recent weeks has done nothing to allay the fears of those still holding out hope for a long term deal. With a Congressional recess quickly approaching and election season hitting full swing shortly thereafter, those in the construction industry should not expect much more than an effort to "kick the can down the road" before the June 30th deadline.

### Generic – Transportation Spending

#### Despite support for transportation infrastructure, attempts to fund programs cause public backlash.

**McBee Strategic Insight**, 2/3/**2012** (Washington Research: The McBee 2012 Preview – Transportation Infrastructure Investment: “The Responsibility of Governing,” p. 4-6)

Whether those are just political talking points or a real desire to legislate remains to be seen. Regardless, public opinion largely backs up that view. According to a Rockefeller Foundation survey conducted in February 2011, two out of three voters consider improving the nation's transportation infrastructure to be "extremely" or "very" important, and four out of five believe that boosting federal funding will improve the economy "and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering." Ninety-one percent of those polled agreed that "our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure – just as our parents and grandparents did," and 71% said transportation funding ought to be an area of bipartisan compromise. However, when it comes to actually financing increased spending on infrastructure, that consensus quickly melts away. "Voters are far less accepting of proposals that would affect their own wallets," the Rockefeller Foundation survey found. True to form, 71% of voters said it would be "unacceptable" to raise the federal gasoline tax – the main funding source for the HTF – which has been set at 18.4 cents per gallon since 1993.

#### The public does not want to pay for transportation infrastructure --- opposition to pork barrel spending is stronger than the ambivalent support.

**Alden**, 6/14/**2012** (Edward – Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, The First Renewing America Progress Report and Scorecard: The Road to Nowhere, Council on Foreign Relations, p. http://blogs.cfr.org/renewing-america/2012/06/14/the-first-renewing-america-progress-report-and-scorecard-the-road-to-nowhere/)

Two-thirds of Americans say that fully funding transportation infrastructure is either “extremely important” or “very important” to them. Yet solid majorities are opposed to any of the usual ways of funding new roads, including higher gas taxes or new tolls. It would be easy to point a finger at Congress, and we certainly do in the report. Reauthorization of the surface transportation bill, usually known as the highway bill, has always been contentious, but nevertheless it used to win approval routinely. But the last multi-year bill expired in 2009 and has been replaced by a series of short-term extensions that make rational construction planning all but impossible for state and local governments. The bill expires again June 30th, and congressional leaders again look unlikely to reach agreement and are predicting another short-term extension. It will be the 10th; as a Miami Herald editorial put it recently, this marks “a new low in congressional irresponsibility.” But congressional inaction in many ways reflects public ambivalence. Americans want uncluttered highways, efficient airports, and seamless mass transit systems, but they are either reluctant to pay for these things or doubt the ability of governments to deliver. The overdue backlash against pork barrel politics for favored projects, for instance, seems to have hardened into a deeper public cynicism about the ability of government to deliver any needed public works. Even proposals like using a federal seed money to create a National Infrastructure Bank that would funnel private investor (not taxpayer) money into new projects have been unable to get through Congress.

#### Paying for transportation infrastructure is election suicide. There is no support for funding.

**McBee Strategic Insight**, 2/3/**2012** (Washington Research: The McBee 2012 Preview – Transportation Infrastructure Investment: “The Responsibility of Governing,” p. 1)

Expected passage of a long-term aviation financing bill next week gives ground transportation advocates cause for hope, but that's likely a red-herring. The politics surrounding how to pay for infrastructure financing simply remain too hot to handle in an election year. President Obama has run away from any discussion of increasing the 18.4 cents per gallon federal gasoline tax, while Republicans won't support a tax increase of any kind to pay for new spending, even if some groups are willing to pay additional taxes. Those views are generally consistent with a voting public that wants to spend more on transportation infrastructure – but does not want to foot the bill out of their own wallets.

Generic – Transportation Spending

#### Voters think federal transportation spending is inefficient and unwise.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 3)

A large majority of voters see room for improvement in how the government spends money on infrastructure and they endorse a host of reforms in this area. • 64% of voters say that how the government currently spends money on building and maintaining our transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise, including one in four (26%) who says it is very inefficient. Just 32% say the government currently spends efficiently and wisely. • Republicans (72% unwise) and independents (67% unwise) are particularly adamant that this is the case, though 56% of Democrats say that current spending is unwise as well.

#### Polls prove the public thinks the federal government wastes transportation spending.

**Reason**, 12/20/**2011** (77 Percent of Americans Opposing Raising the gas Tax and Favor Tolls, Reason-Rupe Transportation Poll, p. <http://reason.com/poll/2011/12/20/77-percent-oppose-raising-gas-tax>)

A majority of Americans believe new transportation projects should be paid for with user-fees instead of tax increases, according to a new national Reason-Rupe poll of 1,200 adults on cell phones and land lines. The Reason-Rupe poll finds 77 percent of Americans oppose increasing the federal gas tax, while just 19 percent favor raising the tax, which is currently 18.4 cents a gallon. The public thinks the government wastes the gas tax money it already receives. Sixty-five percent say the government spends transportation funding ineffectively, and just 23 say the money is spent effectively.

#### The public does not want to pay for transportation infrastructure.

**Feigenbaum**, 3/30/**2012** (Baruch – Transportation Policy Analyst at Reason Foundation, Data Does Not Support Claims that Light Rail Improves Rider Health, Reason Foundation, p. <http://reason.org/blog/show/data-does-not-support-claims-that-l>)

The report is split into four major sections that detail the Return on Investment, Investing in Infrastructure, Uses (for) Underutilized Resources, Supporting the Middle Class and Americans Want More Transportation Investment. (Note to the authors: Americans might want more transportation investment but they do not want to pay for it. Unless the transportation genie builds a beautiful new highway, finding the funds to build that highway will be challenging.) Report subsections include such fluffy topics as Building a National Community and Creating a More Livable Community. The report also proclaims that “Now Is The Time to Act.” I am waiting for one of these reports that says tomorrow is the time to act. The report also details the role of a merit-based national infrastructure bank. Perhaps the authors can explain a merit-based national infrastructure bank to the President, because he still does not understand the merit part.

### Generic – Talking Points 2NC

#### Passing transportation spending takes the jobs agenda strategy off the table and gives the GOP the edge.

**McBee Strategic Insight**, 2/3/**2012** (Washington Research: The McBee 2012 Preview – Transportation Infrastructure Investment: “The Responsibility of Governing,” p. 2-4)

With the 2012 elections looming and a long-term reauthorization of transportation infrastructure programs long overdue, House Republicans are mounting a full-court press on the issue to demonstrate a positive agenda to voters that is "for" something with job-creation potential, instead of simply saying "no" to President Obama's proposals. There are few spending priorities other than roads, bridges, airports that enjoy bipartisan backing as a core public good (rail and mass transit aren't quite as lucky, as we'll describe below), yet transportation spending made up a grand total of 2.6% of the federal budget in the fiscal year that ended September 30. That share has been headed downwards since 3% in Fiscal Year (FY) 2003, and by FY 2021 will be only 2% of federal spending. By comparison, national defense took up 19.7% of the budget in FY 2011, while Social Security and Medicare together accounted for over two-thirds of all FY 2011 spending. To be fair, three-fourths of all infrastructure spending occurs at the state and local level. But all infrastructure spending put together, including for waterways and sewers, encompassed only 2.4% of U.S. Gross Domestic Product in FY 2007, the latest year for which the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has comprehensive data. In that same year Medicare and Social Security alone totaled 7.3% of GDP. And infrastructure's slice of the pie is only getting smaller as entitlement programs and net interest payments on the $15 trillion U.S. debt keep rising and crowding out all other spending. Meanwhile global economic rivals like China, India, and the European Union continue to put a much greater share of their resources into infrastructure investment. While other factors are clearly at work than commitment to infrastructure, at least in China and India GDP growth is expected to significantly outpace that of the U.S. over the next couple of years, according to the latest International Monetary Fund forecast. That fact is not lost on members of either party, who do not want to preside over the U.S. losing "great power" status. On some levels, the tide of support for infrastructure may be turning. A bipartisan House-Senate agreement on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) funding appears set to clear Congress next week and be signed into law. The measure keeps spending roughly flat at $16 billion a year for the next four years – avoiding the steep cuts envisioned by GOP conservatives for most domestic programs. Republicans and Democrats put aside their differences, for instance on a controversial labor matter, in order to move the FAA bill forward – something that could not have been foreseen just a month or so ago when Congress was in the throes of utter gridlock over routine extensions of expiring legislation. Congress is now embarking on a major push to pass a long-term ground transportation funding bill to provide some stability in the construction sector and create potentially millions of jobs ($1 billion in highway spending = 27,800 jobs created, according to the Federal Highway Administration). But despite success on the FAA measure, we think the odds are greatest that the same old partisan fights – namely over how to pay for it – will stymie action on a long-term solution to surface transportation financing until 2013 at the earliest (more on this below). Section 2: Background - Shades of 1998/2005? The five-year surface transportation bill under consideration in several House committees this week represents a departure from Tea Party orthodoxy as its highway program funding would roughly keep pace with inflation, rising from $39.9 billion in FY 2012 to $43.2 billion in FY 2016. That is a major shift and about $30 billion more than the six-year outline House Republicans unveiled last summer that would have cut highway spending by some 33% from current levels, by limiting the program's funding to what the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) is taking in from tax revenues and interest. The measure flat-funds transit programs at roughly $10.5 billion annually. The Senate is working on a two-year funding bill with slightly higher funding authorizations in its two years, spending a little more on highways in FY 2012 ($42.3 billion) and FY13 ($43 billion), and about the same on transit. House Republicans do not believe two years is adequate to provide certainty for the highway program, however, and generally do not like to be dictated to by the Senate. The House position also enjoys backing from major business and road-construction industry groups, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers and American Road & Transportation Builders Association, though an odd coalition of conservative groups including the Club for Growth as well as the labor and environmental community also have concerns. • Two important points about the House GOP bill: - Transit privatization/removal of funding stream. The measure eliminates the dedicated funding source – HTF tax revenues – for mass transit, instead making it entirely subject to general fund appropriations with a one-time $40 billion cash infusion to supplement existing appropriations of about $2.1 billion a year. The move will provide more dedicated resources for highway projects while making transit compete for money against popular "discretionary" programs like defense and veterans' medical services – a powerful incentive to turn transit operations over to the private sector, something House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) has long advocated. To drive home the point, Mica included language forcing transit agencies to contract out operations to private companies in order to obtain their maximum share of federal funds. This has sparked considerable concern among labor unions due to the potential for private firms running transit operations to hire non-union labor. hiring non-union labor. Also, importantly, all transit programs would now be subject to the "sequestration" process, or across-the-board cuts to defense and domestic spending set to occur in 2013, while the highway program would be largely protected given its own dedicated financing source. Presently only about one-fifth of transit funding would be subject to sequestration. - Amtrak funding slashed. Mica's bill cuts Amtrak's operating budget by 25% over the next two years and would privatize food and beverage operations. Senate Democrats from Northeast Corridor states and labor unions are strongly opposed. •These provisions demonstrate the antipathy among conservatives towards spending taxpayer dollars on mass transit and rail projects – which many consider only of use in urban centers they don't represent. That's not a uniform view among Republicans, however, although rail/transit backers in the GOP have dwindled as more moderate members have lost re-election or retired. This will be a bone of contention if the House and Senate ever get to a conference committee to hammer out differences. Passing a multi-year ground transportation funding bill, something Republicans achieved in 1998 and 2005 when they controlled Congress, would take away an issue that Obama and the Democrats have been hammering them on. It would also demonstrate to voters that the GOP is capable of governing, a departure from the dysfunction-marred view of House Republicans held by the public after last year's payroll tax cut debacle. House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) reminded his troops of the mantle of leadership in a closeddoor meeting this week: "Whether we like it or not, the reality is that dealing with our nation's crumbling infrastructure is part of the responsibility of governing. Infrastructure is vital to our economy," Boehner told the House Republican Conference on Wednesday, according to remarks provided by his office.

### Gas Tax Link 2NC

#### Transportation infrastructure is funded by a gas tax --- that is massively unpopular

**Kaiser**, 2/22/**2012** (Emily – Associate Digital Producer of the Daily Circuit, America’s crumbling transportation infrastructure, Minnesota Public Radio News, p. <http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2012/02/22/daily-circuit-transportation-funding/>)

It's hard to claim that America's transportation system is in great shape. The American Society of Civil Engineers says the United States has a $3 trillion backlog on transportation projects and it costs drivers in traffic jam time, wear on cars and damage to the environment. But how are we going to pay to improve it? Emil Frankel, visiting scholar at the Bipartisan Policy Center, joined Kerri Miller on The Daily Circuit Wednesday. "We have an aging, congested, deteriorated system," he said. But one thing politicians can't seem to agree on: How to pay for upgrades. Richard Geddes, associate professor in the Department of Policy Analysis and Management at Cornell University, also joined The Daily Circuit discussion. "We have not always underfunded road repair in the country," Geddes said. Taxes on gasoline have always been a strong source of funding for transportation infrastructure projects as long as there were more drivers using more gasoline, thus paying more taxes. That isn't the case anymore, Geddes said. "The main [reason] in my view is the increasing fuel efficiency of vehicles, which means that people can drive more vehicle miles, but don't pay proportionately more in fuel taxes," he said. So should we increase the gas tax? Geddes said it's a "political bomb to go out and advocate for an increase from the federal gas tax." "At least part of the reason for that is people's lack of faith that the revenue from an increase from a gas tax would be spent wisely by Congress," he said. Geddes referred to the 2005 highway bill, which included 6,371 earmarks and the notorious "bridge to nowhere" in Alaska.

### Ext – Transportation Spending = Gas Tax

#### Money does not materialize from thin air --- the plan is funded by a gas tax.

**National Journal**, 11/15/**2010** (Fuel Tax, Anyone?, p. http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/11/fuel-tax-anyone.php)

At the risk of beating a dead horse, let me restate the obvious: We all know that the highway trust fund is insufficient to maintain the country's current transportation infrastructure, let alone improve it. Lawmakers would be more than happy to bolster spending for highways, railroads, and bridges if only they could make the dollars materialize out of thin air. Meanwhile, economists and transportation-related business and labor groups all seem to land at the same answer for raising the money--a fuel tax increase, either per gallon or per miles traveled. Last week, the chairmen of President Obama's bipartisan debt commission proposed a 15-cent per-gallon gas tax hike to fully fund highway infrastructure. A few days before the draft debt commission outline was released, Sens. Tom Carper, D-Del., and George Voinovich, R-Ohio, proposed a 25-cent-per-gallon gas tax increase.

#### Normal means for funding transportation infrastructure is a gas tax.

**Long**, 6/6/**2012** (Cate, Who will pay for new infrastructure spending, Reuters, p. <http://blogs.reuters.com/muniland/2012/06/06/who-will-pay-for-new-infrastructure-spending/>)

The most prevalent means of funding infrastructure is a tax on gasoline. At a recent conference organized by the American Society of Civil Engineers and the American Planning Association, discussion focused on the need to create accountability and transparency between state transportation departments and the public in how their taxes were spent: Also on the panel was Doug McDonald, former Secretary of the Washington state Department of Transportation (2001-07). It was under McDonald’s watch that the department addressed long-standing accountability and trust issues by establishing and publicizing quantifiable benchmarks for measuring performance. That focus on accountability allowed state officials to win legislative passage of a five-cent gas tax in 2003 after increases were rejected in 2001 and 2002. The increase allowed the state to fund a series of high-priority “nickel projects” selected by lawmakers. After demonstrating they could bring the projects in on-time and on-budget, the department was able to push for a second, phased-in 9.5 cent gas tax hike two years later to fund the largest transportation package in the state’s history, an $8.5 billion plan. The generic talk about the need to increase infrastructure spending is persuasive, but, as in most public policy matters, the question comes down to who pays for it. McDonald’s idea of “establishing and publicizing quantifiable benchmarks for measuring performance” is so simple that it would be easy to dismiss it. But as tax revenues shrink and demands for government services increase, it will be more important than ever to justify **committing scarce taxpayer dollars to infrastructure**. America has seen too many “bridges to nowhere” to sign off on unlimited new spending on roads and sewer systems.

#### Highway Trust Fund proves that the plan is funded by a gas tax.

**Tsay and Gordon**, 12/7/**2011**(Shin-Pei – director of the Leadership Initiative for Transport Solvency in the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Deborah – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, Five myths about your gasoline taxes, CNN Opinion, p. http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/opinion/tsay-gordon-gas-tax-myths/index.html)

3. Gas taxes are unnecessary because the transportation system is paid for in other ways. Not so fast.

America's transportation system is going broke. Revenue for the Highway Trust Fund is derived almost entirely from federal gas taxes and distributed to all 50 states. It covers nearly 80% of the capital costs of federally-funded transportation projects, with states carrying the remainder. From 2008 to 2010, Congress transferred $34.5 billion from general fund revenues to make up the funding shortfall. This stopgap measure was necessary to continue projects that are already in the works. Moreover, deferred maintenance—the failure to care for existing roads and bridges—combined with lost productivity are estimated to add more than $100 billion to the national deficit annually.

Ext – Transportation Spending = Gas Tax

#### Gas tax is the traditional mode of funding for transportation infrastructure.

**Klein**, 2/15/**2011** (Ezra – editor of Wonkblog and a columnist at the Washington Post, The death of the gas tax – and of infrastructure investment?, Washington Post, p. <http://voices.washingtonpost.com/ezra-klein/2011/02/the_death_of_the_gas_tax_--_an.html>)

Perhaps my favorite part of the budget is the Department of Transportation's section (pdf). Readers know that I think infrastructure investment is, at this moment, the biggest no-brainer in the economy. The need is great, the workers are plentiful, the money is cheap, and the material costs are low. And the administration is proposing quite a lot of it: $556 billion over six years. That includes a $50 billion bump in the first year's funding to maximize job creation at a moment when unemployment is high, a $30 billion infrastructure bank, a $32 billion Race to the Top program to encourage states to develop ambitious and innovative reform proposals, and more. It's good stuff. The question is how we're going to pay for all of it. Traditionally, the underlying law -- the Surface Transportation Assistance Act -- was funded by increasing the gas tax. And when I say "traditionally," I mean beginning with Ronald Reagan in 1982. Yes, Reagan increased the gas tax to fund infrastructure investment. George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton both followed his lead on that. Then came George W. Bush, and for the first time, the law was reauthorized and given new funding without being paid for. The connection between infrastructure investment and its traditional funding source was severed.

### Ext – Gas Tax Unpopular

#### Funding infrastructure raises the gas tax --- that is massively unpopular.

**Grant**, 5/8/**2012** (David – congressional correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, Transportation bill, not yet passed, already blasted by critics, The Christian Science Monitor, p. http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/0508/Transportation-bill-not-yet-passed-already-blasted-by-critics)

What’s wrong with America’s transportation situation? In large measure, it's the gas tax. The federal gas tax is a primary means of funding highway construction and maintenance. The problem is that it is not indexed for inflation, so while road repair costs creep upward, the gas tax stays the same. While that might be good news for American pocketbooks, it's devastating for America's highways. The tax was last increased in 1993, meaning that drivers are paying more than a third less into the Highway Trust Fund than they were at the beginning of the Clinton administration. Moreover, the sluggish economy, high gas prices, and environmental concerns have led Americans to drive less and to buy more efficient vehicles. The lower demand for gasoline has further cut into federal taxes. The result has been neglect of America's roadways, according to the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission. Its 2009 report suggests that the federal government needs to spend roughly $100 billion per year to maintain and improve its infrastructure. The Senate transportation bill offers $109 billion over two years. “The gap between what we’re investing and what we need is just enormous,” says Rob Atkinson, former chairman of the NSTIFC. “And they make almost no effort to address that.” The problem is that paying for American infrastructure more fully means raising taxes on someone. One solution, pegging the gas tax to inflation – or raising it outright – would risk further angering Americans already angry about gas prices. A recent Washington Post/ABC News poll showed 65 percent of Americans disapprove of how President Obama has handled gasoline prices, compared with 26 percent who approve.

#### 71% of the public rejects a gas tax to fund infrastructure.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 4)

• Voters are far less accepting of proposals that would affect their own wallets. Seventy-one percent (71%) say it would be unacceptable to increase the federal gas tax; majorities also are opposed to placing a new tax on foreign oil (51% unacceptable), replacing the federal gas tax with a mileage fee (58%), and adding new tolls to interstate highways and bridges (64%).

### Ext – Gas Tax Outweighs Public Support for Infrastructure

#### Even if the public supports the plan, they don’t want to fund it with a gas tax.

Wall Street Journal, 2/28/**2011** (Poll: Yes on Highway Spending, No on Higher Gas Tax to Fund It, p. <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2011/02/28/poll-yes-on-highway-spending-no-on-higher-gas-tax-to-fund-it/>)

Most Americans support more investment in highways, bridges and transit systems but are solidly opposed to raising the national gasoline tax as a funding option, according to a national survey released by the Rockefeller Foundation. The study helps explain the impasse in Washington as President Barack Obama calls for transportation investments: Many lawmakers agree on the need for more highway spending but are averse to taking politically risky steps to raise funding. The survey was conducted jointly by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies between Jan. 29 and Feb. 6, and has a 3.1 percentage point margin of error. Seven in 10 said they wanted elected leaders to seek compromise, rather than hold fast to their position, on legislation for transportation infrastructure. That’s a higher portion than those who urged compromise in addressing the federal budget deficit, tax cuts, entitlements and other issues. Two-thirds of respondents–including majorities of Democrats, Republicans and independents–said that improving transportation infrastructure is “important.” And 80% agreed that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation systems would boost local economies and create jobs. But only 27% said that raising the federal gasoline tax would be an “acceptable” way to provide more highway funding. The 18.4-cent federal tax on a gallon of gasoline provides most funding for transportation projects, and many groups, including the Chamber of Commerce, have called for raising the gas tax.

### Link Shield – Public Distrust

#### The public distrusts claims that transportation spending is needed

**Orski**, 2/5/**2012** (Ken – public policy consultant at the Urban Mobility Corporation, Why Pleas to Increase Infrastructure Funding Fall on Deaf Ears, New Geography, p. <http://www.newgeography.com/content/002662-why-pleas-increase-infrastructure-funding-fall-deaf-ears>)

Another explanation, and one that I find highly plausible, has been offered by Charles Lane, editorial writer for the Washington Post. Wrote Lane in an October 31, 2011 Washington Post column, "How come my family and I traveled thousands of miles on both the east and west coast last summer without actually seeing any crumbling roads or airports? On the whole, the highways and byways were clean, safe and did not remind me of the Third World countries. ... Should I believe the pundits or my own eyes?" asked Lane ("The U.S. infrastructure argument that crumbles upon examination"). Along with Lane, I think the American public is skeptical about alarmist claims of "crumbling infrastructure" because they see no evidence of it around them. State DOTs and transit authorities take great pride in maintaining their systems in good condition and, by and large, they succeed in doing a good job of it. Potholes are rare, transit buses and trains seldom break down, and collapsing bridges, happily, are few and far between. The oft-cited "D" that the American Society of Civil Engineers has given America’s infrastructure (along with an estimate of $2.2 trillion needed to fix it) is taken with a grain of salt, says Lane, since the engineers’ lobby has a vested interest in increasing infrastructure spending, which means more work for engineers. Suffering from the same credibility problem are the legions of road and transit builders, rail and road equipment manufacturers, construction firms, planners and consultants that **try to make a case for more money**.

#### Despite support for infrastructure, the public distrusts that funding will go to useful projects.

**Slone**, September **2009** (Sean – Transportation Policy Analyst at the Council of State Governments, Increasing Public Awareness of Infrastructure Costs & Finance, p. http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/TIA\_infrastructure\_cost.pdf)

In a study earlier this year commissioned by the HNTB Corporation, a firm that provides architecture, engineering, planning and construction services, 81 percent of Americans surveyed said they agreed that making sacrifices to pay for infrastructure improvements now will make the difference between “a more prosperous or a more difficult future for the next generation.” Sixty-eight percent of respondents said they were willing to pay more in taxes to support highway and bridge maintenance and new construction to reduce traffic congestion. But how much more will Americans pay? The survey said the average American is willing to pay $22 a month to reduce the time spent in traffic by 20 percent. The survey further indicated more Americans trust state government above the federal or city governments and private sector companies to manage and maintain infrastructure projects. Yet 61 percent of respondents said they were not confident taxes they pay to build roads in their area are used well and actually make a difference. 4 That distrust in how tax dollars are spent is not helped by the public perception of what happened the last time Congress considered a transportation authorization bill, according to Washington State Secretary of Transportation Paula Hammond “All anybody remembers (from 2005’s SAFETEA-LU bill) was the ‘bridge to nowhere’ and earmarked funding for something that people have decided—whether it’s true or not—is a waste of money,” said Hammond, who chairs AASHTO’s National Transportation Marketing Campaign Task Force and is a member of The Council of State Governments Transportation Policy Task Force.

### Link Shield – Public Priorities

#### The public does not perceive transportation as a high priority --- they distrust that the government would accurately spend the money.

**Orski**, 2/5/**2012** (Ken – public policy consultant at the Urban Mobility Corporation, Why Pleas to Increase Infrastructure Funding Fall on Deaf Ears, New Geography, p. <http://www.newgeography.com/content/002662-why-pleas-increase-infrastructure-funding-fall-deaf-ears>)

Finding the resources to keep transportation infrastructure in good order is a more difficult challenge. Unlike traditional utilities, roads and bridges have no rate payers to fall back on. Politicians and the public seem to attach a low priority to fixing aging transportation infrastructure and this translates into a lack of support for raising fuel taxes or imposing tolls. Investment in infrastructure did not even make the top ten list of public priorities in the latest Pew Research Center survey of domestic concerns. Calls by two congressionally mandated commissions to vastly increase transportation infrastructure spending have gone ignored. So have repeated pleas by advocacy groups such as Building America’s Future, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the University of Virginia’s Miller Center. Nor has the need to increase federal spending on infrastructure come up in the numerous policy debates held by the Republican presidential candidates. Even President Obama seems to have lost his former fervor for this issue. In his last State-of-the-Union message he made only a perfunctory reference to "rebuilding roads and bridges." High-speed rail and an infrastructure bank, two of the President’s past favorites, were not even mentioned. Why pleas to increase infrastructure funding fall on deaf ears There are various theories why appeals to increase infrastructure spending do not resonate with the public. One widely held view is that people simply do not trust the federal government to spend their tax dollars wisely. As proof, evidence is cited that a great majority of state and local transportation ballot measures do get passed, because voters know precisely where their tax money is going. No doubt there is much truth to that. Indeed, thanks to local funding initiatives and the use of tolling, state transportation agencies are becoming increasingly more self-reliant and less dependent on federal funding

### Link Shield – Cannot Spur Voters

#### Small government advocates are gaining momentum on transportation spending --- the transportation lobby cannot spur voters.

**Reinhardt**, 2/27/**2012** (William – founder and editor of the Public Works Financing newsletter, Take Infrastructure Back from Politicians, Engineering News-Record, p. <http://enr.construction.com/opinions/viewpoint/2012/0227-65279take-backinfrastructure.asp>)

The battle lines will be drawn next November. If the "no compromise" wing of the Republican Party gains ground, then the "starve the beast" option will be on the table, and nothing is sacred. Certainly not the Highway Trust Fund, which conservative activist Grover Norquist views as a deep barrel of pork. If not direct federal investment, then what about tax credits and other leveraging tools? Advocates for these programs have been pulling their hair out for years over how tax credits are scored for infrastructure programs. There is no acknowledgement of the federal revenue upside created by public investment in mobility, safe water, etc. That's not going to change easily because those rules are embedded in the federal budget bureaucracy. Because so much is political, the members of the elite infrastructure technocracy in the U.S. too often are forced to bow to the politicians who dispense the subsidies. Compliance with unending regulations is seen as a cost of doing business, but taxpayers, not contractors, pay full price. U.S. construction companies are carrying a much heavier regulatory burden under the Obama administration than ever before. EPA is an untethered driver of regulations. Owners, public and private, are as likely to find themselves in court as under construction. Enforcement actions under federal set-aside programs are up by 10 times in the past three years, and U.S. Dept. of Labor audits are up by 25 times. "There is a huge new regulatory component to our work and more political impact," says Bruce Grewcock, CEO of Kiewit Corp., whose managers generate 50 million man-hours of craft labor a year. "The Obama administration is listening to a different audience," he says. Social Goals Over Roads? Powerful advocates for smaller government charge that the federal public-works budget is so skewed toward social goals and political insiders that any increase in taxes or user fees should be opposed as wasteful. They have a large and growing audience of believers because they are partly correct. Consider this from the director of a major U.S. infrastructure investment fund: "Every big transportation project in America is political now. It has very little to do with delivering infrastructure projects when there's big money involved." He continues, "Lobbyists have found out that the money is at the project level, not in Washington. They add a political tone to everything, and they've convinced local governments that they need political influence to get anything done." Too little gets built because decisions are not made based on merit. Ever-growing competition for scarce public investment capital is embedded in our social contract. In a study last year, venture capitalist Mary Meeker noted that, since 1965, the GNP grew by 2.7 times and entitlements grew by 11 times. Frighteningly, Meeker identified an 82% correlation between rising entitlement spending and falling personal savings rates. Posterity is rarely mentioned these days. So, we are at a crossroads. No amount of "needs" surveys will spur voters or politicians to support a major commitment to meet future demands for transportation, water, public buildings and other critical infrastructure services.

### Link Booster – Pork Barrel Spending

#### Transportation spending is pork laden and is perceived as deficit spending.

**O’Toole**, 2/16/**2012** (Randal – senior fellow working on urban growth, public land and transportation at the Cato Institute, Fixing the House Transportation Bill, Cato at Liberty, p. http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/fixing-the-house-transportation-bill/)

After catching flack from both fiscal conservatives and the transit lobby, House Speaker John Boehner has postponed consideration of a surface transportation bill. Fiscal conservatives (including my fellow Cato scholar Michael Tanner) objected to the bill’s deficit spending; transit interests (including Republicans from New York and Chicago), objected to the bill’s lack of dedicated funds to public transit. Here are a few things you need to know about the transportation bill before it comes up again in a couple of weeks. First, the legislation now in effect, which passed in 2005, mandated spending at fixed levels even if gasoline taxes (the source of most federal surface transportation funds) failed to cover that spending. Gas taxes first fell short in 2007 and the program has been running a deficit ever since. Although the 2005 bill expired in 2009, Congress routinely extends such legislation until it passes a replacement bill. Unlike the 2005 law, the controversial House bill only authorized, but did not mandate, deficit spending. Actual deficit spending would be considered on a year-by-year basis by the House and Senate appropriations committees. Should they decide not to deficit spend, passage of the House bill could potentially save taxpayers more than $60 billion over the next five years. Failure to pass a bill will only lead Congress to continue to deficit spend. Second, transportation is big-time pork. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is the largest committee in Congressional history because everyone wants a share of that pork. Fiscal conservatives’ dreams of devolving federal transportation spending to the states run into the roadblock made up of members of Congress from both parties who don’t want to give up the thrill of passing out dollars to their constituents. The highway bill wasn’t always pork. When Congress created the Interstate Highway System in 1956, it directed that gas taxes be distributed to states using formulas based on such factors as each state’s population, land area, and road miles. While Congress tinkered with the formulas from time to time, once the formulas were written neither Congress nor the president had much say in how the states spent the money other than it was spent on highways. That changed in 1982, when Congress began diverting gas taxes to transit–initially about 11 percent, now about 20 percent. The 1982 bill also saw the first earmarks; the 10 earmarks that year exponentially grew to more than 6,000 earmarks in the 2005 reauthorization.

#### Transportation infrastructure must go through Congress and will get pork attached to it.

**Mac Donald**, 3/16/**2012** (Mitch – group editorial director of DC Velocity, news editor, chief editor and editorial director of Logistics Management, Who doesn’t want a piece of the infrastructure pie?, DC Velocity, p. http://www.dcvelocity.com/articles/20120316-who-doesnt-want-a-piece-of-the-infrastructure-pie/)

Because the mechanism for making that happen comes in the form of the congressional reauthorization bill for surface transportation programs, such as roads, bridges, railroads, and public transit. Unfortunately, in addition to being the means to further investment in infrastructure, it is also perhaps the best single example of congressional earmarking and pork barrel spending you'll ever come across. A just-released report from MapLight, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization that tracks money's influence on politics, reveals the vast amounts of special interest money being thrown at members of Congress from organizations and businesses with a vested interest in the final form of the reauthorization bill. These groups run the gamut from construction interests to labor unions, environmental groups, railroads, trucking groups, public transit supporters, and even bicycling advocacy groups. Here's a quick rundown of contributions from just a few of these interests, as reported by MapLight: Interest groups connected to the construction industry that have taken a position on the bill gave a total of $21,231,210 to members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Members of the U.S. Senate received a total of $25,068,579 from these same interest groups. Building trade unions gave $7,854,079 to members of the House and $3,555,755 to members of the Senate. Transportation unions that have taken a position on the bill gave a total of $2,048,220 to members of the House and $1,313,000 to members of the Senate. Interest groups representing the trucking industry gave $1,882,036 to members of the House. Members of the Senate received $2,392,171. Interest groups representing railroads gave $3,765,664 to members of the House. Members of the Senate received $4,158,467. Everyone, it seems, wants a piece of the surface transportation reauthorization pie. And clearly, it's a meat pie. Pork pie, to be precise.

### High Speed Rail Links

#### Obama’s mismanagement of HSR generates public skepticism.

**Orski**, 1/19/**2012** (Ken – public policy consultant at the Urban Mobility Corporation, The Merits of HSR are not the issue, Transportation at the National Journal, p. <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2011/10/paying-for-roads-with-drilling.php>)

All of the comments so far have missed the central point in the high-speed rail (HSR) debate: that it is not the merits of high speed rail that are the issue but the Obama Administration’s handling of its HSR initiative. It’s the flaws in the Administration’s approach and its misleading rhetoric, rather than the appropriateness of HSR technology, that are the key reason why the press and public opinion have turned skeptical and why Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has refused to fund the program two years in a row. The Administration’s inept handling of the program was the focus of a December 6 hearing of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I thought our exchange on high-speed rail could benefit from taking a fresh look at the Committee’s conclusions.

#### Independents don’t want a federally funded HSR.

**Ekins**, 1/5/**2012** (Emily – Director of Polling for Reason Foundation, 55 Percent of Americans Want Private Enterprise to Build High Speed Rail, Reason, p. http://reason.com/poll/2012/01/05/55-percent-of-american-want-private-ente)

When Americans are asked to choose between government and private business building high-speed rail, however, a majority of Americans (55 percent) want private enterprise to build this infrastructure. In contrast, 34 percent believe government should build high-speed rail. Partisan divisions do arise for this issue of high-speed rail: a plurality of Democrats and Occupy Wall Street supporters prefer government build with taxpayer money, however a majority of pure Independents, Tea Party Supporters and Republicans prefer private companies to build these railways.

#### HSR lacks public support

**Mathews**, 1/24/**2012** (Joe, How to Start High-Speed Rail, Fox & Hounds, p. http://www.foxandhoundsdaily.com/2012/01/how-to-start-high-speed-rail/)

There are reasons for doing that – the biggest one being the federal funding on the table. But for all the money and business plan problems the high-speed rail project, its biggest problem is public support. Such support is **slipping in recent polls**. And if the public won’t support high-speed rail, it has no hope of being built. Building the first link in a less-populated area of California won’t help that. (Even high-speed rail folks in Spain, quoted in a joint project by various California media organizations this week, seemed aghast at the decision to start in the Central Valley, instead of where people are).

#### GOP will spin HSR as expensive

**Journal of Commerce**, 10/18/**2010** (Mixed Signal for Rails, p. Lexis)

While Obama's vision includes hefty spending on roadways and airports, the rail piece is critical. Administration officials believe the only way to slow the ever-growing pressure on roads and air travel is to put more people and freight on trains, which would also reduce the need to pour as much future wealth into pavement. Not everyone is buying in. Several Republican gubernatorial candidates are talking down Obama's high-speed rail efforts as a big-government program that would cost their states and federal taxpayers too much in the long run. Some doubt the benefits of linking more cities by rail, and vow to end their states' support if elected.

High Speed Rail Links

#### HSR lacks public support --- voters are skeptical about paying for it.

**Bernstein**, 11/01/**2010** (Andrea – Director of the public radio Transportation Nation project, Wariness about spending on transportation and infrastructure accompanies voters to the polls, Transportation Nation, p. http://transportationnation.org/2010/11/01/wariness-about-spending-on-transportation-and-infrastructure-acompanies-voters-to-the-polls/)

It’s been a rough election season out there. Unless you’ve crawled into a cave for the last three months, you know the airwaves have been flooded with ads calling candidates everything from thieves to hooligans to rogues and everything in between. But the sour voter mood isn’t just about advertisements — it’s about reduced circumstances, drastic cuts in local government services, higher taxes and fees, fewer jobs, and dramatically higher health care costs — despite health care reform and an $800 billion stimulus bill. Or as one Florida election volunteer Marcia told me in a largely African American neighborhood in Tampa last week: “People are disappointed,” she said. “They thought they were going to have this magic wand that I’m going to save my home because we have Obama as President. And I’m going to have a job because we have Obama as President.” But then, people lost their jobs, and they lost their homes. “Where’s the change?” retired Hoovers vacuum worker Alice Prestier asked me in Canton, Ohio. Or, more bitterly, as one Colorado contractor told me in Loveland, Colorado: “I don’t need to spend $2,000 to support every illegal f\*\*\*\*\*g Mexican in this country. Nor do I need to keep busting my ass for this government. You know, my son can’t ride the bus to school anymore. He’s got to walk two miles to school, explain that to me! You know, why does education have to go, but yet we can support illegals, we can piss money away on stuff that doesn’t’ matter, a health care plan that will never work?” All of which has created a wary public, seemingly unwilling to spend on big transit projects like the ARC tunnel, high speed rail, or even roads. Even though the President has bracketed this campaign season with a call for $50 billion in additional spending on roads, rails, and airports and the distribution, last week, of some $2.5 billion in high speed rail grants, kitchen-table cut backs have spilled over into an attitude about government spending. Where once voters seemed to have faith that large infrastructure projects would create jobs, both in the long and short terms, they now worry that worthy as projects may be, there simply isn’t enough money to spend on things like new transit tunnels, high speed rail systems, or even roads. The Democratic Senate candidate in Colorado, Michael Bennet, was an early defector from the Obama Labor Day plan, and voters — Republicans, Democrats – told me that was “about right.” “It should all be fixed,” Debbie Horoschock told me at the Wilkes-Barre farmers market in late September” of the president’s proposal to spend money fixing rail, roads, and airports. So she thinks that would be a good thing to spend money on? “No. But they should be fixed.” How are they going to be fixed without money? “I don’t know how they are going to be fixed without money. But we need money to fix the damn roads.” High speed rail, actually pilloried by some candidates (Scott Walker in Wisconsin, Rick Scott in Florida, John Kasich in Ohio) gets a lot more raised eyebrows. “They just shouldn’t be spending on that project,” one Ohio retiree in downtown Canton who wouldn’t give her name told me. Even if that meant losing hundreds of millions of federal money coming straight to this depressed area? “Even so.”

High Speed Rail Links

#### HSR unpopular – costs have risen

**Economist** 7/9/**12** [The Economist. Gulliver. “Still on Track.” <http://m.economist.com/gulliver-21558442.php/accessed>: 7/21/12]

AMERICA's high-speed rail plans chug on. Republican-run states, including Wisconsin, Ohio, and Florida may have rejected federal stimulus money to spend on swanky new schemes, but California—which has the most ambitious HSR plans of all—is pressing ahead. On Friday, California’s state Senate approved $2.6 billion in bonds to fund its high-speed rail project, clearing the way for a further $3.2 billion in federal funds. This is enough to allow it to begin building the nation's first true high-speed rail system. (Another nearly $2 billion, also authorised Friday, will go towards other transportation and rail improvements, some of which are tangentially related to the HSR plans.)¶ California is the last remaining proponent of Barack Obama's vision of a modern railroad network in America, an idea that has grown increasingly unpopular as projected costs have risen . Rail has become, like many of the president's priorities, an issue of political identity, and opposition to rail projects is a great way for GOP governors to thumb their nose at the federal government—and, by extension, Mr. Obama himself.¶ The vote was close, with 21 senators, the bare majority needed to pass, voting in favour. Four Democratic senators joined the GOP in opposition . The money is a tiny fraction of the estimated $68 billion the scheme will cost in total–enough just to begin work in California's Central Valley region and perform some preliminary environmental studies.¶ High-speed rail supporters and detractors alike worry that the Central Valley line, between the cities of Bakersfield and Madera, will end up a train to nowhere, cut off from bigger cities such as Los Angeles, Sacramento and San Francisco. Governor Jerry Brown, a Democrat, supports the plan, and California's legislature is likely to remain under Democratic control for some time. But if four Democratic senators were willing to oppose the project on Friday, how many more might turn against it if costs continue to escalate? Building brand-new infrastructure is politically difficult. Although Friday's vote was a milestone, the battle to bring fast trains to America is far from over.¶

### High Speed Rail – Link Shield

#### Link shield – support for HSR is ephemeral because of costs.

**Nussbaum**, 4/11/**2012** (Paul, Cost the highest hurdle for high-speed rail in U.S., Philly News, p. http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20100809\_Cost\_the\_highest\_hurdle\_for\_high-speed\_rail\_in\_U\_S\_.html?viewAll=y)

As the United States takes its first tentative steps toward high-speed rail travel, the initial hurdle is the biggest: money. In the past, the nation's enthusiasm for fast trains has always evaporated when sticker shock set in. **Political support has been** inconsistent **and** ephemeral, leaving previous efforts to die amid debates over ridership, land acquisition, and cost - especially cost.

### Highways Links

#### The public rejects new highways --- they prefer improving existing infrastructure

**Davis**, 1/16/**2009** (Stephen Lee – Deputy Communications Director for Transportation for America, Poll Finds Americans Favor Smarter Transportation Spending in Stimulus Bill, Transportation For America, <http://t4america.org/blog/2009/01/16/poll-most-americans-want-stimulus-to-emphasize-road-and-bridge-repair-and-transit-not-new-road-construction-poll-finds/>)

The 2009 Growth and Transportation Survey describes what Americans think about how development affects their immediate community. An overwhelming 80 percent believe it’s more important that a stimulus plan include efforts to repair existing highways and build public transit rather than build new highways. Forty-five percent of those polled said construction of new highways should “definitely” or “probably” not be included in the plan.

### Keystone Links

#### Keystone will be a highlight of the election.

**Burwell**, 5/3/**2012** (David – director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Keystone XL pipeline, a post child for political posturing, CNN Opinion, p. <http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/30/opinion/burwell-keystone-pipeline/index.html>)

The Keystone XL pipeline has turned into a poster child for political posturing. While it is merely one of many pipelines crisscrossing North America, this project has become "red meat" that both sides of the congressional aisle are using to weaken each other in an election season. To make matters more complicated, Canadian public and private-sector officials have jumped into the fray by coming to town to extol the virtues of the pipeline.

#### Building Keystone would alienate environmentalist --- a key part of Obama’s base.

**Schnur**, 4/9/**2012** (Dan – director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute Politics at the University of Southern California, The President, Gas Prices and the Pipeline, New York Times, p. http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/09/the-president-gas-prices-and-the-keystone-pipeline/)

Where the issue becomes more tangible and therefore trickier for Obama is when the multiple choices become binary. The debate over the proposed XL Keystone Pipeline that would transport Canadian oil through the nation’s heartland to the Gulf of Mexico crystallizes the choices involved and forces a shades-of-gray conversation into starker hues of black and white. Obama recognizes that the devoted environmentalists who represent a critical portion of the Democratic party base need some motivation to turn out for him in the fall. But he also understands that centrist voters who support him on a range of other domestic and foreign policy matters could be lured away by a Republican opponent who either promises relief at the gas pump or who can lay blame at the White House doorstep for those higher prices. Even more complicated is the role of organized labor, which has poured immense amounts of support into Obama’s re-election but also prioritizes the job-creation potential of the pipeline.

#### Keystone is politically toxic to Obama.

**Barber**, 1/18/**2012** (Nigel – biopsychologist and blogger, Keystone Pipeline: Gift Horse or Threat to America, Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nigel-barber/keystone-pipeline_b_1214122.html>)

The Keystone pipeline pits jobs for Americans versus environmentalism and is politically toxic to the Obama administration, which is why Obama wanted to kick the can down the road whereas Republicans want to force an early Presidential decision on the project that can be used as a stick to beat him with during the election. Now Obama seems poised to reject the pipeline based on objection to the route, leaving the door open to a new application.

### Ext – Keystone Kills Environmentalist Support

#### Keystone approval will crush environmentalist support

**CNN iReport**, 2/9/**2012** (Keystone XL Pipeline Alive in Congress with Bipartisan Support, p. <http://ireport.cnn.com/docs/DOC-744727>)

The Keystone XL pipeline project is far from dead in the US Congress. The controversial project is much on the minds of not just Republican, but also Democrat lawmakers. Though many had hoped that the issue was dead or at least in hibernation until after the November presidential election, environmentalists may have to rethink their celebration. It is expected that once the election is over the pipeline will get the green light over the objections of environmentalists. Many believe the only reason the pipeline was sidetracked by the Administration was to keep enviromentalists on President Barack Obama's team through November. A plan to fast-track the stalled Keystone XL oil pipeline was passed by a key committee in the House of Representatives, as Republicans made yet another attempt to spur approval of the project that has become a major issue in the 2012 elections.

### Mass Transit Links

#### Mass transit is expensive and is associated with wasteful spending.

**U.S. News & World Report**, 5/27/**2008** (Mass Transit Systems Have a Hard Time Paying the Bills, p. http://www.usnews.com/news/national/articles/2008/03/27/mass-transit-systems-have-a-hard-time-paying-the-bills)

Because mass transit systems are so expensive to operate, they rely heavily on subsidies from federal, state, and local coffers. But the flow of money has not kept pace with the ridership growth. And when demand is coupled with capital costs or deferred maintenance and bonds coming due, many transit systems now find themselves in a financial bind that promises to only get worse. In the red. The transit agency in Boston, for instance, is now some $5 billion in the red. The New York Transit Authority will face an estimated $700 million deficit this year, which is projected to jump to a $1.1 billion shortfall in 2009 and a $2.07 billion gap by 2011. "The state wasn't kicking in money for capital needs, so we were taking out bonds," says William Henderson, executive director of the Permanent Citizens Advisory Committee to the Metropolitan Transit Authority. "Now, not only are you having to pay for the 40 percent of cost of operations that you're not covering through the fare box, you're also paying for more and more debt service." Like the nation's highways, transit systems are not federal assets; they are owned and operated by a patchwork of local and state partnerships. While this means that each network has flexibility in the way it secures funding, it also makes finding money a constant struggle between often competing entities. In Chicago, one month after the mayor cajoled aldermen into supporting his tax plan, state legislators and Illinois's governor were unable to agree on a CTA funding package, forcing cuts of $200 million from the capital-improvements budget. In Chicago, the need for repairs is particularly acute. Miles of train track need repair, and some dilapidated bus garages are so old they were built for horses. Substantially increasing the fares isn't a practical option in most cases, though record hikes have recently been levied in Washington, D.C., and New York, while the price of a rail ticket in San Francisco has jumped 26 percent in the past five years. A survey in 2001 found that 43 percent of the country's transit riders live in households where the annual income is less than $20,000, and nearly the same percentage of riders come from households without cars. "The hard part of transit funding is finding that sweet spot where you're not punishing the people who need it most, but you're getting enough out of riders to make the whole package work," says Bob Dunphy, senior resident fellow for transportation and infrastructure at the Urban Land Institute. Federal purse strings. Part of the squeeze stems from the failure of federal funding to keep pace with the relative explosion in the number of transit systems under construction. Even as more cities build or expand their systems and ridership hits a 50-year high, the amount of federal funding has remained constant. And now, the federal transportation trust fund, paid for largely through an 18.4-cent-per-gallon gas tax, is scheduled to run out of money next year. The federal fund will have a $3 billion surplus this year, which will become a $3.9 billion deficit by 2009. When Congress proposed raising the gas tax to close the expected gap, the White House called for cuts in spending. The tax has not been raised since 1993. While public opinion is strongly against a rise in the federal gas tax, voters at the local level have consistently supported increasing local taxes to fund their transit systems—some 70 percent of the time, according to a study of some 200 ballot initiatives by the American Public Transportation Association. "At the federal level, [transportation funding] is characterized by the Bridge to Nowhere," says Puentes. But when voters are presented with funding specific projects, "they do so at a pretty good clip."

Mass Transit Links

#### Mass transit does not have a lot of public support --- this makes it easy to attack politically.

**Jones**, 5/4/**2012** (Rob – content and social media manager at Build Direct, Editor-in-chief of the Build Direct blogs, Public Transit and Green Urban Planning: Sexy Buses?, p. http://blog.builddirect.com/greenbuilding/public-transit-and-green-urban-planning-sexy-buses/)

Buses just aren’t sexy. Public transit, public perception The current reputation of public transit as opposed to private car ownership in many cities in North America has an impact on public perception, and therefore it also has an impact on how budgets are structured around the funding of expanded public transit. It has an impact on how the spending of tax money is perceived by the public, with many complaining that they shouldn’t have to fund a service they themselves don’t use. Among other things, this is perhaps a product of not thinking about what their commutes in their cars would be like if no one used public transit. All of this in turn has an impact on the level of political will it takes to think in the long term about how populations should best access urban and suburbans areas, while reducing traffic congestion, creating a more efficient use of land, lowering emissions, and improving air quality. These are long-term investments, that often mean short term budgeting issues. Often, current perceptions about how to manage mass transit simply lead to cuts in services to ‘low ridership areas’ in order to save money. Transit cuts: cutting the throat of future revenue When services are being cut to “save money”, the expectations of those services in general are lowered to the point where gaining ridership back as populations swell over time becomes more and more difficult; no one will spend money on a service that they can’t (or perceive that they can’t) rely on. When a bus runs every hour, it might as well not run at all. You can only cut so much before diminishing returns makes any spending a waste of money. To me, when it comes to public transit, you’ve got to go big or go home. As such, it’s clear that strict standards of service need to be put in place and kept there in all North American cities, and right now. No more of this cutting services because of supposed low ridership. That won’t save money in the long term. It will kill future revenues of a growing number of potential public transit users; remember, populations are projected to double in cities by 2050. By worsening the reputation of public transit in cities for potential commuters, transit cuts actually cut the throat of an expanding market in city infrastructure investment. Cities, states, provinces, nations, need to build on this potential, not kill it. Cultural attitudes affect budgets But, I don’t believe that all of this has to do with money, primarily. I think it has to do with where our cultural heads are at, sitting as we are on the transition from one century and another. I think clever ad campaigns for sexy buses and trains, making transit hubs into culturally and commercially appealing locations, and expanding amenities on commuter trains are all good ideas, and worthy investments to help to design cities around the needs of people who live there. But, I think the main hurdle is still about cultural perceptions on how useful and beneficial taking the bus, the subway, the streetcar can be in modern urban and suburban life in a new century. As it is, I think that taking public transit is still thought of as second-rate to car ownership. The idea of a car-less lifestyle is still looked upon as being unrealistic (in some areas, it is!), to downright bohemian. This bears out when priorities are set for infrastructure budgeting.

### Port Security Links

#### Port security is unpopular --- high political cost with very few returns.

**Haveman & Shatz 6** (Jon D. Haveman, research fellow @ Public Policy Institute of California. Ph.D in Economics-University of Michigan. Howard J. Shatz, senior economist at RAND corporation. 2006 “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost.”, p. http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf)

The second constraint is related to the first: Political incentives to take action in port security are weak. From a politician’s point of view, port security emergency response planning is the worst of all worlds: It requires extremely high up-front costs for benefits that will be realized only in the future—most likely when the official is already out of office—or perhaps never. In addition, making homeland security policy requires making tough choices about where to dedicate limited resources. These are exactly the kinds of choices many politicians try to avoid. When such choices cannot be avoided, longer-term planning usually takes a back seat to shorter-term gains. Consider, for example, a mayor who must decide whether to dedicate additional police officers to lowering the crime rate or enhancing counterterrorism surveillance at the port. Any politician with a reasonably developed sense of selfpreservation focuses on crime and leaves port security for another day. Moreover, even within the area of homeland security, electoral incentives create sub-optimal policy outcomes. The natural impulse of any elected official is to focus on issues of greatest concern to constituents. This sounds good in theory. The problem is that it works poorly in practice. Most California citizens are concerned about terrorism, but few have visited the port complex or worry about its security, and fewer still pay close attention to the details of how elected officials handle the arcane details of CERT training or cross-agency coordination. Instead, since the September 11 attacks, the public and the press have focused their concern on higher-visibility targets such as LAX and the security of local drinking water supplies. The misplaced allocation of homeland security dollars can be seen at every level of government. In December 2004, former DHS Inspector General Clark Kent Ervin articulated this in a report titled “Major Management Challenges Facing the Department of Homeland Security.”

### Public-Private Partnership Links

#### PPPs are massively unpopular --- the public fears diversions and higher costs.

**Papajohn et. al**, 7/1/**2011** (Dean – Civil Engineering Manager at Pima County Department of Transportation, Quingbin Cui – Assistant Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Maryland, and Mehmet Emre Bayraktar – Assistant Professor of Construction Management at Florida International University, Public-Private Partnerships in U.S. Transportation: Research Overview and a Path Forward, Journal of Management in Engineering, p. 132)

Public Opinion of PPPs

Although the executive branch of the federal government has shown strong support for PPPs, support from the legislative branch, state governments, professional organizations, and the public has been mixed. Public concern has been raised in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Texas where PPPs have been put on hold (Layton and Hsu 2008). Many citizens are not persuaded that private firms will adequately watch over the public interest. Some fear that tolls or other revenues will make private firms wealthy instead of being reinvested into transportation infrastructure. Also, the danger exists that PPPs will be developed for the most favorable financial transportation projects, leaving unfavorable but needed projects without adequate resources (Buxbaum and Ortiz 2007). The public hears different messages about PPPs from political leaders and industry. Public concern is raised when an agency like the Government Accountability Office indicates that private tolls tend to be higher than public tolls. Unfamiliarity with tolls in some states or reluctance to see toll rates raised are cause for some public concern. The future of tolling may be related to the gas tax. Without an increase in the gas tax, the national Highway Trust Fund will dwindle, and without the assistance of federal funding, states may be forced to transition to toll roads (Layton and Hsu 2008).

### AT: No Link – Not Congress

#### Congress is normal means for transportation infrastructure investment.

**Mac Donald**, 3/16/**2012** (Mitch – group editorial director of DC Velocity, news editor, chief editor and editorial director of Logistics Management, Who doesn’t want a piece of the infrastructure pie?, DC Velocity, p. http://www.dcvelocity.com/articles/20120316-who-doesnt-want-a-piece-of-the-infrastructure-pie/)

Because the mechanism for making that happen comes in the form of the congressional reauthorization bill for surface transportation programs, such as roads, bridges, railroads, and public transit. Unfortunately, in addition to being the means to further investment in infrastructure, it is also perhaps the best single example of congressional earmarking and pork barrel spending you'll ever come across.

### AT: Link Turn – Plan is a Win (Jobs)

#### Transportation spending is a hard sell --- voters do not perceive it as an economic generator.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

At the moment, it can safely be said that building support for increased transportation spending is not the president's top priority, as he heads into a general election with the economy just showing signs of recovery. Infrastructure funding—and what were once packaged as stimulus projects, generally—have taken a back seat to, say, the price of gas and, by extension, the conspicuously expanded drive for domestic energy resources. The lesson that Obama and the administration seem to have taken from the times they have pushed hard for spending on big transportation-infrastructure projects is that they're a tougher sell than expected, or at least that **voters don't necessarily see them as the economic generators** they eventually become. So, for example, the president insisted that the federal stimulus act include $8 billion for high-speed rail, but then absorbed a great deal of grief over ensuing allocations, which were criticized as politically motivated.

## Internal Links

### Economy Key

#### Voters will decide the election based on the economy --- no other issue outweighs.

New York Times, 3/13/**2012** (Muddled Economic Picture Muddles the Political One, Too, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/us/politics/economy-plays-biggest-role-in-obama-re-election-chances.html?_r=1>)

The final major economic turning point of President Obama’s first term seems to have arrived. The question is which way the economy will turn. Job growth has picked up nicely in the last few months, raising the prospect that the American economy is finally in the early stages of a recovery that will gather strength over time. But with gas prices rising, the government cutting workers and consumers still deep in debt, some forecasters predict that economic growth — and with it, job growth — will slow in coming months. Politically, the difference between the two situations is vast. In one, Mr. Obama will be able to campaign on a claim, as he has recently begun to do, that the country is back on track. In another, he will be left to explain that recoveries from financial crises take years, and to argue that Republicans want to return to the Bush-era policies that created the crisis — as he tried to argue, unsuccessfully, in the 2010 midterm election. His approval rating has slipped again in some polls recently, with higher gas prices possibly playing a role. As a result, the economic numbers over the next couple of months, including an unemployment report on April 6, will have bigger political implications than the typical batch of data. The Federal Reserve acknowledged the uncertainty in its scheduled statement on Tuesday, suggesting the economy had improved somewhat but still predicting only “moderate economic growth.” Economists say the economy’s near-term direction depends relatively little on Mr. Obama’s economic policies. The standoff over Iran’s nuclear program, the European debt crisis and other events will most likely affect the economy more. But many American voters are still likely to make their decision based on the economy. Historically, nothing — not campaign advertisements, social issues or even wars — has influenced voters more heavily than the direction of the economy in an election year. “If you could know one thing and you had to predict which party was going to win the next presidential election,” Lynn Vavreck, a political scientist at the University of California, Los Angeles, said, “**you couldn’t do better than knowing the change in economic growth**.”

#### Economy is focal point of elections

**Monsivais 12**

Monsivais, Pablo Martinez, a member of associate press, 5/26/12, USA Today, Obama Campaign goes on ther defensive on spending, debt, http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/story/2012-05-26/obama-romney-debt-spending/55221120/1

Obama's defensive crouch on debt and spending reflect a hard reality: Polls consistently show voters, including sought-after independents, placing more trust in Romney to handle the massive debt. The nation's economy remains a focal point for voters but many remain concerned that years of heavy federal spending on guns and butter could leave the [U.S.](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/U.S) in a similar position as Greece and other European nations grappling with massive debt.

### Economy Key – Outweighs Partisan Issues

#### National economy trumps partisanship in swing states

**Bays 7/16** (Kymberly Bays, Editor-in-Chief of Independent Voters Network, 7/16/12, Independent Voters Network, “Key to Swing State Voters: Stagnant vs Growing Economy,” http://ivn.us/2012/07/16/key-to-swing-state-voters-stagnant-vs-growing-economy/)

In a new Purple Poll released today, voters in 12 swing states diverge dramatically on their views of the country’s economic trajectory. This overwhelmingly affects who they plan on casting their ballot for in November. “Among those who believe the economy is getting better, 93% support Obama, 4% favor Romney. And among those who say it is getting worse, Romney leads Obama 84% to 7%,” says the Purple Strategies findings. This economic question is now more predictive of vote choice than any other factor this election, including partisanship.

### AT: Economy Outweighs Other Issues

#### In a close election, other issues will matter just as much.

New York Times, 3/13/**2012** (Muddled Economic Picture Muddles the Political One, Too, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/us/politics/economy-plays-biggest-role-in-obama-re-election-chances.html?_r=1>)

But many American voters are still likely to make their decision based on the economy. Historically, nothing — not campaign advertisements, social issues or even wars — has influenced voters more heavily than the direction of the economy in an election year. “If you could know one thing and you had to predict which party was going to win the next presidential election,” Lynn Vavreck, a political scientist at the University of California, Los Angeles, said, “you couldn’t do better than knowing the change in economic growth.” Particularly important, Ms. Vavreck said, were the first six months of an election year, when many voters form impressions that stick. Ultimately, the 2012 election may be close enough that other issues, like immigration or Afghanistan, will play a major role. But the last two years make clear just how important the economy’s direction will be to Mr. Obama’s fortunes.

### Independent Voters – Romney Winning

#### Romney leads with independents – economy

**ABC News 7/11** (Amy Walter is the ABC News Political Director, 7.11.12, ABC News, “Obama Has Problems With Independent Voters,” http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/07/obama-has-problems-with-independent-voters/)

Digging into the crosstabs of our ABC/Washington Post poll it’s clear that Obama has a significant problem with independent voters. On every measure, independents are significantly more disappointed with the president and more open to a Mitt Romney message. While 45 percent of voters overall say they approve of Obama’s handling of the economy, just 37 percent of independents believe that. Obama has a 12 point advantage among all voters on the issue of “who has presented a clearer plan for dealing with the economy – Obama or Romney?” But among independents that flips to an eight point advantage for Romney. Even on the issue of Romney’s record in business, independent voters are more sympathetic to the Republican. Among all voters, more thought that Romney in his work as a corporate investor did more to cut jobs than create them (42 percent to 36 percent). But among independents, that flips to a six point advantage for Romney – 43-37 percent.

#### Romney leading independents – poll

**CBS News and NYT 7/18** (CBS News/NYT, 7.18.12, CBS News/New York Times Poll, “The Presidential Race Remains Close,” http://www.scribd.com/fullscreen/100452979?access\_key=key-ryu3ook8911rwaps7nx)

The President leads among women by five points, while Romney has an 8 point lead amongmen. Independents favor Romney by 9 points. White evangelicals and conservatives backRomney by a large margin, while liberals and African Americans support Barack Obama.

#### Polls show Romney ahead on independents.

**Spencer 7/10** (Dan Spencer, of Red State, 7.10.12, Red State, “Romney extends lead among Independents to 14 percent,” http://www.redstate.com/california\_yankee/2012/07/10/romney-extends-lead-among-independents-to-14-percent/)

In the new ABC News/Washington Post poll, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney extends his lead among Independents to 14 points, 53-39 percent. Two months ago, a POLITICO/George Washington University Battleground poll found Romney had a ten-point lead among the critical Independent voters.

### Independent Voters Key

#### Independent voters will swing the election --- they make up 40% of the vote.

**Khan**, 1/9/**2012** (Huma, Independent Voters on the rise But Do They Matter?, ABC News, p. <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/01/independent-voters-on-the-rise-but-do-they-matter/>)

A day before the nation’s first primary in New Hampshire, Republican front-runner Mitt Romney is busy courting independent voters, a burgeoning group that has the power to sway the results in this year’s presidential election. Forty percent of voters identified themselves as politically independent in 2011, according to a new Gallup poll released today, the highest number recorded in the poll yet. The previous high for independents was 39 percent in 1995 and 2007. Democrats won both presidential races in the following years. Independent voters are an increasingly important voting bloc. They have outnumbered both Democrats and Republicans continuously for the past two and a half years, by far the longest period in which they’ve done so in ABC News-Washington Post polls dating back to 1981.

#### Independent voters are uniquely key in this polarized atmosphere --- most partisan voters have made up their mind.

**Woodruff**, 2/29/**2012** (Judy, Woodruff: Will Independents Return to Obama in 2012?, The Rundown, p. <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2012/02/woodruff-will-independents-return-to-obama-2012.html>)

There's a lot of talk thrown around in every election about the influence of independents -- voters who are registered as neither Democrat nor Republican or who swing back and forth. To listen to some pundits (even this reporter has been guilty of this), independent voters hold **awesome power in close elections**. This may be one election when that conventional wisdom holds up. With a stubbornly polarized atmosphere and partisans on each side fiercely holding to the candidates in their party, the role played by swing voters becomes even more significant. In recent years, independents have made up about 30 percent of the electorate. Republicans and Democrats split most of the other 70 percent, leaving a little room for minority parties. In 2008, President Obama won 52 percent of independent voters, **helping propel him to the presidency**. This year, there's good reason to believe those same voters who sided with Obama -- rather than the 44 percent of independents who went with Sen. John McCain -- will determine the outcome. First, it's safe to assume almost all self-described Republicans and Democrats will vote for their party's candidate. And it's almost as safe to assume that the McCain independents in 2008 will be reluctant to switch to Obama four years later. That leaves the focus on the Independents who swung to Obama four years ago. They are the subject of a paper by two policy analysts at the Third Way, a Washington, D.C.-based centrist think tank. According to Michelle Diggles and Lanae Erickson, the Obama independents of 2008 have certain qualities that may help us understand which way they'll go in 2012. Diggles and Erickson identify 10 qualities in particular but stress four. First, Obama independents are the most moderate segment of the electorate. Second, they are true swing voters in that nearly half of them did not vote for the Democratic candidate in 2004. Third, they look like the U.S. in that they include more women and are more racially diverse than McCain independents. Fourth, they are secular and attend church less often. With growing signs that independent voters may make up the highest proportion of the electorate since 1976, all eyes are on these prized citizens. But as Diggles and Erickson note: "Not all independents are the same, and the real showdown for 2012 is over who will win the Obama independents." They said that if Obama can win the majority of them, he will win re-election. But if he does no better among them than Democrats did in the 2010 congressional elections when a quarter of the Obama independents voted Republican, the story could be different. Watching how Obama appeals to this crucial voting group is one story we plan to watch throughout this exciting election.

Independent Voters Key

#### Independent voters key – now majority of the voters

**Killian 12**

Killian, Linda, a Washington journalist and a senior scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2/2/12, The Atlantic, 4 Types of Independent Voters Who Could Swing the 2012 Elections, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/02/4-types-of-independent-voters-who-could-swing-the-2012-elections/252363/

Even as independent candidates continue to struggle, across the country the ranks of independent voters who think the parties care more about winning elections than about solving the nation's problems are swelling. Their number, along with their disaffection with the two-party political system, is growing exponentially. About 40 percent of all American voters now call themselves independents, a bigger group than those who say they are either Democrats or Republicans -- and the largest number of independent voters in 70 years. In some states, independents now are a majority of the voters.

### Independent Voters Key – Uniqueness Trick

#### A close uniqueness debate magnifies the importance of the link --- independent voters are swing close elections.

**Kaufman**, 4/13/**2012** (Stephen, Who Are America’s Independent Voters? Why Are They Crucial?, International Information Program Digital, p. <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2012/04/201204133847.html#axzz1sqNkxizT>)

The United States may have a political system dominated by two parties, Republican and Democratic, but according to a recent poll, more Americans identify themselves as being independent rather than belonging to either party, and the historical record has shown that independents tend to sway the outcome of U.S. elections. According to a Gallup Poll released in January, the number of Americans identifying themselves as independent rose to 40 percent, the highest level ever measured by Gallup, followed by Democrats and Republicans with 31 percent and 27 percent, respectively. But according to Tara McGuinness, a senior vice president at the Washington-based public policy research and advocacy group Center for American Progress, the apparent surge in the number of independents does not mean that most votes in the November presidential election between President Obama and his probable opponent, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, are undecided. Speaking at the Washington Foreign Press Center April 13, McGuinness said perhaps half of independents actually lean toward one of the two parties. In reality, she said, only about 15 percent of American voters are truly independent, voting sometimes for Democrats and sometimes for Republicans, and they are statistically less likely to vote than their partisan counterparts. U.S. presidential elections are often very close in terms of the popular vote. In 2008, President Obama beat Arizona Senator John McCain with 52.9 percent of the popular vote, compared to 45.7 percent for McCain. That figure closely resembles the fact that Obama won 52 percent of independent voters, compared with 44 percent for McCain. “As independents go, frequently elections go,” McGuinness said. “Especially in close elections, you could not win … [by] simply targeting independent voters, but frequently you cannot win an election without targeting some independent voters.”

### Independent Voters Key – Economy Issues

#### Economy major concern for independent voters

**Gillespie 12**

Gillespie, Nick, editor of reason.com, 03/14/2012, Reason.com, Independents will Decide the 2012 election, http://reason.com/archives/2012/03/14/independents-will-decide-the-2012-electi

In [its summary of 2011 attitudes](http://www.gallup.com/poll/151943/Record-High-Americans-Identify-Independents.aspx) toward government and political parties, Gallup concluded that the surge in independents stems from the “sluggish economy, record levels of distrust in government, and unfavorable views of both parties.” Indeed, a “historic” 81 percent of Americans overall are “[dissatisfied with the way the nation is being governed](http://www.gallup.com/poll/149678/Americans-Express-Historic-Negativity-Toward-Government.aspx)” and 53 percent of us have [negative views](http://www.gallup.com/poll/149795/Republican-Democratic-Party-Images-Equally-Negative.aspx) of the Republican Party and 55 percent of us have negative views of the Democratic Party. Such attitudes aren’t suprising. For the entire run of the 21st century so far, we’ve suffered at the hands of politicians whose predilection for crisis-mongering is surpassed only by ideological gymnastics last seen when [Nadia Comaneci](http://www.nadiacomaneci.com/) was bestriding the balance beam in the 1976 Olympics. Whether it’s George W. Bush’s about-face from a “humble” foreign policy and his disastrous abandonment of “[free-market principles to save the free-market system](http://reason.com/blog/2008/12/16/ive-abandoned-free-market-prin)” or Barack Obama’s malarkey about pushing for “[a net spending cut](http://reason.com/archives/2011/12/08/obama-takes-off-the-gloves)” and papier-mache commitments to civil liberties and executive-branch transparency, it hasn’t been possible to take politicians at their word for a very long time. If Barack Obama wants to win a second term and Mitt Romney, who will almost certainly be the GOP standard-bearer, wants to snag his first, here are three keys to winning independent voters. *1. The Economy, Stupids.* If independents are growing because of the sorry state of the economy, then smart pols will work toward not simply improving the economy but being honest about the limits of what they can do to hasten recovery. You’d think that Mitt Romney, who touts his private-sector success as one of the main reasons to vote for him, would have some idea of how to create long-term growth in output and jobs. Or at least some idea of what he would do with the federal budget. Yet as my colleague Peter Suderman pointed out [just a few days ago](http://reason.com/archives/2012/03/07/the-mysterious-mr-romney), the former Bain Capital bigwig fails at the simple task of saying what he would cut from the federal budget and what tax loopholes he would close. Instead, Romney invokes small-government cliches like magical words that will bring rain. Obama is even worse when it comes to laying out anything that can pass a laugh test when it comes to the economy. Which is why in the CBS/*New York Times* survey, 55 percent of independents disapprove of the way he’s handling the economy and 63 percent agree with the statement that “things have gotten pretty seriously off on the wrong track.” Despite self-interested testimonies that the stimulus was a smashing success (even though many supporters continue to bemoan its small size), everyone knew as soon as its key metric switched from jobs created to “jobs created or saved” that it was a joke. Obama has been promising big new plans to create jobs since before he entered the White House and his eventual delivery of that is about as believable as Senate Democrats’ promises to deliver a budget ever again. What’s worse, Obama has pushed legislation ranging from health care reform to energy subsidies to debt-ceiling increases to Dodd-Frank whose eventual costs are unknowable in the near term. Introducing that sort of uncertainty is no way to clear the ground for a robust and long-lived recovery. A smart, simple, and believable economic message from either candidate—and their respective parties—would start with the frank admission that government in the end can’t really do a helluva lot other than create zombie jobs. [What the government can do is create a stable and predictable framework](http://reason.com/archives/2011/09/01/obamas-jobs-program-if-the-cho) that will allow investors, employers, and workers figure out their next steps. Speaking honestly about the limits of government intervention would also address another key concern among independents: distrust of politicians.

Independent Voters Key – Economy Issues

#### Spending kills support from independent voters

**Zeleny and Sussman 12**

Zeleny and Sussman, Jeff and Dalia, publishers from the NY times, 01/18/12, NY Times, Polls Show Obamas vulnerability with swing voters, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/19/us/politics/poll-shows-obamas-vulnerability-with-swing-voters.html?pagewanted=all

[President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per) opens his re-election bid facing significant obstacles among independent voters, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll, with the critical piece of the electorate that cemented his victory four years ago open to denying him a second term. As Mr. Obama moves toward a full-throated campaign, delivering a [State of the Union address](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/state_of_the_union_message_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) on Tuesday and inching closer to directly confronting his Republican challenger, a majority of independent voters have soured on his presidency, disapprove of how he has dealt with the economy and do not have a clear idea of what he hopes to accomplish if re-elected. The swing voters who will play a pivotal role in determining his political fate are up for grabs, the poll found, with just 31 percent expressing a favorable opinion of Mr. Obama. Two-thirds of independent voters say he has not made real progress fixing the economy. The president, mindful of the headwinds facing him, begins his first major television advertising campaign on Thursday in a handful of battleground states. His targets include independent voters, who the poll found also hold deep skepticism of Republicans. While Republican primary voters say [Mitt Romney](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/primaries/candidates/mitt-romney?inline=nyt-per) stands the best chance of defeating Mr. Obama, nearly half of independents say they have yet to form an opinion of him, creating a considerable opening for Democrats to try to quickly define him if he becomes the nominee. As Mr. Romney and his rivals fight to win the South Carolina primary on Saturday, the poll suggests that Republicans have grown less satisfied with their choices. Nearly 7 in 10 Republican voters across the country said they now want more options, a probable reflection of conservative unease about Mr. Romney and the remaining candidates. But with 10 months remaining until Election Day and the lines of argument coming into view, voters are evenly divided in a matchup between Mr. Obama and Mr. Romney. The president does better against the other Republican candidates. A glimmer of hope may be on the horizon for Mr. Obama, though, as the economy appears to be generating more jobs. The poll found that 28 percent of the public says the economy is getting better, which is the biggest sense of optimism found in a Times/CBS News poll since last February. But Mr. Obama, whose job approval rating remains essentially frozen in the 40s, has considerable work to do rebuilding the coalition of voters who sent him to the White House. Independent voters have concerns about Mr. Obama on a variety of measures, including 6 in 10 who say the president does not share their priorities for the country. “I trusted Obama would bring fresh ideas to the country and improve the economy, even though he was not experienced. It didn’t happen,” said Jay Hernandez, 54, a credit manager from Miami who said that he is not aligned with either party, in a follow-up interview. “If there were another Democratic candidate I might reconsider, but I won’t vote for [Barack Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per).” With the president preparing to address a joint session of Congress next week, which will also be an opportunity to outline his accomplishments to the nation, the poll found that 38 percent of all voters view him favorably, 45 percent unfavorably, and 17 percent have no opinion. The speech will be a chance to draw further distinctions with Congress, whose approval rating remains near record lows of 13 percent. When asked whom they trust, the poll found that Mr. Obama has an advantage over Congressional Republicans in making the right decisions about creating jobs, health care,[Medicare](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/medicare/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) and [Social Security](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social_security_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). Yet the gap narrows on the economy — the chief concern among voters — with 44 percent of Americans saying they trust Mr. Obama and 40 percent saying they trust Republicans in Congress. The public is evenly split on whom they trust to deal with the budget deficit, which the poll found to be the public’s second most important issue.

### Independent Voters Key – Likely to Switch

#### Independent voters are the most likely voters to switch in an election.

**Ebberly 2012** (Todd Ebberly is an associate professor of political studies at St. Mary’s College of Maryland, Do Independent Voters Matter?, Rasmussen Reports, p. <http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/political_commentary/commentary_by_todd_eberly/do_independent_voters_matter>)

Are independent voters a myth? That is certainly the conclusion of many who study political science. Research has demonstrated that, when pressed, independent voters often reveal significant partisan preferences: They lean Democratic or lean Republican. When leaners are reclassified and grouped among their partisan peers the share of pure independents in the electorate falls -- by some accounts -- to less than 10% of the electorate. If the true number of independent voters is less than 10% of the electorate, then independent voters are of little concern. In an age of narrow victory margins in the national popular vote for the presidency and control of the House of Representatives, winning a majority of that 10% can be crucial, but appeals to a party's partisans would be a more important focus. But what if the number of independent voters is greater than 10%, or even greater than 20%? Suddenly, winning a majority of independent voters becomes more important. In a recent report written for the [centrist Democratic organization Third Way](http://click.icptrack.com/icp/relay.php?r=5256281&msgid=456114&act=R4EG&c=561522&destination=http%3A%2F%2Fcontent.thirdway.org%2Fpublications%2F489%2FThird_Way_Report_-_Family_Feud_Democratic_Activists_vs_Democratic_Voters.pdf), I examined whether or not leaners are indeed independent. For my research, I used the 2000-2004 panel study conducted by the American National Election Studies (ANES). I selected the panel study for a simple reason: It's one of the few studies available that tracked the same group of voters across multiple elections. That's important. Most studies of voting and partisanship capture only a snapshot of a point in time and allow researchers to measure partisanship only during a given election cycle. Such snapshots would be fine if partisanship were permanent and not subject to change. That is very much the view of partisanship taken by those who consider independent voters to be a myth. In my research for Third Way, I compared the partisan voting loyalty of Democrats and Republicans by looking at their partisan vote choice across three House elections (2000, 2002 and 2004) compared to their strength of partisanship in 2000. Survey respondents were classified as being strong, weak or independent partisans (leaners). I found that weak and independent partisans are less loyal to party in the short term and especially across time. While roughly 90% of strong partisans voted the party line in 2000, approximately a quarter of weak and independent partisans crossed party lines that year. In 2002 and 2004, strong and weak partisans held steady at roughly 90% and 75% loyalty, but independent partisans were more volatile -- especially independent Democrats. In 2002, 46% of those who identified as an independent Democrat in 2000 voted Republican. The share was 38% in 2004. I also found that independent partisans were far more likely to switch their partisan identification over time -- so 2000's independent Democrat could well be 2004's independent Republican. That's something a non-panel series could not account for. The study suggested that during a given election period independent partisans are as loyal to party as their weak partisan peers, but that loyalty wanes over time. To me, a voter who switches his or her partisan vote choice from one election cycle to the next is not a loyal partisan -- rather, that voter is an independent voter.

#### Swing state independents key – other parties already decided

**PollHeadlines 12** (PollHeadlines, blog, 5/4/12, PollHeadlines, “Close Races Beginning in Presidential Swing States,” http://www.pollheadlines.com/blog/archives/141)

One of the highlighted swing states in the news this week is Virginia. The latest Washington Post poll shows that Obama has a slight lead over Romney with a 51-44% advantage. Most Virginians say Obama’s views as more in line with their own. This is due to the fact that Virginia was a rather overlooked state in the Primary, neither Santorum nor Gingrich made it onto the ballot for the 2012 Republican primary meaning Romney did little campaigning there and voters simply don’t know him.Romney is trying to rectify that and is campaigning heavily in Virginia. He has even gained the support from former opponent Michele Bachmann as well as the popular Virginian Governor Bob McDonnell to help close the gap between himself and President Obama. With recent political polls showing the vast majority of each political base already firmly behind their respective candidates it will be more crucial than ever to sway independent voters in swing states. Now all they have to do in the upcoming months is prove that they will do a better job in running the country than that other guy.

### Independent Voters Key – Swing States

#### Independent voters are increasing in size. They are the swing vote in battleground states.

**USA Today**, 7/10/**2012** (Analysis: Independents jump in key swing states, p. <http://content.usatoday.com/communities/onpolitics/post/2012/07/independent-voters-swing-states-obama-romney-/1>)

Independent voters are growing in some battleground states that will help decide the 2012 presidential election, a Bloomberg News analysis says. The upshot: Democrats have lost more voters in those swing states. Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire and North Carolina have grown by a combined total of 443,000 independent voters, according to data from the top elections officials in those states. At the same time, the Bloomberg analysis shows Democrats have lost 480,000 voters in those six states while Republicans picked up 38,000 voters. Michelle Diggles of Third Way, a Democratic-leaning research group, told Bloomberg that independents are "really just fed up with both parties." "Most elections are about the center, and that's where the swing vote is going to come from," Diggles is quoted as saying.

#### Independents voters increasing – will be key to swing states.

**McCormick 12**

McCormick, John, British professor of political science at Indiana University in the United States

07/09/12, Bloomberg, Independent Voter Surge cuts democrats swing state edge, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/print/2012-07-10/independent-voter-surge-cuts-democrats-swing-state-edge.html

Democrats are losing ground in voter registration in six key battleground states as more voters elect to register as independents, according to a new Bloomberg News analysis of state voter records.The collective total of independents grew by about 443,000 in Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire and North Carolina since the 2008 election, according to data compiled by Bloomberg from state election officials. This results in them being critical to the election. During the same time, Democrats saw a net decline of about 480,000 in those six states, while Republicans--boosted in part by a competitive primary earlier this year--added roughly 38,000 voters in them, the analysis shows. The shift comes four years after President Barack Obama won the White House in 2008 thanks in part to wide support among independents. But indy voters swung back toward Republicans during the 2010 midterms, helping the GOP retake the House—a shift that may help Romney. According to the latest [Washington Post/ABC News poll](http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/07/dead-heat-in-vote-preferences-presages-an-epic-battle-ahead/), Romney holds a 14-point lead over Obama among independent voters nationally.

#### Swing state victories rely on independent votes

**Jones 12** (Jeffrey M. Jones writer for Gallup, 4/4/12, Gallup, “Obama Solidifying Lead Among Independents in Swing States,” http://www.gallup.com/poll/153764/obama-solidifying-lead-among-independents-swing-states.aspx)

Independent voters in the most competitive states may be the quintessential swing group, perhaps holding the key to victory for either Obama or his Republican opponent. Since last fall, their support has shifted toward Obama over his likely Republican opponent Romney, after previously favoring Romney. And it is those independent voters -- particularly women -- who are driving Obama's overall lead in swing states. So while both campaigns will make considerable efforts to make sure their core supporters vote, the other big piece of their strategy would be finding the issues or themes that help win over independents in the states where either candidate has a reasonable chance of winning.

Independent Voters Key – Swing States

#### Lead in independent swing state votes key to election

**Sink 12** (Justin Sink, writer for The Hill, 4/5/12, The Hill, “Poll: Swing-state independents breaking for Obama over Romney,” http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/220085-poll-swing-state-independents-breaking-for-obama-over-romney)

President Obama is expanding his lead among independent voters in swing states, providing the president a crucial buffer as he fights to retain control of the White House this fall. Obama is the choice of 48 percent of independent voters, versus 39 percent who favor presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney. That represents the president's best lead yet; he was trailing Romney for all of 2011 among independents and just edged ahead of the former Massachusetts governor for the first time in February. The poll, conducted at the end of March by USA Today and Gallup, surveyed voters in Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. President Obama will likely need to carry a majority of those states to earn reelection. The president will be favored if current trends hold; with Democrats and Republicans added into the survey results, Obama leads Romney 51 percent to 42 in swing states. That's the first time Obama has led his Republican challenger in a head-to-head match-up in key states, with Romney edging the president by 2 percentage points as recently as February. But independents have swung strongly to the president's favor in recent weeks as promising economic news boosts his favorability — and the effects of a bruising Republican primary catch up with Romney. The movement has been especially pronounced among women. At the end of 2011, Obama trailed Romney by 11 percentage points among independent men and five points among independent women, but over the past two months, Obama has swung that to a one-point advantage among men and a 14-point lead among women. Romney, meanwhile, has seen 11 percent of women who supported him defect, versus just 4 percent of men. Interestingly, that movement does not seem to be driven by the president's controversial decision to mandate employer-funded free access to contraception. Nearly six in 10 women said they were unfamiliar with the president's view on contraception, while those who did know the president's policies were evenly split on whether they supported it. Nevertheless, the poll illustrates that Mitt Romney will need to focus his efforts on winning back the independents that were key to his early support — and who will inevitably swing the results of November's election.

### Independents Key – Arizona

#### Independents essential for Arizona swing vote

**Bays 12** (Kymberly Bays, Editor-in-Chief of Independent Voters Network, 5/11/12, Independent Voters Network, “Swing States Crucial for Presidential Race,” http://ivn.us/2012/05/11/swing-states/)

IVN’s list of swing states to watch differs slightly from many mainstream outlets due to the inclusion of Arizona. The party affiliation of the state’s electorate puts Arizona in a unique situation. The home state of former presidential candidate and Republican Senator John McCain has seen an explosion of growth in the numbers of independent voters since 2008. Over 200,000 more voters are now registered as independent compared to 2008, making a full third of the state’s voters unaffiliated with a political party. For this and other reasons, Arizona is quite possibly at the top of the Obama campaign wish list. The President has a chance to “steal” this border state, which has leaned Republican and only voted for a Democratic presidential candidate once since President Truman. An April poll by Arizona State University’s Morrison Institute of Public Policy found President Obama faring better with independents in the state, but slightly trailing Gov. Romney overall. But there is work still to be done in the state: 18% of those polled were still undecided.

### Independents Key – Colorado

#### Colorado independent population decides the swing vote

**Eischen 12** (Faith Eischen, writer for IVN, 7/3/12, Independent Voters Network, “Swing State Colorado: ‘Tossup’ in Upcoming November Election,” http://ivn.us/2012/07/03/swing-state-colorado-tossup-in-upcoming-november-election/)

In the upcoming election President Obama and Mitt Romney must appeal to the emerging independent electorate in Colorado. Both presidential candidates may struggle with this task as they continue to court the bases of each of their own political parties. The centrist think tank, Third Way conducted a study of swing states including Colorado. Third Way found that the percentage of registered Republicans and Democrats barely increased since 2008, while newly declared independents drastically rose, in comparison. Third Way analyst Lanae Erickson said in Colorado, it’s now practically a three-way tie in registration. “Independents actually rose by nearly 10 percent in Colorado just since 2008. So there’s been a huge surge in independent voters. And, so, as a proportion of the electorate, independents have really gained on both parties.” Colorado’s history indicates a traditionally conservative state and a wariness of big government, which could ultimately hurt Obama. However Romney will have a challenge winning support from Colorado’s women and independent voters, who showed major influence in 2010 Democratic wins for senate and governor. Utah, Romney’s home state, boarders Colorado, which may also influence which way the state swings.

#### Colorado independent population growing – other parties decline

**Sale 11** (Anna Sale, reporter for It’s a Free Country, 8/4/11, New York Public Radio, “Anna and the Independent Voter: Colorado Lessons,” http://www.wnyc.org/articles/its-free-country/2011/aug/04/anna-sale-searches-independent-voter/)

I started our search this week in Colorado, with a first stop in Fort Collins, which is in Larimer County. I picked Fort Collins because it has more registered independent "unaffiliated" voters than Republicans or Democrats, and it's in a swing Congressional District that went from Republican to Democrat and back to Republican in the last three elections. And that stands out, because in Colorado, voters have to be a member of one of the major parties to vote in their primaries. I continued on to Greeley, were Republicans continue to win by large margins, but population is steadily declining. I ended the day in Colorado Springs, a Republican stronghold that is home to the Air Force Academy and Air Force and Army bases, where voters told me they leaned Republican, but that's where their similarities ended. Talking to voters in the shadow of the debt ceiling deal, calling yourself an independent was a badge of honor, and it didn't necessarily mean they weren't a member of the Democratic or Republican party. Rather, voters this week seemed to embrace independent as a self-definition to draw a line between their politics and the debate in Washington, which conservative and liberal voters alike derided as a mess.

### Independents Key – Iowa

#### Independents key to winning Iowa – 40% of the electorate

**Bays 12** (Kymberly Bays, Editor-in-Chief of Independent Voters Network, 5/11/12, Independent Voters Network, “Swing States Crucial for Presidential Race,” http://ivn.us/2012/05/11/swing-states/)

President Obama won Iowa in 2008 by 146,000 votes. When Republicans descended on the state for the Iowa Caucuses earlier this year, they probably quickly noticed the presence of Obama for America. President Obama’s reelection campaign actually spent more money in the state during this time than any one Republican. Iowans have a slightly better standing in the economy, ranking as fifth-best in the United States in terms of unemployment. The question will be if current trends towards improvement continue, stall or worsen. Independent voters in Iowa make up 40% of the electorate, larger than both registered Republicans and Democrats. This is a critical mass of people both Gov. Romney and President Obama will have to woo.

### Independents Key – Pennsylvania

#### Independents key in Pennsylvania

**Bridges 12** (Will Bridges, of The Washington Dispatch, 2/18/12, The Washington Dispatch, “2012 Swing-State Election Analysis: Pennsylvania,” http://hearourvoices.us/post/2012/02/18/2012-Swing-State-Election-Analysis-Pennsylvania.aspx)

Looking at the breakdown of the Pennsylvania electorate according to party identification, in 2010 Democrats made up 40% of the vote, Republicans 37%, and Independents 23% according to CNN's comprehensive exit poll of nearly 3,000 voters. Contrast that with 2008, when Republican also made up 37% of the vote, but Democrats accounted for 44% and Independents only 17% in the state of Pennsylvania, again according to CNN's comprehensive exit polling of nearly 3,000 voters. Given the steady nature of the Republican vote in 2008 and 2010, two wildly different elections with wildly different results, the key factor that may decide the electoral fate of Pennsylvania in 2012 is Democratic turnout. If the Democrats cannot at least regain some of the electorate share they lost to the independent vote in 2010, things become very dicey for President Obama in Pennsylvania this fall, especially considering his poor approval rating among independents, which dropped from 47% to 42% nationally over the course of 2011 according to Gallup. Had Obama only managed to win 42% of independents in Pennsylvania in 2008, his margin of victory would have dropped from 55-45% to 52-48%. If 2012 turnout by party ID mirrors 2010 turnout, and Obama takes the same share of Democrats and Republicans he took in 2008, but only takes 42% of independents, the race between he and the Republican challenger would be a virtual 50-50% tie. Assume Obama does not do as well among Republicans this time around, a safe assumption, and Obama loses in Pennsylvania under this scenario. Of course, turnout by party ID likely will not favor Democrats as heavily as in 2008, nor will it likely be as bad for them as it was in 2010. If we split the difference, and assume Democrats comprise 42%, Republicans 37%, and Independents 20% of the Pennsylvania electorate in 2012, and we assume that Obama's share of the Republican vote drops to 10%, and we assume that Obama maintains his 2008 share of the Democratic vote, then in order to win the state of Pennsylvania President Obama must win 42.5% of the Independent vote. The battle for Pennsylvania will likely be closer this year than it has been in recent years. When one consider's Mitt Romney's appeal among independents and moderates, as well as Rick Santorum's two state-wide election wins in the state, winning Pennsylvania seems within reach for the Republicans this fall. President Obama still has the edge, but faces a strong challenge and the very real possibility of defeat in the Keystone State.

### Partisanship Kills Obama

#### Political infighting tanks Obama’s reelection chances

**Medved**, 4/1/**2012** (Michael – nationally syndicated conservative talk show host, Obama’s Achilles: Broken Promise of Bipartisan May Sink Reelection, Daily Beast, p. http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/04/01/obama-s-achilles-broken-promise-of-bipartisanship-may-sink-reelection.html)

In the last 100 years, every U.S. president who lost his bid for a second term did so because he abandoned his principal promise to the American people. If Republicans can persuade the public that Barack Obama similarly shattered the pledge at the very core of his presidency, **they will succeed in denying him the new lease on the White House** he insists he deserves. Four elected chief executives in the past century failed in their reelection campaigns—and each of them flopped by landslide margins. For William Howard Taft in 1912, Herbert Hoover in 1932, Jimmy Carter in 1980, and George H.W. Bush in 1992, broken promises doomed their chances for another four-year term. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt’s hand-picked successor, based his first presidential campaign on guarantees that he would continue the popular policies of his ebullient predecessor, but voters in 1912 knew they’d been betrayed because TR himself came out of retirement to tell them so! Roosevelt not only challenged Taft for re-nomination but ultimately conducted his third-party “Bull Moose” campaign, handing victory to Democrat Woodrow Wilson and pushing the incumbent to a paltry 23 percent of the popular vote. In 1928, Commerce Secretary Herbert Hoover ran as the prosperity candidate, deploying the sonorous slogan, “A Chicken in Every Pot, a Car in Every Garage.” The Great Depression smashed his optimistic assurances and helped FDR carry 42 of 48 states. After the sleaze and polarization of the Nixon administration, a nation weary of Watergate turned to a youthful, deeply religious Georgia governor who titled his campaign autobiography Why Not the Best? As a former officer on nuclear submarines, Jimmy Carter ran as a sure-handed technocrat who offered the explicit promise of “a government as good as its people.” After three years of economic meltdown, a seemingly endless hostage crisis, and self-defeating talk of malaise, that cheerful vow sounded laughably quaint, and Carter fell by 8.4 million votes to Ronald Reagan. Finally, in 1988 Vice President George H.W. Bush escaped the nagging “wimp” factor and electrified the GOP convention with an unequivocal declaration meant to evoke the steely resolve of Clint Eastwood. “Read my lips,” he snarled. “No new taxes!” Violating that well-publicized oath with a sharp increase in marginal tax rates literally wrecked his presidency: producing a primary challenge from Pat Buchanan, a formidable third-party candidacy by Ross Perot, and a lopsided November win for the young governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton. If Republicans want to see history repeat itself in 2012, with a once-popular incumbent turned out of office by a deeply disillusioned electorate, they must persuade the public that Barack Obama has continued the big-loser pattern of broken promises. That means reminding voters of the most important theme associated with his rise to power: the pledge to unify the nation and **put aside petty,** partisan differences. Whatever happens with the unemployment rate or gas prices, the president’s failure to live up to these assurances remains both painful and apparent.

Rural Voters Key

#### Rural vote key to the election

**The Daytona Beach News Journal**, 6/21/**2012**, “Rural voters could be key to the presidential contest,” http://www.news-journalonline.com/opinion/editorials/n-j-editorials/2012/06/21/rural-voters-could-be-key-to-the-presidential-contest.html

Whichever candidate has the keys to unlock the most doors to the most groups of voters will win. In recent weeks, it has become apparent that rural voters are a key demographic that Republican Mitt Romney cannot take for granted and President Barack Obama, a Democrat, cannot ignore in favor of big-city voters. It means rural voters are likely to be targeted in Volusia and Flagler counties. Voters in rural Florida could end up tipping the Sunshine State to either candidate. The targeting of rural voters is part of the strategies of both campaigns. Romney seeks to "over perform" in rural areas and tip states such as Florida to his side. This is a strategy that Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker, a Republican, used to beat back his recall election earlier this month. Walker did exceedingly well in rural and small-town parts of Wisconsin. He was able to cancel out huge margins for the Democratic candidate in Milwaukee and Madison. Rural voters also thumped Democrats in the 2010 midterm elections. In that election, Democrats lost 60 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. About two-thirds of those seats came from rural America, according to National Public Radio. Voters in rural areas tend to be socially conservative and concerned about the core values of a candidate. Urban and suburban voters, on the other hand, tend to look at the fiscal policies of candidates first. But it's no easy trick for the conservative GOP to do well in all rural areas. Republicans lost New Hampshire and Colorado in 2008 partly because they lost rural areas there. Republicans usually carry rural areas, but the margins of victories vary. According to the Associated Press, President George W. Bush beat Democrat John Kerry in rural areas by almost 20 points in 2004. Republican John McCain also won rural voters but by a smaller margin -- 8 points. That smaller margin probably kept him from winning states with large numbers of rural voters -- states such as Indiana, Ohio, Florida, Iowa and North Carolina. Those states are must-wins for Romney in 2012. Both candidates were busing through small towns recently. Romney was in New Hampshire at a farm and Obama has sent Vice President Joe Biden into small towns. Here in Florida, there is much talk that both candidates for the White House will target moderate suburban voters along Interstate 4, from Volusia County to Tampa. But it's clear now they will also target the small towns in rural Florida. Volusia and Flagler counties have large rural areas. Farmland makes up about one-third of Volusia County's total land, according to county documents. The numbers can vary, but one estimate -- based on 2008 property tax data -- puts agricultural acreage at between 229,000 and 251,000 acres. Volusia County government estimates these farms -- about 1,700 of them -- had $106 million in market output in 2002. These owners operated nurseries, greenhouses and farms. A small portion tended to poultry and cows. In Volusia these rural industries had a total output impact of more than $780 million, in 2007 dollars. Flagler County, of course, also has a considerable amount of farmland -- about 58,400 acres of farms, with an average size of 712 acres, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Flagler County sold $35 million in farm goods in 2007 and had a total economic impact of $412 million in 2007, according to Flagler County's government website. Voters in these areas will want to know what policies Obama and Romney will implement to benefit rural America -- from farms to small towns. They will want to know which candidate will help them export more goods to Europe and Asia -- where demand for U.S. agricultural products is growing. So far, the campaign in rural America hasn't revealed sharp differences between Romney and Obama. There are no attack ads running in which Obama criticizes Romney for not supporting corn farmers on increasing or keeping ethanol subsidies, for example. Obama has also avoided a debate on Second Amendment gun rights. The overall debate on the role and size of the federal government is likely to be the main point of difference that rural voters see as separating Romney from Obama. The Los Angeles Times recently quoted a rural Pennsylvania man as saying bad debt situations like the problems in Greece or Spain could happen here. It is a worry Obama needs to confront. The presidential battle will be fought with vigor in small-town and rural America. The nation is far more urban than it was 50 years ago, but it's good that rural areas still count in key elections.

Rural Voters Key

#### Rural voters determine election result

**O’Connell**, **2012** (Ford O’Connell, managing director of Civic Forum Strategies and the chairman of CivicForumPAC. June 15, 2012, “Why Mitt Romney and Barack Obama Are Battling for the Rural Vote” U S News, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/ford-oconnell/2012/06/15/key-to-presidential-election-lies-in-rural-america)

Former Gov. Mitt Romney has spent almost his entire life in big cities. But if he is to win the election for president this November, he will have to learn to connect with voters from the farms and small towns of America. In a year when popular and Electoral College votes both figure to be close, momentum in rural areas could spell the difference in a variety of states. This is not lost on either campaign. It's why Romney will embark today on his "Every Town Counts" bus tour—a five-day, six-state journey that will take him to rural localities in the battleground states of New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Michigan. [See a collection of political cartoons on Mitt Romney.] Every little bit of face time with rural voters should help the former Massachusetts governor. President Barack Obama performed unusually well in rural areas in 2008. He lost to Republican Sen. John McCain by 8 percentage points—a huge step up after Sen. John Kerry lost to President George W. Bush by 19 points in 2004. President Obama's ability to carry key rural counties in Iowa, Colorado, and North Carolina helped lift him to victory. Moreover, the president enjoyed uncommon success among white men—a key constituency in rural areas. He split the vote among white independents and claimed 43 percent of the total among white voters—levels of achievement not seen by Democrats since Jimmy Carter's election in 1976. But things no longer look so bright for the president. Rural Americans, like their urban and suburban counterparts, said they voted based on the economy in 2008, and his policies have not helped them. Unemployment is at least a half-point higher in rural areas than urban areas. And, of the nation's more than 3,000 counties, about 30 percent now endure unemployment rates of 10 percent or higher and a good many of those are rural counties in 2012 battleground states such as North Carolina, Wisconsin, Michigan, Colorado, and Ohio. [See a collection of political cartoons on the 2012 campaign.] Worse, President Obama carried the Tar Heel State by 14,000 votes in 2008—his smallest margin of victory in any state. But 50 of the counties with the worst unemployment rates in the nation are in rural North Carolina, and 15 of those counties went for President Obama in 2008. Obama's disapproval ratings exceed his approval ratings in Iowa and North Carolina, and polling shows races tightening considerably in other rural battleground states, such as Michigan and Wisconsin. Thus, Democrats have begun to worry that if he can't alter his economic message and change his campaign strategy, he could find himself in real trouble come November. Yet, Governor Romney also has some work to do among rural voters before he can start to measure the White House drapes. Former Sen. Rick Santorum defeated him soundly in nearly every contest that involved large rural populations. Romney was 11 points better in metro areas than nonmetro areas. The United States Department of Agriculture divides America into nine classifications—from most urban to most rural. In 2008, Romney captured the two most urban classifications against John McCain. McCain carried the other seven. [Check out our editorial cartoons on President Obama.] McCain lost in 2008 in large part not because rural areas went for Obama but because an unenthusiastic rural electorate stayed home. Romney's bus tour and subsequent appeals are designed to assure those voters turn out in 2012. To do this, he must keep it simple. He must outline a cogent, understandable economic plan that rewards private initiative and limits government regulation. He must promise to nurture the domestic energy production boom—oil, coal, and natural gas—that has brought new wealth to North Dakota, north Louisiana, and elsewhere. He must connect to patriotism and the military—a significant number of rural families have members who serve or have served. And he must demonstrate his commitment will extend beyond Election Day and through all four years of his term. If he can do these things, if he can connect with rural Americans, if he can run up the kind of margins George W. Bush did in 2004 and perhaps flip states such as Michigan, rural America could be a real "Electoral College game changer" says Mark Halperin of Time magazine. If Romney succeeds, it could well be rural America that pushes him over the top and into the White House.

Rural Voters Key

#### Obama and Romney target rural voters

**Shapiro**, **2012** (Ari Shapiro, a magna cum laude graduate of Yale, June 15, 2012, “City Slickers Romney And Obama Woo Rural Voters,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/2012/06/15/155108821/city-slickers-romney-and-obama-woo-rural-voters)

Even though rural communities appear solidly Republican these days, both presidential candidates are trying to win over voters there. Romney and President Obama are both, let's be honest, city slickers. That's a big change for the American presidency, says Dee Davis, president of the Center for Rural Strategies. "If it's [Ronald] Reagan on a horse or [Bill] Clinton, the man from Hope [Ark.], there's always been this kind of visual narrative or this story that to be president you had to be able to handle the wilderness, be comfortable outside of the city. It's just part of the lore," he says. You're not likely to see Romney or Obama in a cowboy hat very often. But both men are trying to appeal to the folks who live in small towns, traditionally Republican strongholds. a"It's been an extraordinary priority nd the proof of that is the fact that the president established the Rural Council," says Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack. The Rural Council, which Vilsack runs, is a group of Cabinet members who meet to talk about policies aimed specifically at rural America. This week the council put out a report documenting improvements in the agricultural economy. "In that report is the plan, if you will, for revitalizing the rural economy. We haven't had a plan in the past. We now do," Vilsack explains. Competing Plans The administration's plan talks about increasing exports, producing biofuels and giving low-interest loans to small businesses in rural America. Exports are already way up over the past few years. Farmers are seeing record profits. Vilsack says that's a sign of Obama administration success at helping rural America. Jim Talent, a former senator from Missouri who now advises the Romney campaign, disagrees. "Exports are up. That's in part because of the weak dollar — and I guess the administration can claim some credit for that. I mean, the dollar's weak because the economy's weak," Talent says. Over these five days, Romney will visit six swing states that went for Obama four years ago. But he'll focus on the small towns in those states that went Republican last time, in hopes of tipping the whole state into the red column this time. Talent says during this bus tour Romney will lay out his ideas to help rural America — more oil and natural gas drilling, lower taxes and deficit reduction.

### Women Voters – Pro-Obama Now

#### Polls show that women support Obama in swing states.

**Forbes 7/11** Bryce Covert Forbes Correspondent and Columnist. “Women Poised to Bring it Home for Obama in Key Swing States” http://www.forbes.com/sites/brycecovert/2012/07/11/women-poised-to-bring-it-home-for-obama-in-key-swing-states-election-romney-polling/

Because that crucial gender gap in swing states looks like it will hold steady. New polling research from EMILY’s List out today shows that independent women in key battleground states are primed to vote Democrat in November. The group already conducted some online focus groups that found independent women looking for qualities in candidates that match up both with Democrats in general and female candidates in particular. This new research fills out that picture. In talking with 950 independent likely women voters, pollster Lisa Grove told me, EMIILY’s List found that Obama has a solid edge in getting their votes, up eight points over Romney, 48-40. What could be driving that preference? The birth control fight shows up: women are very angry, and in particular don’t trust Republicans to let them make choices about their own bodies. Democrats, the polling found, have a 34-point advantage when it comes to who these women think will protect a woman’s right to make her own reproductive choices. But they’re also angry about that fight because it distracted from the economy. And in fact the economy is at the forefront of their minds. When asked what issues were making these women worry, the very first was retirement security and the ability to retire with dignity – and interestingly enough, over half of women under 40 are concerned about retiring, not just the elderly. Next was the ability to access health care in a crisis, followed by losing their jobs or someone close to them getting laid off. It’s little wonder that the economy is weighing so heavily. Twenty percent of the sample polled had a relative move in with them because of the economy. “It’s very, very real and certainly not an abstraction” for these women, Grove told me. “It’s been brought home – literally.” When these women look around for solutions, they don’t see much comfort on the right. The biggest margin of advantage for Democrats is women thinking they’ll make millionaires and billionaires pay their fair share, by 37 points. Not too far behind is that women think Dems better understand how hard it is to make ends meet by 20 points. There’s a 17-point advantage for Dems in who will build an economy that will work for the middle class and a 14 point one for who is committed to protecting the social safety net that will let Americans retire with dignity. This is all part of a larger trend in which the economy drives women toward the Democratic Party. As I previously wrote, a paper published just before the 2010 midterms showed that women historically side with Democrats in supporting greater spending on the social safety net in bad times, while men defect to the GOP because they care more about lowering the deficit. The authors conclude that women are more likely to support liberal spending policies in a tough economy because “men tend to be less economically vulnerable than women, and they are less pessimistic than women about the economy.” That’s crystal clear in EMILY’s List’s recent polling. There are some pitfalls for Democrats in the polling, in particular that Republicans hold a three-point advantage on who has a concrete plan for fixing a broken economy. Yet as Ari Berman has written, Obama’s jobs plans have all been very concrete, and the ones that have passed showed real results. Romney, on the other hand, may claim that he’s going to create 11.5 million jobs in his first term, but “true to form, Romney never said how he would create that many jobs, nor has any reputable economist backed up his claim,” Berman writes. Hopefully his nonexistent math will be made clearer before we all head to the polls. If so, Obama should feel pretty optimistic about key support from women voters. \\

Women Voters – Pro-Obama Now

#### Women will turn out for Obama

**Wiggins 4/2** Mark Wiggins. KVUE ABC News. “Poll suggests women could be key vote in 2012 presidential election” http://www.kvue.com/news/Poll-suggests-women-could-be-key-vote-in-2012-presidential-election-145835705.html

AUSTIN -- In a race down to the wire, every vote counts. A new poll by USA Today/Gallup shows President Barack Obama beating Republican front runner Mitt Romney among swing state voters for the first time since late 2011. The poll suggests the reason in part is due to an increase in support from women under the age of 50, more than 60 percent of whom said they favor Obama compared to about 30 percent who said they favor Romney. The same poll shows 41 percent of women identified themselves as Democrats compared to 24 percent who identified themselves as Republicans. After weeks of demonstrations over issues like women's health, birth control, and Planned Parenthood, women voters on both sides of the debate are making their voices heard. "I think it's been good in that while women already tend to be more likely to vote and more interested in participating in the elections as we see in voter turnout statistics, I think it definitely has had an impact on the interest in the upcoming election," said Julie Oliver of the non-partisan League of Women Voters of Texas. While the polls can give a sort of overhead view, the view on the street can be a little more complicated. "Generally speaking, a couple of things that women voters are going to be very interested in are the economy and the environment," said Oliver. April Gonzales of Illinois told KVUE the economy was the most important issue in the upcoming election. "The economy and health care," answered Mary Guillen. Tammy Stroud said her concerns center on energy. "Domestic versus foreign oil," said Stroud. "And changing that to where we don't depend on other countries for our oil when we have enough of it here." Asked about the debate surrounding various women's health issues, Gonzales voiced disappointment in the GOP hopefuls' response to recent disparaging comments made by conservative radio host Rush Limbaugh. "I think that the Republican nominees missed a great opportunity," said Gonzales. "I'm conservative, fiscal conservative, so I think that it's a state issue," said Stroud. "It's not really a national issue about who controls health care." "It's just too much back and forth," said Guillen. "There's nothing you can really stand on right now." "I think the fact that the debate and the discussion has been amongst a group of men on these very women-oriented issues has caused some frustration among women voters," said Oliver. "They want to be able to participate in those discussions, and of course their way of participating is by voting."

### Young Voters Key

#### Young voters key to Obama reelection

**Seib**, **’11** (Gerald F. Seib, staff writer for the Wall Street Journal, Nov 8, 2011, “Winning Youth Vote Will Be Crucial for Obama in 2012,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203733504577023931037152266.html)

For President Barack Obama, the election of 2012 may well turn out to be a young man's (and young woman's) game. Mr. Obama won the presidency in 2008 in no small measure because of strong support among younger voters. That support sagged for Democrats in 2010, and the party paid dearly. In his re-election effort, amid a still-troubled economy and in an environment in which the president will be hard-pressed to match his initial support among various other demographic groups (white males, the working class, Hispanics), replicating that performance among young voters figures to be crucial. In swing states such as Colorado, where the population trends younger, it may be the decisive factor. Certainly the Obama campaign is treating the young vote as potentially decisive. It just launched something called Greater Together, a program aimed specifically at mobilizing voters aged 18 to 29. In recent days it held the first of a series of "student summits," this one conducted by campaign chief Jim Messina and live-streamed to 80 college campuses across the country. And it has hired an activist whose experience includes running the Hip-Hop Summit Action Network to lead a young-voter drive. The effort won't be without its complications. Certainly younger voters start out as a core support group for the president. A new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll finds that the president's job approval among Americans aged 18 to 29—the traditional definition of younger voters—is 51%, compared with 37% among those 35 to 49.

#### Young voters key to Obama’s reelection

**Brownstein**, **’11** (Ronald Brownstein, two-time finalist for the Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of presidential campaigns, National Journal Group's Editorial Director, former the National Affairs Columnist for the Los Angeles Times and the Times' National Political Correspondent and the author of the weekly Washington Outlook column, political analyst for CNN, the American Political Science Association presented him its Carey McWilliams award for lifetime achievement, granted to honor a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics, Apr 28, 2011, “A 2012 Paradox,” National Journal, p. Proquest)

In 2008, Obama won three-fifths of voters under 30, two-thirds of Latinos, and 95 percent of African-Americans. With his support among older and blue-collar whites eroding, he needs big showings among all those groups again in 2012. There's no sign of wavering in Obama's black support. But in 2010, exit polls found that the Democratic vote in House elections dipped among both young people (to 55 percent) and Latinos (to 60 percent). In Gallup's weekly averages of its tracking poll, Obama's approval rating has reached 60 percent among Latinos only once since January--and has never been that high among young people. His ratings among both groups have fallen below 50 percent over the past two weeks; among Latinos, he's at his lowest level ever. Against those warning signs, the White House is betting that these young and minority voters will mostly look forward, not back, as they choose in 2012. Recent Gallup polling shows that while young people and minorities are more negative than older whites about their current economic circumstances, they are also more optimistic about their financial future. One senior White House official argues that such optimism suggests a residual faith in Obama. The president will also benefit, the official maintained, from drawing contrasts with a GOP nominee likely to be tugged toward conservative positions on issues ranging from immigration reform to retrenching student loans. Previewing a likely Obama case, the official argued: "These are also the people who will be hurt most by the policies of our opponents." Those are plausible arguments. But second-term presidential elections almost always unfold less as a choice than as a referendum on the incumbent. And that means Obama has placed a huge wager by embracing a fiscal strategy that denies him many tools to directly address the continuing struggles of African-Americans, Latinos, and young people. They may be at the margin of the economy, but they're at the center of his electoral coalition.

Young Voters Key

#### Youth make up high percentage of eligible voters—key to 2012 elections

**Fischer**, **2012** (Regina Fischer, staff writer for the News Register Online, 2/27/12, “College students’ votes have impact on elections,” News Register Online, http://newsregisteronline.com/?p=406)

The youth of America make up 24 percent of the voting population, according to the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE). That percentage equates to 46 million eligible voters between the ages of 18-29, compared to the 39 million voters over the age of 65. That’s a lot of young adults who can make a huge difference in the upcoming Nov. 6, 2012 election. But the real question is will they? That demographic did come through in the 2008 Presidential Election, according to CIRCLE. An average of 51 percent of these young Americans voted when Barrack Obama and John McCain faced off. It was the highest percentage since 1972, when the legal voting age was lowered to 18. That year the new law catapulted Richard M. Nixon to re-election with 72.5 percent of eligible youth voting, thus altering the nation’s history forever. And there is no doubt that America’s youth played a significant role in Obama’s win in the 2008 election. His campaign’s usage of social media was credited for reaching untapped voters, volunteers and donations. Studies show that young people with college experience vote more consistently, CIRCLE reported. A random poll of students on North Lake College’s campus yielded mixed results earlier this month when The League of Women Voters (LWV) were signing up new voters. “I don’t really care about voting,” said NLC student Jimmy Houser. Yet, others like Gabriel Sarmiento acknowledged that the importance of voting is “so we can get our thoughts and ideas across to our elected officials.” Ian Wood, another NLC student, observed that “it helps [youth] to get their voice out to be heard.” The college’s Student Government Association (SGA) was responsible for bringing the LWV representatives to campus. “We have to inform young people about the importance of voting,” said SGA secretary Jeong Lee. A number of significant issues in the 2012 election may affect this young populace. USA Today reported that new laws going into effect in 14 states will require a photo I.D., less early voting, and the banning of convicted felons from voting. Also, the rising cost of living: gas, food, tuition and health care.

Young Voters Key

#### GOP tries to win over young voters from Obama

**Moody**, **2012** (Chris Moody, staff writer for ABC News, July 10, 2012, “How Republicans plan to win over the youth vote,” ABC News, http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/republicans-plan-win-youth-vote/story?id=16749919#.UAmKuLRI-So)

Four years after Barack Obama won the support of 66 percent of voters aged 18 to 29, Republicans are working on a fresh approach to bring younger voters and candidates into the fold, using a coalition of traditional campaign organizations, super PACs, non-profit advocacy groups and policy-based think tanks. And even Republicans organizing these efforts admit, it's going to take some work. Two groups, the Young Guns Action Fund and Maverick PAC--the latter was co-founder by George P. Bush, nephew of former President George W. Bush and son of former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush--will focus on finding young Republican political talent and supporting them with money. The two organizations announced a strategic partnership Tuesday that organizers hope will increase engagement with voters that were lost to Obama in 2008. One short-term goal, of course, is to narrow the enthusiasm gap between young Republicans and Democrats, but ultimately, they're looking far beyond the next election. "The relationship is about developing something for the long-term that looks past just this November," YG Action Fund President John Murray told reporters during a breakfast meeting in Washington D.C. on Tuesday. "By the mid-terms in 2014 perhaps we've made a little more progress; by the next presidential we've made some more progress, and [we've gained]...the capacity to build that over time because it's going to take time." Here's how the partnership will work: The YG Action fund, a super PAC, will scour the country looking for new young Republican House and Senate candidates. (The group is similar to, but independent from, the National Republican Congressional Committee's "Young Guns" program.) The Action fund will support these new GOP candidates and independently bolster their campaigns. Meanwhile, MavPAC will build its own base of young, new donors and fundraising bundlers, whom they plan to connect with the new recruits. The two groups will share data based on the information they gather from new supporters. They plan to spend $5 million this election cycle on the joint project. YG Action Fund will recruit the pilots and cover the air war, while MavPAC rallies the boots on the ground. Organizers say they hope to make some headway with younger voters this cycle, but they aren't promising a Republican revolution by November. "We want to manage expectations," said MavPac co-founder Bush. "We don't want to say it's going to swing 180 degrees to the other side. I think it's worth the effort. I think to leave a complete demographic group like this uncontested is a mistake for the Republican Party." To reach the goal, MavPAC and YG Action Fund leaders both pointed to Obama's success four years ago, and how he was able to "capture the imagination" of young people in his speeches. Now, they say, many of those same voters have graduated from college, are struggling to find work and are disappointed. Republicans plan to capitalize off that frustration. "I am not here to say that there's some magic wand we're going to wave and all these voters are going to suddenly vote Republican," Murray said. "I think what we recognize is that there's a unique moment in time where there's a real choice being presented in this country and many of these voters, once you articulate that voice, tend to say, 'you know, I want this freedom and opportunity and I'm concerned about it.'" MavPAC and YG Action aren't the only groups focused on shoring up the Republican base of young voters this cycle. American Crossroads, a group co-founded by Republican operatives Karl Rove and Ed Gillespie, announced the formation of Crossroads Generation earlier this year. In 2010, conservative operatives launched Generation Opportunity, which conducts nationwide voter registration drives targeting the younger set. Free from the restrictions of campaign finance laws, those independent groups will work to amplify the efforts of traditional party organizations.

### Young Vote Key – Close Election

#### Youth vote decisive in a close election

**Nickels**, **2012** (Robert Nickels, staff writer for the SCC Challenge, May 30, 2012, “Youth vote may be crucial in this election,” The SCC Challenge, http://www.sccchallenge.com/opinion/2012/05/30/youth-vote-may-be-crucial-in-this-election/)

After four years of a down economy that has made the job market tougher for college-aged adults, the youth vote is back up for grabs, and Republicans have sensed an opportunity to close the gap in a voting bloc President Obama needs if he wants to secure reelection in November. In a sign that the youth vote is far from settled a recent poll from the Harvard University Institute of Politics found that only 43 percent of voters under the age of 30 planned to support the President, while 26 percent favored the presumed Republican nominee Mitt Romney. While the President still enjoys a sizeable lead among young voters, it is down significantly from his 2008 number. This, combined with 2008 having a record number of youth voters, a turnout that New Hampshire Institute of Politics Executive Director Neil Levesque says is unlikely to be matched, means that the youth vote will be heavily contested in what is expected to be a close election. The President has already begun courting youth voters with a recent swing through college campuses in battleground states speaking out in support of keeping interest rates on government backed student loans from doubling on July 1 and urging colleges to lower the cost of attendance. That, along with his expression of support for gay marriage, is seen as actions meant to rally young voters to turn out for the President in November. Romney is going after the President on the economy but a Rutgers University study that found that half of all college graduates between 2006 and 2011 failed to find a full-time job. Romney’s campaign is being assisted by a new political “super” committee called Crossroads Generation, which is using $50,000 to launch a new social media ad in swing states targeted at voters under 30. With just under six months until the election, the College Republicans and College Democrats are already very active in enlisting their fellow students to register to vote as well as to volunteer to help elect their respective candidates. Both parties are also very active in social media, one area where the Obama campaign had a significant edge of the campaign of his 2008 opponent John McCain. Four years after an election that saw record numbers of young voters turn out for him at the polls, the President is trying to reignite the support of an important constituency that carried him into the White House, and Romney is trying to turn any dissatisfaction with a slow economy that has led to a difficult job market for many youths into an advantage. In an election that is forecasted to be very close, it may come down to which candidate makes a better case to America’s youngest voters.

### Young Voters Not Key

#### Young voters have lowest turnout

**Jones**, **2012** (Jeffrey M. Jones, the Gallup Poll managing editor, 7/13/12, “Young U.S. Voters' Turnout Intentions Lagging,” Gallup, http://www.gallup.com/poll/155711/Young-Voters-Turnout-Intentions-Lagging.aspx)

PRINCETON, NJ -- Fifty-eight percent of U.S. registered voters aged 18 to 29 say they will "definitely vote" this fall, well below the current national average of 78% and far below 18- to 29-year-olds' voting intentions in the fall of 2004 and 2008. The 20-percentage-point deficit for young voters versus the national average compares unfavorably with six- and seven-point deficits in the later stages of the 2004 and 2008 elections, respectively. These results are based on an analysis of May 1-July 10 Gallup Daily tracking interviews with more than 30,000 registered voters, and more than 2,800 18- to 29-year-old registered voters. In addition to asking presidential vote preferences, Gallup asks registered voters to rate their chances of voting on a 10-point scale, with "10" indicating they will "definitely vote." This analysis reports the percentage of voters who say they will definitely vote. The question is asked as part of Gallup's larger likely voter scale that will be used in the fall. Turnout intentions are currently lower among all registered voters than they were in the month before the last two elections, with 78% saying they will definitely vote, compared with figures of at least 85% in October/November 2004 and 2008. This partly reflects the normal pattern in which fewer voters say they will definitely vote in the late spring and early summer months than in the fall of an election year. However, a comparison of similarly timed data in the 2004 and 2008 elections still suggests turnout levels this year may not match those from the last two elections. In June 2004 (80%) and June 2008 (82%), slightly more registered voters said they would definitely vote than the 78% who do so now. Young voters were one of the key groups in President Obama's winning 2008 coalition. They widely support the president this year as well, but historically their turnout levels usually lag behind those of other groups. Thus, the question surrounding young voters is not so much whom they will support as whether they will officially register that support in the voting booth. The 20-point deficit in turnout intentions for young voters compared with the current national average is the largest among major demographic subgroups. A table showing the full data on each subgroup can be found on page 2. If history is a guide, young voters should become more likely to say they will definitely vote between now and the fall, as occurred in 2004 and 2008. These increases were much larger than the national increases in those years, suggesting young voters decide whether they will actually vote later than most voters do. Even with the increases, however, young voters ended up significantly below the national averages in voting intention by the time of the election. Thus, young voters' vote intention deficit will likely shrink in the coming months, but there would need to be a larger increase than occurred in 2004 and 2008 to indicate their turnout levels might match those from the last two elections.

## Obama Good (Domestic)

### Turns Case – Transportation Spending

#### GOP will rollback transportation funding --- kills aff solvency

**Goldman**, 3/23/**2012** (Ben – freelance writer, Interim Editor of Streetsblog Capitol Hill, GOP Budget Would Cut Transpo to the Bone, DC Streets Blog, p. <http://dc.streetsblog.org/2012/03/23/gop-budget-would-cut-transpo-to-the-bone/>)

Compared to President Obama’s transportation plan, which Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has been defending for the past month, the House GOP plan would essentially cut transportation spending by 25 percent. The Ryan document singles out high-speed rail for criticism, saying its job creation potential has been exaggerated. In making the case for his budget plans, Obama has emphasized the word “investment,” especially when it comes to transportation infrastructure. The president has asked for a six-year, $476 bilion transportation program, including a $50 billion injection available for projects immediately. The House GOP’s plan undercuts the President’s by 25 percent on transportation, which would force state and local governments to pick up the slack, or else. There are at least two problems with relying more on states to handle the construction and maintenance of a national, multimodal transportation system. First, state DOTs are in many cases set up to be highway-building agencies and not much more, and they’re not often held accountable for their expensive, car-centric boondoggles. Second, cities and states are even more constrained than the feds right now. That’s because they have two things working against them: the growing reluctance of the feds to invest in transportation, and the disproportionate rise in construction costs, as Brad Plumer wrote for the Washington Post.

### Ext – Obama Will Increase Transportation Spending

#### Re-election will result in more transportation spending

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

"I think then he could really use the hammer of the bully pulpit of a sitting president who does’t have to run again," said Chris Ward, who served as the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's executive director before moving to construction firm Dragados. "I think he’ll be a very different president once he gets reelected." “I’ll tell you this, if he wins a second term, he’s going to come into a second term with some domestic priorities,” said Schank. “Investing in transportation is not a bad way to invest his political capital.”

### Ext – GOP Rollbacks Transportation Spending

#### GOP will cut not increase transportation spending.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

But the Republican-controlled House is looking to cut transportation spending, not increase it. It will be all the president can do to get them to agree to pass the Senate's version of this year's transportation-spending bill, which **more or less extends the status quo**. “The White House hasn’t recommended funding sources, and the Congress has been reluctant to propose new revenues,” says Yaro, of the Regional Plan Association. House Republicans in particular have staked out a radical position on infrastructure funding, going so far as to propose eliminating mass-transit financing entirely from the gas tax.

### Economy 2NC

#### Romney’s economic plan causes economic collapse --- kills the housing market and consumer spending

**Waldron**, 1/12/**2012** (Travis, Economists: Romney’s Economic Plan Fails to Deal With ‘Main Drags’ On U.S. Economy, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/12/403210/economists-romneys-draconian/)

Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney’s (R) economic plan has become the centerpiece of his presidential campaign. Though his proposals are often vague, analyses of the plan shows that it would provide huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans while raising taxes on low-income families. And though Romney claims to be concerned about the federal budget deficit, his plan would add more than $6 trillion in deficits over 10 years. Romney, who touts his experience as a job creator, has suggested laying off thousands of public sector workers. He wants to slash vital programs for the poor and middle-classes, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and gut Medicare and Social Security. His embrace of the radical Cut, Cap, and Balance plan pushed by House Republicans would, in effect, shrink the federal government to pre-Ronald Reagan era sizes. But for all his talk about the plan on the campaign trail, economists surveyed by Reuters say Romney’s plan **likely wouldn’t deal with the main drags on the American economy**, while the cuts to vital programs would be “utterly draconian“: These steps would shrink the federal government’s role more than even former president Ronald Reagan managed 30 years ago when he turned many social programs over to the states. That scenario concerns liberal economists. “If applied, these fiscal measures would be utterly draconian. The attacks on Medicare and Social Security would throw large portions of the population into poverty,” said Jamie Galbraith, business professor at the University of Texas in Austin. Mainstream economists worry more that neither Romney nor his Republican opponents are addressing the main drag on the U.S. economy – weak demand from American consumers still weighed down by debt. Among the “main drags” highlighted in the Reuters piece is the housing crisis, which has placed “a big drag on consumer spending which drives two thirds of the U.S. economy.” But the GOP candidates have offered little in the way of solutions for the crisis, and Romney’s own prescription involves **letting the housing market hit rock bottom** — further damaging millions of homeowners. “Markets work,” Romney told moderators at a debate in November when asked what he would do to address the housing crisis. According to former Wall Street economist Thomas Gallagher, addressing demand should be at the top of the list when it comes to speeding the recovery. Instead, Romney is focused on budget deficits and tax reform — the types of austerity measures that are pushing Europe toward another recession. Perhaps that’s why a survey of economics professors found that the Republican proposals were so bad, they wouldn’t pass an Econ 101 class.

### Economy – Foreign Tax Exemption 2NC

#### Romney’s tax exemption policy hurts domestic economy dramatically

**Hanlon 12** (Seth Hanlon, director of Fiscal Reform at American Progress, 7.16.12, Center for American Progress Action Fund, “Romney’s New Tax Incentive for Outsourcing U.S. Jobs,” http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/07/hanlon\_outsourcing.html)

The unfortunate consequence is that our tax system’s skewed incentives “encourage firms to locate physical assets, production, and jobs in [low-tax foreign] countries,” according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center. Worse, our existing system even encourages companies to invest in high-tax foreign countries, rather than the United States, because once assets are offshore, the resulting profits can be moved fairly easily on paper to tax havens. Loopholes in the existing tax code also encourage and reward large corporations to game the rules to treat their profits as having been earned abroad even if they were actually earned in the United States. Profit shifting by multinational corporations costs the United States tens of billions of dollars in revenue. This system is badly in need of reform to reverse the bias toward offshore investment and prevent profit shifting. Romney’s new and expanded subsidy for offshore investment Romney’s economic platform would exacerbate these harmful features of the international tax system. He pledges to move the United States toward a “territorial” tax system. What this means is that instead of paying a deferred tax on their foreign profits, U.S. corporations would pay no U.S. tax. Exempting overseas profits from tax would be a tax cut for multinational corporations of $130 billion over 10 years. When combined with Romney’s proposal to slash the top corporate rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, which would cost more than $900 billion, it pushes the total corporate tax cuts in the Romney plan to over $1 trillion. A bigger reward for shipping U.S. jobs abroad Exempting U.S. corporations’ foreign profits would sweeten the tax code’s already-rich inducements to move investments and jobs overseas. A U.S. company deciding whether to build a factory in the United States or elsewhere would know that the returns from its investment, if made abroad, would be permanently free of U.S. tax—not merely tax deferred, as under our current system. That would result in a large tax cut for some U.S. multinationals, but it would run counter to the interests of U.S. workers. In recent testimony, Congressional Research Service economist Jane Gravelle explained that a territorial system: ... would make foreign investment more attractive. That would cause investment to flow abroad, and that would reduce the capital with which workers in the United States have, so it should reduce wages. [A territorial system] will increase the after-tax rate of return that firms see abroad, so they will want to move their investments--they would want to make investments abroad, instead of the United States. Gravelle concludes that because a territorial tax system distorts investment decisions, pushing investment offshore, it is “not neutral or efficient.” An analysis by Reed College economist Kimberly Clausing similarly finds that “the tax incentive to locate jobs in low-tax countries would increase significantly.” Clausing estimates that investment and profits would migrate to low-tax countries, resulting in 800,000 jobs in low-tax countries and potentially displacing U.S. jobs.

### Economy – Tax Cuts 2NC

#### Romney’s tax cut policy destroys the economy and prevents growth

**Zakaria 12** (Fareed Zakaria, PhD from Harvard, writes a foreign affairs column for The Post, 6/7/12, The Washington Post, “Romney is wrong on tax cuts,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/fareed-zakaria-romney-is-wrong-on-tax-cuts/2012/06/07/gJQAy1pHLV\_story.html)

By contrast, Mitt Romney’s first major ad is substantive — and wrong. He tells us that on his first day in office — after approving the Keystone XL pipeline — he will “introduce tax cuts . . . that reward job creators not punish them.” The one idea that is almost certain not to jump-start this economy is a tax cut. Why can we be sure of this? Because that is what we have done for the past three years. For those who think President Obama’s policies have done little to produce growth, keep in mind that the single largest piece of his policies — in dollar terms — has been tax cuts. They actually began before Obama, with the tax cut passed under the George W. Bush administration in response to the financial crisis in 2008. Then came the stimulus bill, of which tax cuts were the largest chunk by far — one-third of the total. The Department of Transportation, by contrast, got 6 percent of the total to fix infrastructure. That wasn’t the end of it. There was the payroll tax cut, the small business tax cut, the extension of the payroll tax cut, and so on. The president’s Twitter feed boasted: “President Obama has signed 21 tax cuts to support middle class families.” And how has that worked out? In the wake of a financial crisis caused by excessive debt, tax cuts are highly unlikely to lead to increased economic activity. People use the money to pay down their debts rather than shop for cars, houses and appliances. As for the idea that job creators are not creating jobs because their taxes are too high, think about it: Would Mitt Romney invest more of his money in American factories if only he had paid less than the 13.9 percent rate he paid last year? Please! The Wall Street Journal invoked Milton Friedman to say that the problem with all of these tax cuts is that they are temporary. If only we had across-the-board cuts in rates. Except that these were tried as well. The 2001 Bush tax cuts were designed precisely along those lines. They were, in dollar terms, the largest tax cuts in U.S. history. And the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service concluded in 2010 that “by almost any economic indicator, the economy performed better in the period before the [Bush] tax cuts than after the tax cuts were enacted. . . . GDP growth, median real household income growth, weekly hours worked, the employment-population ratio, personal savings, and business investment growth were all lower in the period after the tax cuts were enacted.” The years 2000 to 2007 were the period of the weakest job growth in the United States since the Great Depression. The one certain effect of tax cuts would be to balloon the deficit. Bruce Bartlett, a former economic official under Ronald Reagan, points out that the aggregate revenue loss of the Bush tax cuts was the largest in U.S. history. “Both Harry Truman and Ronald Reagan passed larger individual tax cuts, but both took back about half of them with subsequent tax increases.” When pressed, Romney and his advisers sometimes say that they are just for tax reform; other times, they cite the Simpson-Bowles plan. I’ve long argued that reforming the nation’s bloated and corrupt tax code is vital and that Simpson-Bowles is a superb framework for deficit reduction. But neither will cut taxes. Simpson-Bowles raises them by more than a trillion dollars. You can use euphemisms such as “ending tax expenditures” and “closing loopholes,” but when you do that, someone’s taxes will go up. And when you close big loopholes such as the deduction of mortgage interest — which is the only way to get real revenue — tens of millions of peoples’ taxes will go up. Tax cuts have been a central cause of America’s deficit problems. For four decades, Washington politicians have bought popularity by cutting taxes, always saying that spending cuts or growth will make up for lost revenue. That rarely happened, and the result is $11 trillion in federal debt held by the public. To perpetuate this pandering one more time is not just dishonest — it is dangerous.

### Ext – Tax Cuts Hurt Economy

#### Romney tax cuts increases the deficit, hurts the middle and lower class

**Krugman 12** (Paul Krugman, PhD from MIT, writer for NYT, Nobel Prize winner in Economics, 6/15/12, NYT, “Policy and the Personal,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/16/opinion/krugman-policy-and-the-personal.html?ref=paulkrugman)

The story so far: Former President George W. Bush pushed through big tax cuts heavily tilted toward the highest incomes. As a result, taxes on the very rich are currently the lowest they’ve been in 80 years. President Obama proposes letting those high-end Bush tax cuts expire; Mr. Romney, on the other hand, proposes big further tax cuts for the wealthy. The impact at the top would be large. According to estimates by the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Romney plan would reduce the annual taxes paid by the average member of the top 1 percent by $237,000 compared with the Obama plan; for the top 0.1 percent that number rises to $1.2 million. No wonder Mr. Romney’s fund-raisers in the Hamptons attracted so many eager donors that there were luxury-car traffic jams. What about everyone else? Again according to the policy center, Mr. Romney’s tax cuts would increase the annual deficit by almost $500 billion. He claims that he would make this up by closing loopholes, in a way that wouldn’t shift the tax burden toward the middle class — but he has refused to give any specifics, and there’s no reason to believe him. Realistically, those big tax cuts for the rich would be offset, sooner or later, with higher taxes and/or lower benefits for the middle class and the poor. So as I said, this election is, in substantive terms, about the rich versus the rest, and it would be doing voters a disservice to pretend otherwise.

#### Romney’s upper class tax cut hurt the economy

**Blodget 12** (Henry Blodget is co-founder, CEO and Editor-In Chief of Business Insider, 7/11/12, “ANALYSIS: Mitt Romney's Tax Plan Will Help Rich People And Hurt Most Americans,” http://www.businessinsider.com/mitt-romneys-tax-plan-2012-7?op=1#ixzz215CpGCiX)

But it's important to note that Mitt Romney's plan will be vastly more helpful to the richest 1% of Americans and the rest of America's "ownership" class than it will be to average Americans. It also won't help fix the economy. Why? Well, for starters, the current tax rates on the country's highest earners are already very low relative to most of the last century. Second, the country's richest people--like Mitt Romney himself--make a huge amount of their earnings from capital gains and dividend taxes, which are at record lows. (As has been widely discussed, Mitt Romney paid a 14% tax rate on the $22 million he made in 2010. His tax policy would ensure that he keeps paying that rate.) So, Mitt Romney's proposal for personal taxes will help the country's highest earners much more than other taxpayers. And since the problem with the economy is not that the richest Americans don't have enough money--they do--but instead that the vast American middle class, which contributes most of the spending in the economy, is broke and deeply indebted, putting even more money in the hands of the richest Americans won't help the economy. It will just put more money in the hands of the richest Americans. What is less obvious is that Romney's big proposed tax cut--chopping the corporate tax rate from 35% to 25%--will also be a boon to the richest Americans, because they're the ones that own most of the country's corporations. And this tax cut also won't help the economy--because, again, the problem with the economy is not that corporations can't afford to hire people and make investments. Corporations can afford this. Today's corporate profit margins are the highest in history, and corporations already have so much cash that they don't know what to do with it. Again, the problem in the economy is that the corporations' end customers--the hundreds of millions of people in America's middle class--are broke. So there's no reason for corporations to hire anyone else or make additional investments--because American consumers can't afford to buy more products even if the corporations make them. Moreover, far from American corporations paying usurious taxes relative to the rest of the world, our companies actually pay relatively low tax rates--because most companies take full advantage of dozens of corporate tax loopholes. So, although Romney pitches his corporate tax cut as a way to "make America more competitive," it will really just make certain Americans--and certain foreigners, those who own American corporations--richer, by inflating the value of the corporations. And it won't help the economy. In fact, by increasing wealth inequality in the country, it may well hurt it.

Ext – Tax Cuts Hurt Economy

#### Romney will hurt short term economy – tax cuts and budget cuts

**Blodget 12** (Henry Blodget is co-founder, CEO and Editor-In Chief of Business Insider, 7/11/12, Business Insider, “And Now Let's Analyze Mitt Romney's Plan To Fix The Economy...” http://www.businessinsider.com/analysis-mitt-romneys-plan-to-fix-the-economy-2012-7?op=1#ixzz215Cd1e59)

Romney's plan contains some good ideas about how to change some things for the better, along with a bunch of clunkers. But the plan will not "fix" the economy, at least not in the short term. By cutting government spending, the plan will actually hurt the economy in the short term--by putting more people out of work and reducing personal incomes (and spending). Cutting the corporate tax rate will also reduce government revenue, which will likely offset any helpful impact on the deficit from the government spending cuts. So the plan also won't help the deficit and debt problem, at least in the short term. (The idea that corporations will use the money they're saving on taxes to make new investments and hire more people is misguided. It is based on fundamental misunderstanding--or misrepresentation--of what is wrong with the economy. Corporate profit margins are already at record highs, and corporations have cash coming out of their ears. If corporations could generate a great return by making more investments and hiring more people, they would already be doing this. But the corporations aren't doing that. Why not? Because their customers--consumers--are still hurting.) Lastly, the plan includes no "stimulus" or other mechanisms that would give the economy a shot in the arm and persuade corporations to start hiring people again.

### Ext – Romney Kills Jobs

#### Romney’s job and funding cuts kills the economy – empirics and Europe

**Krugman 12** (Paul Krugman, PhD from MIT, writer for NYT, Nobel Prize winner in Economics, 6/14/12, NYT, “We Don’t Need No Education,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/15/opinion/krugman-we-dont-need-no-education.html?ref=paulkrugman&pagewanted=print)

So would getting rid of teachers, police officers, and firefighters help the American people? Well, some Republicans would prefer to see Americans get less education; remember Rick Santorum’s description of colleges as “indoctrination mills”? Still, neither less education nor worse protection are issues the G.O.P. wants to run on. But the more relevant question for the moment is whether the public job cuts Mr. Romney applauds are good or bad for the economy. And we now have a lot of evidence bearing on that question. First of all, there’s our own experience. Conservatives would have you believe that our disappointing economic performance has somehow been caused by excessive government spending, which crowds out private job creation. But the reality is that private-sector job growth has more or less matched the recoveries from the last two recessions; the big difference this time is an unprecedented fall in public employment, which is now about 1.4 million jobs less than it would be if it had grown as fast as it did under President George W. Bush. And, if we had those extra jobs, the unemployment rate would be much lower than it is — something like 7.3 percent instead of 8.2 percent. It sure looks as if cutting government when the economy is deeply depressed hurts rather than helps the American people. The really decisive evidence on government cuts, however, comes from Europe. Consider the case of Ireland, which has reduced public employment by 28,000 since 2008 — the equivalent, as a share of population, of laying off 1.9 million workers here. These cuts were hailed by conservatives, who predicted great results. “The Irish economy is showing encouraging signs of recovery,” declared Alan Reynolds of the Cato Institute in June 2010. But recovery never came; Irish unemployment is currently more than 14 percent. Ireland’s experience shows that austerity in the face of a depressed economy is a terrible mistake to be avoided if possible. And the point is that in America it is possible. You can argue that countries like Ireland had and have very limited policy choices. But America — which unlike Europe has a federal government — has an easy way to reverse the job cuts that are killing the recovery: have the feds, who can borrow at historically low rates, provide aid that helps state and local governments weather the hard times. That, in essence, is what the president was proposing and Mr. Romney was deriding. So the former governor of Massachusetts was telling the truth the first time: by opposing aid to beleaguered state and local governments, he is, in effect, calling for more layoffs of teachers, policemen and firemen. Actually, it’s kind of ironic. While Republicans love to engage in Europe-bashing, they’re actually the ones who want us to emulate European-style austerity and experience a European-style depression. And that’s not just an inference. Last week R. Glenn Hubbard of Columbia University, a top Romney adviser, published an article in a German newspaper urging the Germans to ignore advice from Mr. Obama and continue pushing their hard-line policies. In so doing, Mr. Hubbard was deliberately undercutting a sitting president’s foreign policy. More important, however, he was throwing his support behind a policy that is collapsing as you read this. In fact, almost everyone following the situation now realizes that Germany’s austerity obsession has brought Europe to the edge of catastrophe — almost everyone, that is, except the Germans themselves and, it turns out, the Romney economic team. Needless to say, this bodes ill if Mr. Romney wins in November. For all indications are that his idea of smart policy is to double down on the very spending cuts that have hobbled recovery here and sent Europe into an economic and political tailspin.

Ext – Romney Kills Jobs

#### Romney’s austerity campaign destroys job creation and slows the economy

**Boushey and Ayres 12** (Heather Boushey is Senior Economist at the Center for American Progress Action Fund and Sarah Ayres is a Research Assistant on the Economic Policy team at CAP Action, 7/2/12, Center for American Progress Action Fund, “Economists Agree Romney’s Plan Would Spark a New Recession,” http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/07/omney\_economic\_plan.html/)

The private sector of the U.S. economy has added jobs for the past 27 months in a row, corporate profits have hit an all-time high, and the U.S. auto industry is back, with manufacturers consistently adding jobs for the longest period since the mid-1990s. Still, as President Barack Obama has said, “we are still not creating (jobs) as fast as we want.” And the biggest hurdle to swifter job creation is the embrace of austerity by Republicans in Congress who refuse to implement measures that would boost employment—a position supported by their presidential candidate, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney. This austerity has real—negative—economic consequences. Increasingly, economists are pointing to austerity as a key reason for too-slow job creation. Despite considerable warnings from economic experts that government spending is critical to creating jobs, conservative leaders in Congress are inflicting these austerity programs on us at the federal, state, and local level. According to Yale economists Ben Polak and Peter Schott: Without this hidden austerity program, the economy would look very different. If state and local governments had followed the pattern of the previous two recessions, they would have added 1.4 million to 1.9 million jobs and overall unemployment would be 7.0 to 7.3 percent instead of 8.2 percent. Even though austerity is not good for the U.S. economy, this is exactly the economic policy promoted by Romney. His ideologically driven agenda would continue the failed supply-side policies of President George W. Bush by giving even more tax breaks to the rich—a policy that has not generated strong and sustained economic growth—while slashing investments in our middle class and America’s future competitiveness, such as education, public safety, basic research and development, and infrastructure upgrades. Romney’s plan for spending cuts is deliberately vague, but it is clear that it will require drastic cuts to programs that support middle-class families and support economic growth in order to fund tax cuts for the rich.

### Ext – Romney Kills the Economy

#### Romney’s policy is contradictory and wouldn’t help the economy

**The Economist 12** (The Economist, 4/21/12, The Economist Print Edition, “Flip back please,” http://www.economist.com/node/21553024)

But there is also a second Romney—the desperate crowd-pleaser who will say anything to win over his audience of the day. This Romney lurches both to the left and the right. On trade, he has promised that on his first day in office he will have China branded a currency manipulator. This is doubly daft. Economically, it is unjustified: as China has allowed the yuan to appreciate, it has become far less undervalued, as evidenced by China's shrunken current-account surplus (see article). Politically, it would needlessly inflame the prickly Chinese during their own leadership transition. For the chief executive of the world's biggest economy to start by picking a fight with the second-biggest would be plain stupid. As troubling as his pandering to the left on trade is his swing to the right on taxes. Until February, Mr Romney had promised to cut taxes only on corporate profits and investment. Then, in a crude attempt to catch up with his tax-slashing rivals, he pledged to cut all personal income-tax rates by 20%. That would take the top rate of tax down to levels last seen under Ronald Reagan. Mr Romney claims he could pay for this by closing loopholes for the affluent—an excellent reformist idea, but meaningless unless you say which loopholes are going to go. Apart from sketching out a few small ideas to a group of donors, ideas that his aides rapidly downplayed, Mr Romney has said almost nothing about which tax breaks should go. The most likely reason is that any realistic cull of loopholes to pay for his lower income-tax rates (and the lower capital-gains and dividends rates he wants) will hit the middle class. The younger Mr Romney would never have invested in an entrepreneur with such a large hole in his numbers. But in this case it is worse, because Candidate Romney has not even evaluated the problem correctly. The businesslike solution to America's finances is not revenue-neutral tax reform. The gap between what Americans expect from their government and what they pay is simply too big. Even if spending cuts close most of that gap, some money must come from higher revenues. Mr Romney surely knows this, but when asked during a debate if he would reject a deficit deal that cut $10 of spending for every dollar of higher taxes, he raised his hand, alongside the nuttier candidates.

#### Romney’s intended spending reductions would undercut the economy

**Boushey and Ayres 12** (Heather Boushey is Senior Economist at the Center for American Progress Action Fund and Sarah Ayres is a Research Assistant on the Economic Policy team at CAP Action, 7/2/12, Center for American Progress Action Fund, “Economists Agree Romney’s Plan Would Spark a New Recession,” http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/07/omney\_economic\_plan.html/)

The result would bring more austerity and less growth. According to an analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “by 2022, if the [federal] budget had to be balanced while taxes were cut,” which is Romney’s goal, “the proposals would require cutting entitlement and discretionary programs other than Social Security and core defense by more than half.” Specifically, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that Romney’s proposals would deplete Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program by $3.4 trillion over the next 10 years. In addition, the nonpartisan think tank says that, under Romney’s plan, compensation payments for disabled veterans would be cut by one-quarter, and 13 million people struggling to put food on the table for their families would be kicked off the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. None of this would create jobs—never mind Romney’s claims that austerity for almost all of us will lead the wealthy to invest more in job creation. In fact, what it would do is undermine middle-class economic security, which in turn would lead to less spending and more and more families struggling to make ends meet. These kinds of cuts will hurt our economic future because we won’t be making the kinds of investments—in education or infrastructure—that will drive future growth. We have already seen the effect austerity has on economic growth and it is not pretty. For the past two years, Republicans in Congress have inflicted an austerity regime that has held back job growth and slowed the economy. The Republican-led House of Representatives has repeatedly refused to consider measures like the American Jobs Act, which would spur growth and reduce unemployment by beefing up aggregate demand. By refusing to act, Congress has ensured that huge job losses in the public sector drag down overall employment levels.

Ext – Romney Kills the Economy

#### Romney’s plan fails to address aggregate demand increase – multiple reasons demand is key

**Boushey and Ayres 12** (Heather Boushey is Senior Economist at the Center for American Progress Action Fund and Sarah Ayres is a Research Assistant on the Economic Policy team at CAP Action, 7/2/12, Center for American Progress Action Fund, “Economists Agree Romney’s Plan Would Spark a New Recession,” http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/07/omney\_economic\_plan.html/)

At the heart of economists’ worries is that Romney’s economic plan fails to address the single-biggest drag on the U.S. economy—a continued lack of aggregate demand. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Ben Bernanke recently explained, “while both cyclical and structural forces have doubtless contributed to the increase in long-term unemployment, the continued weakness in aggregate demand is likely the predominant factor.” Most small-business owners agree: A Gallup survey of small businesses shows that 71 percent are not hiring because there isn’t enough demand to justify new hires. Big corporations are similarly reluctant to hire, instead choosing to sit on record levels of cash. As many experts realize, investments in infrastructure, education, and other services can go a long way to help correct the shortfall in aggregate demand and give our economy a much-needed boost to spur growth while laying the foundation for long-term economic growth. One needs look no further than the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. According to Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf, the Recovery Act “created higher output and employment than would have occurred without it.” And four out of five economists surveyed by the University of Chicago’s Booth School of Business agree that employment at the end of 2010 was higher than it would have been without the Recovery Act. The U.S. economy is not adding jobs quickly enough to bring back full employment anytime soon, and for that Americans can blame obstinate congressional Republicans intent on cutting spending instead of creating jobs. Now, despite clear evidence that their spending cuts are slowing economic growth, Mitt Romney has a plan that doubles down on austerity. What the U.S. economy needs now is the exact opposite. Investing in education, infrastructure, and research and development will boost the economy in the short term and set the United States on a path to long-term competitiveness. As Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman explains, “Now is not the time to be laying off school teachers. Now is not the time to be doing public works, rehiring those school teachers, to get this economy moving again.” In other words, deficit reduction should wait until after we have given our economy the kick-start it needs today. Romney’s plan is the wrong prescription.

### Economy – Obama Policy Good

#### Obama has comparatively better short-term economic plan

**Klein 12** (Ezra Klein, writer for Washington Post’s Wonkblog, 7/6/12, Washington Post, “Comparing Romney’s and Obama’s jobs plans,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/07/06/comparing-romneys-and-obamas-jobs-plans/)

In his news conference, Romney emphasized four ideas in his plan: expanding domestic energy production, working out trade agreements with Latin America, cracking down on China and cutting the corporate tax rate. These are all reasonable ideas. But working out trade agreements takes a long time. Getting the Keystone oil pipeline up and running takes a long time. Rewriting and implementing a new corporate tax code takes a long time. Changing China’s policies takes a long time. It’s difficult to see how any of these ideas creates a substantial number of jobs quickly. Obama also tends to emphasize four parts of his plan: increasing infrastructure investment, hiring more state and local workers, doubling the size of the payroll tax cut and adding a new set of tax cuts for small businesses and companies that hire new employees. Two of those policies imply directly hiring hundreds of thousands of workers. The other two move money into the economy immediately. It’s easier to see how these policies lead to more jobs and demand in the short term. In terms of the deficit, the Obama administration has put forward a specific set of ideas — mostly by eliminating itemized deductions for wealthier Americans — to pay for its plan. The Romney campaign has not yet said how it will cut corporate and individual tax rates without increasing the deficit. In a sense, what’s really interesting about the Romney and Obama plans is that they don’t conflict with one another. Obama has a set of ideas for boosting job creation now. Romney has a set of ideas for long-term economic growth. You could implement all of Obama’s 41 bullet points and all of Romney’s 59 bullet points simultaneously. There’s nothing about increasing infrastructure investment that keeps you from cutting corporate taxes, for instance. That’s not to say the two campaigns agree on what to do — the Obama administration wouldn’t be happy about repealing the Affordable Care Act, while Romney wouldn’t much like raising taxes on the rich — but it goes to show how focused they are on different aspects of our economic problems. Obama has a plan for creating jobs now. Romney has a plan for changing the regulatory, budgetary and tax environment in which jobs are created later.

Economy – Obama Policy Good

#### Obama economic policy will help the economy – 5 points

**Garofalo 12** (PAT GAROFALO is Economic Policy Editor for ThinkProgress.org at the Center for American Progress Action Fund,1.25.12, Think Progress, “Five Good Economic Policy Ideas From Obama’s State Of The Union,” http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/25/411142/5-good-economic-policy-ideas-obama-sotu/?mobile=nc)

During last night’s State of the Union, President Obama unveiled a series of proposals aimed at addressing growing income inequality, a shrinking middle class, and abuses by the nation’s biggest banks. “We will not go back to an economy weakened by outsourcing, bad debt, and phony financial profits. Tonight, I want to speak about how we move forward, and lay out a blueprint for an economy that’s built to last,” Obama said. Here are five economic proposals Obama laid out that, though they don’t have high prospects of getting through the Republican House, would help achieve the goal of making the economy work for everyone: – WIDESPREAD MORTGAGE REFINANCING: Obama called for a program to give “every responsible homeowner” the chance to refinance their mortgage at lower interest rates. The plan aims to expand a previous administration refinancing effort so that it applies to those homeowners with privately backed mortgages, instead of only those with government backed mortgages. “It’s going to help homeowners who are struggling and it’s likely to be a first step to really opening up the market to more normal credit standards,” said Columbia Business School professor Christopher Mayer. Incidentally, the ten districts that could benefit most from mass refinancing are all represented by Republicans. – MINIMUM TAX FOR MILLIONAIRES: Due to the preferential treatment of investment income and the widespread use of tax deductions, loopholes, and tax havens, one quarter of millionaires are able to drive their tax rates down to a level below that of middle class families. In 2009, nearly 1,500 millionaires paid no income tax at all. To rectify this, Obama proposed a minimum 30 percent tax rate for millionaires. – MINIMUM TAX FOR CORPORATIONS: Many of the country’s largest, most profitable companies have been able to avoid paying corporate income tax on billions in profits, driving corporate tax revenue down to historic lows. Though not as straightforward as simply eliminating the ability of multinational corporations to delay paying taxes on offshore profits, Obama’s proposed minimum tax would limit the ability of corporations to exploit low-tax havens like Ireland or the Cayman Islands. – FINANCIAL FRAUD COMMISSION: Obama last night announced the creation of a commission, co-chaired by New York Attorney General Eric Schneidermann, to investigate and prosecute fraud committed by the financial industry. The administration had been taking some heat for its possible willingness to settle foreclosure fraud charges with the country’s five largest lenders, but this commission is a change of course (assuming it does more than the three year old Financial Fraud Task Force, which has done precisely nothing). – BANK TAX TO FUND AID FOR HOMEOWNERS: The mortgage refinancing plan Obama proposed would be paid for in part by a fee on the nation’s biggest banks (those with more than $50 billion in assets), akin to the Financial Crisis Responsibility Fee that the administration had previously proposed, but dropped due to Republican intransigence.

### Cap and Trade 2NC

#### Obama will pass Cap and Trade if elected --- key to reduce emissions and solves warming.

Samuelsohn’ 11 (5/3/11, Darren Samuelsohn, Darren Samuelsohn is a senior energy & environment reporter for POLITICO Pro. He graduated from the University of Missouri School of Journalism, “Obama signals to greens for 2012”, <http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=b75cfcfc-802a-23ad-4095-a6d19dce8fa3>)

President Barack Obama is offering his beleaguered green base some titillating morsels for what he hopes to deliver on energy policy if he wins a second term.¶ Don't get Obama wrong; these are not campaign promises - yet.¶ But over the past month, the president has made it clear in West Wing meetings and fundraisers that he wants to rally environmentally minded voters who, thanks in large part to last year's big global warming legislative failure, still feel like his second pick for the prom.¶ "We've had some setbacks, and some things haven't happened as fast as people wanted them to happen," Obama said at a recent New York fundraiser. "I know. I know the conversations you guys have. ‘Oh, you didn't get the public option - and, gosh, I wish that energy bill had passed.' I understand the frustrations. I feel them too."¶ Obama's team knows about the consequences of an environmental exodus. In the 2000 presidential election, Democrats blamed some greens with helping George W. Bush narrowly win the White House by supporting Ralph Nader over Al Gore.¶ Last week in Chicago, Obama 2012 campaign adviser David Axelrod and Mayor-elect Rahm Emanuel tried to do their part to buck up the green base during private meetings with about 80 major environmental philanthropists.¶ Attendees told POLITICO that the former White House officials heard a number of complaints about last year's climate bill loss but responded by pointing to the president's commitment to their issues via EPA climate rules and tens of billions in spending on renewable energy through the 2009 stimulus package.¶ "We had a back and forth about getting to first base versus swinging for the fences," said Betsy Taylor, co-founder and board president of 1Sky, one of the environmental groups pushing for federal policies to curb greenhouse gases.¶ With his day job, Obama must be careful not to give the appearance he's resting on his laurels until a second term.¶ The president pounced last week on House Speaker John Boehner's ABC News interview expressing an openness to end some of the oil industry's biggest tax breaks. And his Cabinet fanned out around the country to unveil a long-awaited policy defining what waters are subject to federal pollution rules - answering pleas by greens to clarify conflicting Supreme Court opinions.¶ But Obama's team probably is going to have to wait on many other top green priorities.¶ Regulations for coal ash, a potentially toxic leftover from coal-fired power plants, probably will be pushed back until after the election.¶ EPA's most anticipated new climate regulations for power plants and other major industrial sources are due in final form next spring. But with congressional Republicans making the rules a centerpiece of their legislative attack strategy, sources within and outside the administration expect that EPA's efforts will ultimately get punted beyond November 2012.¶ Earlier this month, Obama dropped in unannounced on a group of youth activists meeting with senior aides in the White House. During a nearly 30-minute exchange, the president cited the challenges of moving comprehensive energy legislation in Congress, given hurdles from the Republican-led House.¶ "The implication there was it would be pretty hard to do anything massive in the next 18 months," said Courtney Hight, executive director of the Energy Action Coalition and a former White House Council on Environmental Quality staffer.¶ Veterans of Obama's first-term cap-and-trade battle have packed up their most ambitious requests until after the presidential campaign, relegating themselves to the back seat as the White House and Congress try to address the debt limit and budget issues.¶ "I don't think anybody expects anything different than those two topics will take up all the energy for the remainder of this term," said Manik Roy, vice president of federal government outreach at the Pew Center on Global Climate Change.¶ But Roy said he would look to Obama for a second go at energy issues come 2013.¶ "If we start seeing the unemployment situation turned around, if we get ourselves on a path to deal with the debt, then I think in a second term, I'd expect him to come back to his policy priorities, including clean energy," Roy said.¶ To even win a second term, Obama must navigate some tough terrain on energy issues, with his moves being scrutinized from all parts of the political spectrum.¶ With Americans paying more than $4 a gallon for gasoline in many places, GOP presidential rivals like Tim Pawlenty and Mitt Romney have hit the major television networks and conservative radio stations to decry Obama's energy policies. Picking at Obama's scabs, Republican operatives are also making light his mixed two-plus-year record on environmental issues.¶ "Why make any more promises when you didn't deliver the first time around?" said Mark McIntosh, counsel at Boyden Gray & Associates and a former White House official in the George W. Bush administration.¶ Obama's left flank remains a concern too.¶ Greens who fought Bush on global warming policy and science for eight years have in recent months been agonizing over whether Obama would really follow through with a veto threat on any piece of legislation that strips EPA of its climate change powers, from stand-alone measures to riders in the catch-all budget.¶ During the Power Shift youth conference on energy issues last month in Washington, organizers dubbed one of their sessions "What to Do When the President's Just Not That Into You."¶ "I just want to see him draw a line in the sand," said Hight, who helped organize the White House meeting that included deputy chief of staff Nancy-Ann DeParle, top energy and climate adviser Heather Zichal, Council on Environmental Quality Associate Director Amy Salzman, Office of Public Engagement Director Jon Carson and his associate director, Kal Penn.¶ "I think we shook them a little bit," Hight said. "It was the first time they were thinking young people aren't a sure thing."¶ During the meeting, Obama didn't make any promises on energy or environmental legislation. But Hight said he urged the activists to "keep pushing me," adding, "It's your job to push the envelope. It's my job to govern."¶ Daniel Weiss, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, said Obama's campaign rhetoric on energy could serve a purpose as Republicans attack him on the issue.¶ "If the president wins a comfortable reelection, one could argue he's won the debate and therefore creates the space for enough Republicans to say ‘we've got to address this, that a deal is conceivable,'" Weiss said, citing Bill Clinton's 1997 budget deal with House Speaker Newt Gingrich after trouncing Bob Dole in the 1996 election.¶ Weiss said it's "very possible" that Obama in a second term could make progress on a clean energy standard and measures to reduce oil consumption.¶ And while he acknowledged it's something of a long shot, Weiss said the idea of legislation forcing "direct reductions on global warming pollution" would even be on the table if it appeased coal-state Democrats with financial aid for carbon capture and sequestration technologies. Obama also would need some Republicans to return to a space on climate issues that the party reluctantly occupied when John McCain became its 2008 presidential nominee with a campaign platform that included cap-and-trade legislation.¶

#### Unchecked global warming causes extinction.

**Tickell 2008** (Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Guardian, “On a Planet 4C Hotter, All We Can Prepare for is Extinction”, 8-11, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

### Ext – Romney Kills Cap and Trade

#### Romney won’t support cap and trade

Lawler’ 11 (8/25/11, Joseph Lawler, formerly managing editor of The American Spectator. “Mitt Romney Clarifies Climate Change Stance”, http://spectator.org/blog/2011/08/25/mitt-romney-clarifies-climate )

Yesterday Mitt Romney clarified that, although he does believe that human activity is contributing to rising global temperatures, he does not support cap and trade or a carbon tax. ¶ "Do I think the world's getting hotter? Yeah, I don't know that but I think that it is," [Romney] said. "I don't know if it's mostly caused by humans."¶ "What I'm not willing to do is spend trillions of dollars on something I don't know the answer to."¶ Previously, Romney had asserted that man-made global warming is real and expressed support for emissions reductions. Those remarks left Romney's stance on measures such as cap and trade a little unclear, until now. ¶ A majority of Republicans don't believe that global warming is caused by humans and, accordingly, oppose schemes like cap and trade. Expressing skepticism of the science behind climate change, as for instance Gov. Rick Perry has, allows candidates to assure voters that they won't support cap and trade or carbon taxes once they're in office. This assurance is necessary because often Republicans who do believe in global warming end up working with Democrats on climate change bills -- John McCain is a good example.

### EPA 2NC

#### Romney will rollback EPA protections --- results in CO2 emissions and air pollution.

Star Ledge’ 12 (June 03, 2012, “Scary times for environment -- especially if Mitt Romney wins”, http://blog.nj.com/njv\_editorial\_page/2012/06/scary\_times\_for\_environment\_--.html)

The grim report on jobs Friday greatly improves the odds that Republicans will win in November, putting Mitt Romney in the White House and bolstering GOP positions in the House and Senate.¶ If that happens, they promise to roll back the progress made under President Obama and Environmental Protection Agency administrator Lisa Jackson.¶ Romney wants to strip the EPA of its power to regulate carbon emissions. Jackson relied on that power to enact rules that will double automobile efficiency standards by 2025 and toughen truck standards, too.¶ Transportation is the largest single source of air pollution. So cutting emissions in half will make a profound change, especially in a car-centric state such as New Jersey. It also will reduce oil imports sharply, lessening our dangerous dependence on unstable regimes in the Mideast.¶ Jackson’s tough limits on coal-fired power plants rely partly on carbon controls, as well. So those gains would be endangered. Again, the air in New Jersey will get dirtier.¶ Because, while our own coal plants have exotic pollution control equipment, those to the west and south do not. Many lack even the most basic filters, known as scrubbers, and rely only on tall smoke stacks to push the toxins higher into the atmosphere.¶ The catch for New Jersey is this: Their toxins float into our air. Roughly one-third of our air pollution is imported, according to the state Department of Environmental Protection.¶ Romney also has promised to pull back on subsidies for green energy, and to preserve the tax breaks and subsidies for profitable oil and gas companies. With all this, it is no wonder the fossil fuel industries are pouring money into his campaign.¶ But that’s not all. Romney has promised a broad campaign to cut regulations on water and land, as well. He suggests that any new regulations would have to be approved by Congress, a frightening prospect if the extremists in the GOP strengthen their grip.¶ President Obama’s record on the environment is mixed. Even during his first two years, before Republicans took control of the House, he was unable to bring coal-state Democrats along to pass climate-change legislation. And in a few key areas, he has restrained Jackson from even using her regulatory powers, based on existing legislation, including the Clean Air Act.¶ Another problem is that most new threats are not covered by the old laws. Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) has tried to strengthen the weak laws on toxic substances, for example, but has so far failed. If Republicans win in November, any chance of passage will be snuffed out.

#### Unchecked global warming causes extinction.

**Tickell 2008** (Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Guardian, “On a Planet 4C Hotter, All We Can Prepare for is Extinction”, 8-11, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

### Ext – Romney Will Rollback EPA Regulations

Romney will push for a rollback.

Mims’ 11 (10/28/2011, Christopher Mims, contributing editor at Technology Review, a columnist at BBC Future and the editor of the Smart News blog at Smithsonian Magazine and the Grist, “Mitt Romney, political windsock, flips to climate change denial” <http://grist.org/list/2011-10-28-mitt-romney-political-windsock-flips-to-climate-change-denial/>)

What's even more frightening than the fact that Romney is a Frankenstein of stolen body parts whose only animating force is ambition? The fact that he intends to use his newfound animus toward reality as an excuse to gut the EPA. “I think the EPA, acting in concert with the president, really doesn’t like oil, gas, coal, and nuclear. I really do believe that the EPA wants to get its hands on all of energy and be able to crush it to cause prices to go through the roof. …The EPA should not be regulating carbon dioxide.”

#### Romney will rollback all of Obama’s environmental regulations

Samuelsohn’ 12 (1/17/12, Darren Samuelsohn, is a senior energy & environment reporter for POLITICO Pro. He graduated from the University of Missouri School of Journalism, “Romney’s Massachusetts record presents a complex green picture”, <http://junkscience.com/2012/01/17/left-tries-undermining-romney-with-past-environmental-record/>)

On the campaign trail, Romney says he’s a climate change skeptic and promises to undo many of President Barack Obama’s environmental regulations. He would pursue a “drill-baby-drill” approach to energy production. But beyond a pledge to amend the Clean Air Act so that it can’t be used to regulate greenhouse gases, Romney has not gone into much detail on policy or legislative specifics.

### EPA Regulations Good – Climate

#### EPA regulations are key to climate reductions and climate leadership.

Parenti’ 10 (4/20/2010, Christian Parenti, Christian Parenti is a contributing editor at The Nation and a Fellow at The Nation Institute. “The Nation: The Case for EPA Action” http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126129216)

On April 1 the Environmental Protection Agency established rules restricting greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks, starting in 2012. This is the first of what could become a sweeping series of regulations stemming from the agency's conclusion that greenhouse gases harm human health. If the EPA were to act robustly, it could achieve significant and immediate greenhouse gas emissions reductions using nothing more than existing laws and current technology. Doing so would signal to a waiting world that America is serious about addressing climate change.¶ But a dangerous assault on the agency is gathering momentum in Congress, corporate boardrooms, the media and the courts. The swarm of counterattacks all seek to strip the EPA of its power to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources like coal-fired power plants. Some legislative proposals would even undo the EPA's finding that greenhouse gases are hazardous, taking the EPA out of the climate fight altogether.¶ Wonkish at first glance, the fight over EPA rulemaking may be the most important environmental battle in a generation. The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says rich countries like the United States must cut emissions 25 to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020—only ten years away—and thereafter make precipitous cuts to almost zero emissions. If we don't act now, average global temperatures will likely increase by more than 2 degrees Celsius and trigger self-compounding runaway climate change, resulting in a massive rise in sea levels, devastated agriculture and attendant social chaos. Not one of the climate change bills up for discussion meets this threshold, and it is looking increasingly unlikely that Congress will be able to pass any comprehensive climate change legislation this session. The failures of Congress and the harrowing facts of climate science mean that aggressive and immediate EPA action is essential.¶ From a legal perspective, the EPA has all the tools it needs to respond adequately to the climate crisis. In fact, "the United States has the strongest environmental laws in the world," says Kassie Siegel, an attorney with the Center for Biological Diversity. The center specializes in suing the government when it violates green laws. "We don't need new legislation. The Clean Air Act can achieve everything we need: a 40 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions over 1990 levels by 2020."¶ The two most important things the EPA can do are to halt any permitting of new coal-fired power plants—about fifty new plants are seeking approval—and to force all existing coal-fired facilities to make the technologically feasible switch to natural gas. If this "fuel switching" happened, total nonvehicle US emissions would be reduced by 13 percent or more in a matter of a year or two, say various experts. Natural gas is generally half as polluting as coal. But in the case of old, inefficient coal-fired plants, switching to gas can reduce emissions by as much as two-thirds.¶ And there is plenty of natural gas: discoveries have glutted the market, and prices are down more than 60 percent from their recent peak. Gas is not a solution; it merely offers a realistic "bridging fuel" as we move toward power generated from wind, solar, geothermal and hydro sources.¶ Perhaps the most far-reaching impact of EPA regulation would be to put a de facto price on carbon by leveling fines on greenhouse gas polluters. Such penalties could reach thousands per day, per violation. If targets for emissions reductions are tough enough, few coal plants will be able to meet them and will instead pay fines—what amounts to a carbon tax. Then a cheap source of energy would become expensive, which would drive investment away from fossil fuels toward carbon-neutral forms of energy.¶ At first, President Obama seemed ready to use executive power to do an end run around a sclerotic Congress, when he authorized the EPA to start regulating greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act. Obama was merely complying with the law: the EPA has been mandated to act since 2007, when the Supreme Court ruled, in Massachusetts v. EPA, that the agency should determine whether greenhouse gases threaten our health. The Bush administration refused to use this authority, but when Obama took office he allowed the EPA to do its job again.¶ This past December the EPA published a science-based "endangerment finding," which found that CO2 and five other greenhouse gases are, in fact, dangerous to human life. Once the EPA issues an endangerment finding, it is legally bound to promulgate regulations to address the problem; the first of these were the vehicle emissions reductions announced on April 1.¶ Now the EPA is following up by drafting regulations for stationary greenhouse gas sources. Called a tailoring rule, it will stipulate when, where and how greenhouse gas pollution must be controlled. At first the agency said it would regulate facilities emitting 25,000 tons or more of greenhouse gases per year. But pressure from fossil fuel industries and Congress has caused the EPA to backpedal to a threshold of 75,000 tons per year, a limit the EPA could raise to 100,000 tons by the time its tailoring rule is finalized.¶ In February, Senator Jay Rockefeller of West Virginia sent a letter urging EPA administrator Lisa Jackson to delay the implementation of greenhouse gas point source review. Signing on with Rockefeller were seven other Democratic senators, all but one from the nation's top coal-producing states. In response, Jackson pushed back any new regulations until 2011—conveniently after this fall's midterm election. Rockefeller wasn't satisfied and has since introduced legislation seeking to suspend EPA action until after 2012.¶ Because the tailoring rule is not yet final, the whole issue of stationary source regulation could get put off indefinitely, or be pre-empted by climate change legislation that strips the EPA of its regulatory powers.¶ The fight over the EPA's role goes back to 1997, when President Clinton signed, but could not get the Senate to ratify, the Kyoto Protocol. Searching for a way around the Senate's blockade, Clinton's EPA administrator, Carol Browner—now director of the White House Office of Energy and Climate Change Policy—took the position that the EPA was already authorized to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the 1970 Clean Air Act. Soon a coalition of green groups, including Greenpeace and the Center for Biological Diversity, petitioned the EPA to start taking action.¶ The specter of muscular regulations from the EPA caused near-panic among major polluters. In late 1999 the American Petroleum Institute, the trade association of the oil and gas industry, called a meeting of major industrial corporations; twenty-eight executives attended, representing the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, as well as the aluminum, airline, chemical, electrical power, aerospace, cement, fertilizer, coal and oil industries. The leaked minutes of that meeting revealed a plan to spin the issue of EPA regulation in the media, to fight it in the courts and push legislation that would strip the EPA of regulatory power. The executives also agreed to pressure the EPA directly to reject the petition filed by the green groups.¶ The plan worked; Browner backed off. Then the Bush administration stacked the EPA's ranks with fossil fuel-loving loyalists. When climate change regulation again became an issue in 2009, the industry's counterattack was already in place. Thus, both the House climate bill (Waxman-Markey, which passed in June 2009) and the Senate bill (Kerry-Lieberman-Graham, still under consideration) contain language restricting the EPA's power to control greenhouse gas pollution from stationary sources.¶ Now even more toxic legislation is gathering support. Republican Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska—aided by corporate lobbyists like Jeffrey Holmstead, formerly with the Bush EPA and now head of environmental strategies for the lobbying firm Bracewell & Giuliani, and Roger Martella Jr., a partner at Sidley Austin—has written a resolution that would overturn the EPA's original greenhouse gas endangerment finding.¶ Alaska is a big oil, gas and coal producer, and Murkowski is one of the top recipients of petroleum industry campaign donations. So far this year she has received $188,000; only two senators, Democrat Blanche Lincoln and Republican David Vitter, have received more oil and gas money than Murkowski.¶ Murkowski's resolution was introduced January 21 under the little-used Congressional Review Act, which means it needs only fifty-one votes to pass and cannot be blocked from a vote by Senate majority leader Harry Reid. Although it is called a "resolution of disapproval," it would have the force of law. So far forty other senators are on board, including three Democrats—Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Blanche Lincoln of Arkansas and Ben Nelson of Nebraska.¶ In the House, Joe Barton, a Republican from Texas, has written a companion resolution of disapproval. Not surprisingly, Barton is tight with polluters; over the past two decades he has received more than $2.7 million in direct campaign contributions from electrical utilities and the petroleum industry.¶ Obama would, by all accounts, veto the Murkowski or Barton bill. But their point is not so much to gut the EPA in Congress as it is to intimidate, delay, confuse and blunt into irrelevance any EPA action. Other pushbacks are taking the form of lawsuits and petitions from the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and fossil fuel lobbies. Fifteen states have filed suits seeking to block the EPA's endangerment ruling, and at least seventeen state legislatures have seen bills introduced to strip EPA powers. None of these efforts are likely to achieve their stated goals, but they are all part of a right-wing and corporate strategy to send a message to Obama and the Senate, where real EPA-stripping could happen if Kerry-Lieberman-Graham passes.¶ Behind much of this state-level pressure is money from Charles and David Koch, petroleum magnates who are increasingly notorious for funding far-right ventures such as FreedomWorks, a tea party organizer, and think tanks that traffic in climate-change denial. One of their organizations, Americans for Prosperity, is running a Regulation Reality Tour, which is trying to whip up outrage about the "EPA's power grab." Part of this Astroturf campaign involves political theater: fake "carbon cops" in little green Smart cars with flashing lights pull out badges and issue citations for carbon "crimes" like mowing a lawn.¶ But green groups are organized to fight back and are having some success, as witnessed by the EPA's recently issued regulations under the Clean Water Act, which will sharply curtail mountaintop removal [see Eshelman, page 17]. Unfortunately, many big environmental groups in Washington have not made defending the EPA a priority. Most endorsed Waxman-Markey, and in late March twenty of the biggest groups came out in support of the still-unpublished Kerry-Lieberman-Graham bill. Those groups included the Alliance for Climate Protection, Environment America, the League of Conservation Voters, Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Blue Green Alliance, Natural Resources Defense Council, Center for American Progress Action Fund and Union of Concerned Scientists. The Sierra Club has switched to defending the EPA and opposing any climate change bill that strips the agency of its power; other environmental groups may soon follow.¶ So where is the Obama administration? The president says he prefers climate legislation to EPA regulation. That is an unnecessary concession; Obama does not need to wait for Congress. In this situation, American politics is not hostage to an obstructionist right-wing fringe or the lack of a sixty-vote supermajority. Existing laws allow—even require—broad and robust action.¶ Throughout American history the executive branch has steadily been accruing power. Before the 1930s presidents rarely proposed legislation. Even LBJ worried that his phone calls to lobby senators could violate the "separation of powers doctrine." Nixon created the EPA in 1970 precisely to concentrate more power in the hands of the executive. He gathered up all the existing environmental programs, gave them no extra money and put them in one agency, which answered to a director appointed by the president. The Bush administration practically searched the vest pockets of bureaucrats to find ways (often illegal) to enhance presidential prerogatives.¶ And the current president?¶ "Obama, like Bush before him, is happy to assert unlimited executive authority when it comes to the war on terror, detention without trial, warrantless wiretapping," says Brendan Cummings, senior counsel at the Center for Biological Diversity. "But when it comes to addressing global warming, he refuses to use his clear and lawful executive power to reduce greenhouse pollution to protect people and the planet."¶ "Heading into an election, I think, the administration is very leery of offending powerful corporate interests," says Tyson Slocum of Public Citizen. "That is especially true when those corporate interests make campaign expenditures in swing states."¶ Other greens agree. "At stake in the fight over the EPA's ability to address global warming pollution is not only the president's environmental record but really the core promise of his presidency, to change the way Washington works," says Kert Davies, director of research at Greenpeace USA. "The year behind us on energy and climate policy shows what you get when the Obama administration's seeming compulsion for compromise meets the entrenched power of the coal, oil and nuclear industries."¶ Tragically, climate change is not an issue where compromise will work. Bad healthcare bills can be improved; but on the climate front, time has run out. Atmospheric CO2 concentrations are at 390 parts per million and need to go back to 350 ppm. Already, oyster farms in the Pacific Northwest are in decline because of ocean acidification caused by climate change. Last year many Midwestern crops were too rain-soaked to harvest. Drought, likely linked to climate change, is battering much of Latin America, Africa and Asia. Everywhere signs of nature's unraveling are evident.¶ Allowing Congress to strip the EPA of its review powers or letting the administration dither away its responsibility to act boldly would be a disaster. The EPA is our last, best hope.

### EPA Regulations Good – Economy

#### EPA regulations generate billions of dollars in economic growth.

Boak’ 11 (Josh Boak, Josh Boak is an economics reporter for POLITICO. Josh was previously a reporter on the staffs of the Chicago Tribune and the Toledo Blade. Educated at Princeton and Columbia, 9/21/1, “Report: Some regs could spur growth”, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0911/63957.html)

Laurie Johnson, chief economist at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said improved rules for ozone pollution might have actually spurred industrial demand across the economy.¶ If better standards were in place, she estimates that businesses sitting on $2 trillion in cash reserves would have bought and installed new equipment, possibly generating tens of thousands of jobs. On her blog, Johnson criticized Obama for choosing to delay the rules.¶ “The most unfortunate aspect of this bad decision,” Johnson wrote, “is that the president has given an official blessing to the polluters’ worst propaganda and perpetuated the decades-old myth that public health and environmental protection must be traded off against jobs.”¶ And pushing back the date when new rules get implemented won’t remove the air of uncertainty that companies say has stopped them from investing.¶ “If you’re continually delaying and delaying them, it’s just not helpful,” Johnson told POLITICO. “At some point, it will happen.”¶ A 2010 EPA analysis said the tighter standards should cost $19 billion to $25 billion, while generating economic benefits of up to $37 billion.¶ The difficulty is that analyses are open to interpretation in a way that first-person testimonies are not, since the outcomes depend on what gets plugged into complex equations.¶ Susan Dudley, a top regulatory official in George W. Bush’s White House, said the benefits in the EPA report were overstated because it overcalculated the financial value of the number of lives that would be saved.¶ But there are benefits to regulation that cannot be inserted into questions of costs and benefits. A new report by Public Citizen documents five major instances in which the introduction of government regulations led to breakthrough innovations.¶ “In some ways, what happens is regulation sort of rallies business’ motivation,” said Taylor Lincoln, a research director for the consumer advocate group. “Industry has an incentive to come up with a better mousetrap.”¶ For example, increased energy efficiency for refrigerators, washing machines, air conditioners and other appliances will save consumers more than $13 billion a year through 2030.

#### Recent research proves that EPA regulations will not hurt the economy.

Boak’ 11 (Josh Boak, Josh Boak is an economics reporter for POLITICO. Josh was previously a reporter on the staffs of the Chicago Tribune and the Toledo Blade. Educated at Princeton and Columbia, 9/21/1, “Report: Some regs could spur growth”, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0911/63957.html)

Challenging a flood of firsthand business testimonials about the burden of federal red tape, new research by environmental and consumer groups suggests some regulations might even lay the groundwork for a lasting economic recovery.¶ Republican congressional leaders, seeking to roll back 10 upcoming rules, have been bringing entrepreneurs to Capitol Hill to make personal cases for less federal regulation.¶ But in a new report, the liberal-leaning Economic Policy Institute has found the compliance costs for all of the administration’s new Environmental Protection Agency regulations represent just 0.1 percent of the economy — a burden for some but not the job-killing death blow that many Republicans complain about.¶ “These regulations are a minor component of the entire economy and are something that the economy can absorb,” said Isaac Shapiro, director of EPI’s regulatory policy research.

### Ethanol Subsidies 2NC

#### Romney supports ethanol subsidies.

Wall Street Journal, 3/27/**2011** (Romney Hearts Ethanol Subsidies, p. <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2011/05/27/romney-hearts-ethanol-subsidies/>)

It was an odd setting for a policy pronouncement, but on the sidewalk outside the Historical Building here, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney embraced ethanol subsidies. It came just days after and blocks from where his rival for the Republican presidential nomination, Tim Pawlenty, said the subsidies should be phased out. “I support the subsidy of ethanol,” he told an Iowa voter. “I believe ethanol is an important part of our energy solution for this country.” Iowa leads the nation in the production of corn, a main source of ethanol.

### NASA 2NC

#### Obama election is critical to exploration of Mars. Romney will cripple NASA and the Mars mission.

**Miami Herald**, 4/3/**2012** (Obama camp, Dems Swipe at Mitt Romney Over Space Policy, p. http://miamiherald.typepad.com/nakedpolitics/2012/04/obama-camp-dems-swipe-at-mitt-romney-over-space-policy.html)

From a transcript of a call with Obama supporter and Cocoa Mayor Michael Blake said: “Florida is a unique state. It is a place that turns curiosity into discovery..... the President continues to support space exploration by requesting higher funding for NASA and supporting the development of a new vehicle for human space flight. We don’t just defend programs like NASA because of our commitment to exploration in Florida, but because of how important the space industry is to Florida’s economy. “Sadly, Mitt Romney and the GOP value pandering to Florida voters more than defending an institution that not only has helped define us as a nation, but pushes our curiosity as children and grows our understanding as adults. Mitt Romney and the GOP hope to make enough noise to distract Floridians from their plans to slash funding for programs that matter to voters – programs like Social Security and Medicare, and our nation’s space program. Romney has proposed cutting taxes by $5 trillion, balancing the budget, and increasing defense spending. Meeting all these promise would require huge cuts outside defense. If these cuts were made to all programs equally, it would mean over $4.5 billion in cuts for in America's space program. If that wasn’t bad enough, Romney has repeatedly stressed he’d make **no promises about funding** for the **space** program or the future direction of NASA. When it comes to NASA and space exploration, it is clear that Mitt Romney is completely wrong on the issue and out of touch with the Space Coast. “As the Mayor of Cocoa, I see firsthand how important investments in human space flight affect our economy in the Space Coast, but more importantly as a teacher, I work with students inspired by the space exploration to reach for the stars. Thanks to President Obama’s leadership, we have seen the United States of America embark on an ambitious new direction for NASA, laying the groundwork for a sustainable program of exploration and innovation. And it’s important to remember the history: The Bush Administration in 2004 made the decision to end the Space Shuttle program while President Obama extended the program's life by adding two Space Shuttle launches to the manifest. An independent commission found that the previous Administration's plan for human spaceflight in the post-Shuttle era was not viable under any feasible budget scenario. President Obama has tasked NASA with an ambitious vision for human spaceflight that will take American astronauts beyond where we've ever been before - **with the ultimate goal being a human mission to Mars**. “This new direction extends the life of the International Space Station, supports the growing commercial space industry, and addresses important scientific challenges while continuing our commitment to robust human space exploration, science, and aeronautics programs. For generations, the space program has fueled jobs and entire industries. The space program has improved our lives, advanced our society, strengthened our economy, and inspired generations of Americans. This is exactly why it is so essential that we pursue a new course and that we revitalize NASA and its mission—not just with dollars, but also with clear aims and a larger purpose. Unlike the Republicans, who continue fighting for polices that would cripple NASA, President Obama has also requested increased and stable funding—more than the Congress has appropriated.

NASA 2NC

#### Mars colonization is the only way to prevent inevitable extinction

**The Objective Observer**, July **2003** (The Case for Colonizing Mars, p. http://www.theobjectiveobserver.com/index.php?option=com\_lyftenbloggie&view=entry&id=8&Itemid=93)

One simple fact screams out for human beings to colonize Mars with all due haste. That fact makes it crystal clear that the Earth has a deplorable track record when it comes to its ability to support life. Consider that 99.9% of all species that have ever existed on planet Earth are extinct. Now, when you look at that fact, please also consider that this does not mean that .1% of species have survived since the dawn of time. The .1% figure simply represents species that have yet to go extinct. In other words, we happen to have some species alive and thriving on the Earth today. Those species by and large evolved relatively recently. Thus, the .1% figure is not really a survival rate but rather a percentage of all species that have ever existed on the Earth that currently happen to be alive. Another way of viewing this is in terms of survival rate as a function of time instead of as a function of species. If we were to look at all species that have existed during the last 10 years, the survival rate would be close to or at 100%. In other words, of all the species that have existed on planet Earth for the last 10 years, no extinctions have occurred. If we were to look at species that have existed for the last 1,000 years that 100% figure would drop slightly due to extinctions such as the dodo and the passenger pigeon. Looking at the survival rate for species that have existed for the last 10,000 years, that 100% figure would be even less and as we go further and further back in time, the survival rate would approach or become zero. Therefore, we can state as a certainty that the longer a species exists on the Earth, the more likely it becomes that species will go extinct and this continues until that species’ extinction is a certainty. What causes these extinctions? Irrelevant. I am not here to debate the cause of animal extinctions. There are many theories regarding why extinctions occur. The most popular today being that asteroids and/or comets randomly strike the Earth every millennia or so and serve as a first strike that initiates extinction. Asteroids and comets are currently blamed for many of Earth’s mass extinctions throughout its history. However, regardless of whether extinctions occur by asteroid, by comet or by some other as yet unknown device, the fact that 99.9% of species that have ever existed on the Earth are extinct remains the same. Consider also that human beings are on the top of the food chain, quite similar to dinosaurs in their day. Why is this relevant? Well, for one simple fact. Land extinctions tend to kill off the large, dominate animals at the top of the food chain while some of the smaller animals near the bottom of the food chain survive. Oddly enough, mass extinctions seem to happen in reverse in the ocean, the smaller animals at the bottom of food chain become extinct and the ones at the top of food chain tend to survive. This may actually explain why intelligence evolved first on land instead of in the oceans, but that is the subject of a different essay. Of course, one might argue that there has never been a species of animal on the Earth that was so intelligent, so diverse and so well adapted to its environment as homo sapiens. Thus, the argument is that if there is going to be a species that survives a mass extinction, homo sapiens have the best chance. However, this argument is rather full of logical errors in reasoning. First, in terms of diversity and adaptation, homo sapiens rather pale in comparison to other successful organisms such as all of the species of dinosaurs. Second, there is absolutely no evidence that intelligence has anything to do with surviving a mass extinction. Thus, we have a few simple scientific facts that human beings have been well aware of for several decades that make it perfectly clear to any reasonable mind that human beings WILL become extinct if they remain solely on planet Earth. And yet, human beings by and large are doing very little to colonize Mars. And by very little, I do not mean to denigrate those individuals that have written on this subject or those at NASA and other agencies around the world that are working right now on all of the problems associated with colonizing Mars. However, what I am proposing is to make the colonization of Mars a priority of the United States and world governments second only to national defense. I am sure that this last argument is sure to spark protests and outrage from many different sectors. I can hear the arguments now. “We have enough problems to solve here on Earth first before we start trying to colonize other planets.” “Why not put resources into deflecting or destroying asteroids and comets instead of colonizing Mars?” “We do not have the technology to colonize Mars.” “Why not colonize the oceans?” Why not colonize the Moon?” “We have no evidence that colonizing Mars will avoid human extinction.” I will address each of the arguments in turn. “We have enough problems to solve here on Earth first before we start trying to colonize other planets.” This statement is very true, human society is fraught with all kinds of problems. However, all other problems pale in comparison to the extinction of the species. The reason is simple. If homo sapiens as a species becomes extinct, all other problems are irrelevant. “Why not put resources into deflecting or destroying asteroids and comets instead of colonizing Mars?” This one is quite simple. First, one should know that we probably only know of about 5% of the asteroids and/or comets that pose a severe threat to the Earth. If one of those asteroids within that 5% was going to hit the Earth, we would have some warning; maybe enough to come up with and successfully execute a plan to deflect it. However, for the other 95%, we would have little or no warning. Second, we do not know for a certainty that asteroids or comets cause mass extinctions. We have some pretty good evidence that points to this, but nothing certain. Mass extinctions might be caused by viruses or some as yet unknown device. The only certainty in preserving the human species is to expand beyond the bounds of planet Earth. “We do not have the technology to colonize Mars”. Yes we do. We are 100 or perhaps a 1,000 times more prepared today to tackle the problem of Mars colonization than we were to tackle the problem of landing on the moon. Our society is perhaps the best prepared it has ever been throughout its entire history to tackle such an exploration and colonization. Quite simply, we have the technology today to begin terraforming and permanently colonizing Mars. In addition, it has already been proven that when nations make certain well-defined goals and objectives top priority, the problem is solved with surprising rapidity. This can be seen with the development of the atomic bomb as well as the Apollo program to land on the moon. “Why not colonize the oceans?” This argument stems from the fact that ocean extinctions tend to occur in reverse of land extinctions. That is, the big, dominant animals at the top of the food chain tend to survive ocean mass extinctions. First, human beings are not native to the oceans and therefore, the normal “rules” would not apply. Second, big, dominant animals do go extinct in the oceans. Third, 99.9% of all species that have ever inhabited the earth, on land and on water have gone extinct. Expanding to an ocean environment does not change that fact. “Why not colonize the Moon?” Indeed, this seems reasonable. It gets our species off of planet Earth and the Moon is a lot closer than Mars. However, the Moon lacks the ability to support a self-sustaining human colony. A Moon colony would be much too dependent on Earth for its very existence. This does not mean that we should not pursue a permanent Moon colony. Indeed, a permanent Moon colony may be a crucial step in colonizing Mars. However, a Moon colony cannot serve as a replacement for Mars colonization. “We have no evidence that colonizing Mars will avoid human extinction.” This is absolutely true. However, we know for a fact that it is a certainty that if we remain solely on planet Earth we will go extinct. We also know that creating a self-sustaining colony on another planet is the best and perhaps only way to avoid extinction. And Mars is the most likely candidate within our solar system for colonization.

### Obamacare 2NC

#### Obama reelection guarantees survival of ACA

**Feldmann**, **6/28** (Linda Feldmann, staff writer for the Christian Science Monitor, 28 June 2012, “Mitt Romney: To get rid of 'Obamacare,' get rid of Obama,” Christian Science Monitor, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1022511627)

"Whatever the politics, today's decision was a victory for people all over this country whose lives will be more secure because of this law and the Supreme Court's decision to uphold it," Obama said. The president then focused on the aspects of the law that are already popular, such as the guarantees of coverage despite someone's pre-existing health conditions and the ability of young adults up to age 26 to be included on their parents' insurance plan. He also acknowledged the controversy around the unpopular individual mandate, which he had not supported four years ago as a presidential candidate but ultimately included in the law as a way to bring the insurance industry on board. "Well, it should be pretty clear by now that I didn't do this because it was good politics," he said. "I did it because I believed it was good for the country." Now, with the blessing of the Supreme Court, he gets to test the theory of his plan, which goes into full implementation in January 2014. The court's decision raises the stakes for the November election. If Obama is reelected, the Affordable Care Act is virtually certain to remain in law. If he loses, the law could be in peril. But Obama and his allies have been counting on growing public appreciation for the law as time goes on, and as its provisions go into effect.

### Ext – Obama Key to Obamacare

#### Obama must be reelected for Obamacare survival

**Anderson**, **2012** (Jeffrey H. Anderson, staff writer for The Weekly Standard, July 6, 2012, “Obama: 'I Passed' Obamacare,” The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/obama-i-passed-obamacare\_648172.html)

In the wake of the Supreme Court's Obamacare ruling, President Obama seems to have forgotten exactly how our law-making process works. Yahoo! News reports that, at a rally in Ohio on Thursday, the former part-time constitutional law lecturer and current president declared that "the law I passed is here to stay." While it's true that not a single Republican in the House or Senate voted for Obamacare, a great many Democrats did. Many of them have since been returned to private life by the voters, and if the same fate awaits Obama, his signature legislation will not be "here to stay."

#### Obama reelection key to Obamacare says Daschle

**Anderson**, **2012** (Jeffrey H. Anderson, staff writer for The Weekly Standard, July 9, 2012, “Daschle: Obama ‘Must Be Reelected’ for Obamacare ‘to Survive’”, The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/daschle-obama-must-be-reelected-obamacare-survive\_648294.html)

Apparently thinking that, in our republic, the president unilaterally passes laws and the Supreme Court unilaterally decides whether or not we’ll keep them, President Obama has been telling the American people that “the law I passed [Obamacare] is here to stay.” But former Senate majority leader Tom Daschle — Obama's first choice as secretary of Health and Human Services — says that for Obamacare “to survive,” Obama “must be reelected.”

#### Obama believes Obamacare is here to stay

**The Pioneer**, **2012** (The Pioneer, July 11, 2012, “Can Obamacare help Obama?,” The Pioneer (New Dehli), p. Proquest)

Both the contenders are using the healthcare issue for their own reasons. "The law I passed is here to stay", Mr Obama announced triumphantly at a campaign event in Ohio last week. His campaign has been reporting larger crowds following the court's green light for the healthcare revamp under which insurance companies can no longer deny coverage on grounds of pre-existing conditions. Mr Romney, however, remains committed to repealing the measure. "What the court did not do on its last day in session, I will do on my first day if elected President of the United States. And that is I will act to repeal Obamacare," he said immediately after the verdict. His compulsions stem from the fact that 'Obamacare' is modelled on 'Romneycare' - the healthcare law that he had pushed years ago as Governor of Massachusetts. Mr Obama is not one to stop touting the healthcare success even as Mr Romney makes sure that the spotlight is turned on the President's "mismanagement of the economy". "It should be pretty clear by now that I didn't do this because it was good politics. I did it because I believed it was good for the country", said Mr Obama after the verdict, asserting: "No illness or accident should lead to any family's financial ruin." At his campaign outings, he tells the Republicans that it's time to move on, noting: "We fought so hard to make that happen and now the Supreme Court has ruled it's time for us to move forward. We don't have to re-litigate the last two years. I don't want us to keep having political arguments that are based on politics and not on facts."

Ext – Obama Key to Obamacare

#### Obama won’t roll back health care reform

**Aigner-Treworgy**, **2012** (Adam Aigner-Treworgy, CNN White House Producer, 7/17/12, “Obama defends health care reform in Austin,” CNN Poltics: Political Ticker, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/tag/cnn-white-house-producer-adam-aigner-treworgy/)

Austin, Texas (CNN) - During his third fundraiser of the day Tuesday evening, President Barack Obama defended his top domestic policy achievement and pushed back against one of the most popular attack lines coming from his Republican opponents. "We are not rolling back health care reform," Obama said. "The Supreme Court has spoken. We are moving forward." While the recent court decision ruling that the Affordable Care Act is constitutional was largely seen as a win for Democrats, it also delivered Republicans a brand new talking point. The Supreme Court had labeled the penalty on those choosing not to purchase health insurance as a tax, countering what the Obama administration had been arguing since the law was passed. "If you've got health care, the only thing that now happens to you – you're not paying a tax – the only think that's happening to you is that you have more security because insurance companies can't jerk you around," Obama said, directly addressing Republicans who have already begun to use language from the Supreme Court's decision to attack him. Under his law, young people can stay on their parents' insurance longer, seniors will pay less for prescription drugs and everyone will be given free preventive care, the president told the crowd of more than a thousand people crowded into the Austin Music Hall. "If you don't have health care than we're going to help you get it," he continued. "And the only people who may have a problem with this law are folks who can afford health care but aren't buying it, waiting until they get sick and then going to the emergency room and expecting everybody else to pick up the tab. That's not responsibility. That's not consistent with who we are."

### Ext – Romney Kills Obamacare

#### Romney will repeal Obamacare

**Anderson**, **2012** (Jeffrey H. Anderson, staff writer for The Weekly Standard, July 9, 2012, “Daschle: Obama ‘Must Be Reelected’ for Obamacare ‘to Survive’”, The Weekly Standard, http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/daschle-obama-must-be-reelected-obamacare-survive\_648294.html)

Daschle writes: “The final hurdle may be the biggest — the political aspect....Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney has pledged to repeal the law on his first day as president. If elected, while he cannot do this single-handedly, he can virtually stop its implementation with executive orders.” Daschle continues: “In addition, should the Republicans win control of the House and Senate, it is likely that a legislative repeal effort would be successful. Given that the law was passed using reconciliation rules in the Senate, only 51 votes would be needed for repeal.” Romney has promised that, under his administration, Congress would use the reconciliation process to repeal Obamacare.

#### Romney vows to kill Obamacare after Supreme Court ruling

**Mathes and Biddle**, **2012** (Michael Mathes and Jo Biddle, staff writers for the Edmonton Journal, 29 June 2012, “Republicans fight on as 'Obamacare' upheld,” Edmonton Journal [Edmonton, Alta]: A.19, p. Proquest)

White House hopeful Mitt Romney led a reinvigorated Republican charge against health-care reforms Thursday, with a snap vote called to repeal the law after it was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. "What the court did not do on the last day in session, I will do on my first day if elected president of the United States, and that is that I will act to repeal 'Obamacare,' " Romney vowed. The nation's top court upheld U.S. President Barack Obama's health-care reforms to insure another 32 million Americans in a major victory as the Democratic leader seeks re-election in November in what is shaping up to be a tight race. Despite the court's ruling, Romney said the justices "did not - say that Obamacare is good law or that it is good policy. "Obamacare was bad law yesterday. It is bad law today," he said, arguing the Affordable Care Act would raise taxes, cause the national deficit to balloon and make up to 20 million Americans lose their existing insurance. Some 75 per cent of businesses surveyed had also said that the requirement to provide health insurance would force them to scale back hiring, he said. Republican leaders on Thursday set a July 11 vote in the House of Representatives to repeal the law, but it will likely be dead on arrival in the Democrat controlled Senate. " Republicans won't let up whatsoever in our determination to repeal this terrible law and replace it with the kind of reforms that will truly address the problems it was meant to solve," said Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell.

#### Romney committed to killing Obamacare

**The Pioneer**, **2012** (The Pioneer, July 11, 2012, “Can Obamacare help Obama?,” The Pioneer (New Dehli), p. Proquest)

Both the contenders are using the healthcare issue for their own reasons. "The law I passed is here to stay", Mr Obama announced triumphantly at a campaign event in Ohio last week. His campaign has been reporting larger crowds following the court's green light for the healthcare revamp under which insurance companies can no longer deny coverage on grounds of pre-existing conditions. Mr Romney, however, remains committed to repealing the measure. "What the court did not do on its last day in session, I will do on my first day if elected President of the United States. And that is I will act to repeal Obamacare," he said immediately after the verdict. His compulsions stem from the fact that 'Obamacare' is modelled on 'Romneycare' - the healthcare law that he had pushed years ago as Governor of Massachusetts.

Ext – Romney Kills Obamacare

#### Romney plans to repeal Obamacare by replacing Obama

**Feldmann**, **2012** (Linda Feldmann, staff writer for the Christian Science Monitor, 28 June 2012, “Mitt Romney: To get rid of 'Obamacare,' get rid of Obama,” Christian Science Monitor, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1022511627)

Immediately, the issue is thrust into the center of the presidential campaign, as well as House and Senate races. Republicans, including presidential candidate Mitt Romney, insist the law must be repealed and replaced. But for any legislation to defund or overturn the law to be enacted, the GOP must take control of both houses of Congress and retake the White House. "This is a time of choice for the American people," Mr. Romney said after the court ruling. "Our mission is clear. If we want to get rid of 'Obamacare,' we're going to have to replace President Obama." Romney called the health-care law a "job-killer" that raises taxes, cuts Medicare, and adds trillions to the national debt and deficits. He also maintained that as many as 20 million Americans will lose their current insurance. "And perhaps most troubling of all, 'Obamacare' puts the federal government between you and your doctor," Romney said. In addition, the Supreme Court majority's surprise finding that the penalty for not buying insurance is a "tax" - which allowed the court to work around the Commerce Clause of the Constitution - fuels the old arguments about "tax and spend Democrats." These are the talking points that Republicans will use heading into the fall elections. But for the GOP, having Romney as the effective head of the party is awkward, given his leadership as governor of Massachusetts in instituting a health reform that served as the model for Obama's plan. Romney has maintained that health care should be handled at the state level, and that what works for Massachusetts isn't necessarily right for the nation. Still, on this issue, he's not the party's cleanest messenger.

#### Romney election ends Obamacare

**Rasmussen**, **2012** (Scott Rasmussen, founder and president of Rasmussen Reports, 29 June 2012, “ObamaCare will not survive,” Tribune, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1022671291)

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision that President Obama's health care law is constitutional keeps it alive for now. But it's important to remember that the law has already lost in the court of public opinion. The Supreme Court ruling is a temporary reprieve more than anything else. In March, I wrote that the health care law was doomed even if it survived the court. Looking at the data today, it's hard to draw any other conclusion. Fifty-four percent of voters nationwide still want to see the law repealed. That's going to be a heavy burden for the Obama campaign to bear. It's hard to believe that public opinion will change between now and Election Day because opinion on the law hasn't budged in two years. In fact, support for repeal now is exactly the same as it was when the law first passed. Consistently, for the past two years, most voters have expressed the view that the law will hurt the quality of care, increase the cost of care and increase the federal deficit. As a result, the fact that the law remains in place may end up hurting the president's chances for re-election more than helping them. It gives Mitt Romney another easy target and one that can be tied directly into concerns about the economy. If Romney wins, there is virtually no chance the existing health care law will survive.

### Obamacare Good – Economy

#### Health care reform is key to the economy --- generates spending, jobs and resolves the fiscal crisis.

**Gruber**, 12/4/**2008** (Jonathan – Professor of Economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Medicine for the Job Market, New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/04/opinion/04gruber.html?_r=1&ref=opinion>)

Given the present need to address the economic crisis, many people say the government cannot afford a big investment in health care, that these plans are going nowhere fast. But this represents a false choice, because health care reform is good for our economy. As the country slips into what is possibly the worst downturn since the Depression, nearly all experts agree that Washington should stimulate demand with new spending. And one of the most effective ways to spend would be to give states money to enroll more people in Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Plan. This would free up state money for rebuilding roads and bridges and other public works projects — spending that could create jobs. Health care reform can be an engine of job growth in other ways, too. Most proposals call for investments in health information technology, including the computerization of patient medical records. During the campaign, for example, Mr. Obama proposed spending $50 billion on such technology. The hope is that computerized recordkeeping, and the improved sharing of information among doctors that it would enable, would improve the quality of patient care and perhaps also lower medical costs. More immediately, it would create jobs in the technology sector. After all, somebody would need to develop the computer systems and operate them for thousands of American health care providers. Expanded insurance coverage would also drive demand for high-paying, rewarding jobs in health services. Most reform proposals emphasize primary care, much of which can be provided by nurse practitioners, registered nurses and physician’s assistants. These jobs could provide a landing spot for workers who have lost jobs in other sectors of the economy. Fundamental health care reform would also stimulate more consumer spending, as previously uninsured families would no longer need to save every extra penny to cover a medical emergency. When the federal government expanded Medicaid in the 1990s, my own research has shown, the newly insured significantly increased their spending on consumer goods. Universal health insurance coverage would also address economic problems that existed before this downturn began — and that are likely to linger after growth resumes. In our current system, people who leave or lose their jobs often must go without insurance for months or years, and this discourages people from moving to positions where they could be more productive. Most reform proposals call for the creation of pools of insurance coverage that would guarantee access to high-quality, affordable care for people who are self-employed or out of work, increasing their mobility. If this coverage focuses on disease prevention and wellness, it could also improve the health, and thereby the productivity, of the workforce. In the long term, the greatest fiscal threat facing this nation is the growth in the costs of health care. These costs have more than tripled as a share of our economy since 1950, and show no signs of abating. The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that the share of the economy devoted to health care will double by 2050.

#### Repealing healthcare hurts the economy --- jacks small business

**Cutler**, 7/23/**2010** (David M. – Professor of Economics at Harvard University, What Will Happen to Small Business if Health Care is Repealed, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/07/sm all\_biz \_reform.html)

The conservative effort to repeal the new health care law will hit small businesses hard and severely affect their ability to be the “engines of the economy.” Firms with fewer than 500 employees accounted for 64 percent, or 14.5 million, of the 22.5 million net new jobs created between 1993 and the third quarter of 2008. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, combined with the jobs bill, will help reduce the current cost burdens on small firms and their workers. These proposed reforms will encourage entrepreneurial activity by increasing the incentives for talented Americans to launch or expand their own companies, and they will increase the pool of workers willing to work at small firms. And small businesses will benefit in particular from reductions in absenteeism and improvements in worker productivity resulting from better health outcomes due to expanded access to health insurance coverage. It’s critical to drive these reforms forward at a time when unemployment is high and the economy is still faltering. We can’t afford to step back. This push for repeal highlights opponents’ willingness to put politics ahead of supporting small business and ensuring the health of Americans who are small business employees.

### Obamacare Good – Disease

#### Reform solves disease pandemics.

**Kennedy 2009** (Rep. Patrick, U.S. House Representative – Rhode Island, “True Pandemic Preparedness: Health Care Reform Now”, Huffington Post, 5-12, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rep-patrick-kennedy/true-pandemic-preparednes_b_202559.html>)

The recent outbreak of the swine flu serves as a stark reminder about the need for comprehensive health care reform in this country. Every citizen in this country should have access to affordable, high quality health care. Given the recent economic downturn, the group of nearly 46 million Americans without health insurance has grown by perhaps as many as 4 million. This population, and the larger group with under-insurance in our country, are highly susceptible to any pandemic outbreak. They are less likely to receive early preventative care, early diagnosis, early treatment, and due to financial fears, are less likely to take sick time from work. Not only is such a large group of Americans without the resources to combat a threat such as a pandemic flu for their own health safety, but having such a large group of people without access to proper care dramatically increases the risk of transmission to the rest of the population. The realities of biology will not let us separate into "us" versus "them" categories.

#### Disease spread causes extinction.

Scotsman 1995 (9-11, “The Mega Death”, p. 13, Lexis)

Bullets and bombs may be the weapons of the present, but plagues, viruses and killer microbes are the arsenal of the future. Together with the sarin gas which it released on the Tokyo underground in April, the Japanese Ohm cult had stockpiled a lethal bacterium which it chose not to unleash. Crippling continents by using killer infectious diseases is no far- fetched idea of sci-fi novels. But the scientists’ inability to distinguish between naturally emerging and synthetic disease outbreaks means whole areas could be laid waste before anyone realised what was happening, warns Laurie Garrett, author of a ground-breaking book on the burgeoning of infectious disease. All this on top of the fact that new diseases are emerging naturally at an alarming rate - representing a real threat to the survival of the human species - says The Coming Plague. Meticulously researched over the past decade, Garrett’s book charts the history of our age-old battle against the microbes, and concludes that we are beginning to cede the advantage to the disease-carriers. The optimism born out of defeating smallpox in the Sixties was dangerously premature. Everything from overuse of antibiotics to increased promiscuity have helped smooth the path for the microbes ever since. “The survival of the human species is not a pre- ordained evolutionary programme,” warns Nobel Laureate Joshua Lederberg in The Coming Plague. When Garrett’s book was released in the United States, it caused such widespread alarm that Vice President Al Gore set up a special task force to review American preparedness to tackle newly-emerging epidemics. In July, the evaluation concluded that the microbial threat was not just a domestic problem, but a national security question. It is no longer just governments which had the capability to engage in biological warfare.

## Obama Good (Foreign Policy)

### China Bashing 2NC

#### Romney’s China policy will collapse relations.

**Sanger**, 5/12/**2012** (David – chief Washington correspondent for the New York Times, Is There a Romney Doctrine?, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/13/sunday-review/is-there-a-romney-doctrine.html?pagewanted=all)

More complicated for Mr. Romney, given his business credentials, is his position on China. He argues for more arms to Taiwan and much tougher use of trade sanctions to respond to China’s currency and market manipulations. In the past, such actions have frozen Chinese cooperation with the United States, but, the white paper insists, “Romney will work to persuade China to commit to North Korea’s disarmament,” as if the last three presidents have not.

### Ext – Romney Leads to China Bashing

#### Romney election leads to China bashing --- results in a trade war

**Palmer**, 3/27/**2012** (Doug, Romney would squeeze China on currency manipulation-adviser, p. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-usa-romney-china-idUSBRE82Q0ZS20120328)

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

#### Romney results in escalating protectionist wars with China

Wall Street Journal, 9/7/**2011** (Mitt Romney’s 59 Economic Flavors, p. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904537404576554692126810066.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

By far the most troubling proposal is Mr. Romney's call for "confronting China" on trade. This is usually a Democratic theme, but Mr. Romney does Mr. Obama one worse by pledging to have his Treasury brand China a "currency manipulator" if it doesn't "move quickly to bring its currency to full value." He'd then hit Beijing with countervailing duties. Starting a trade war is a rare policy mistake that Mr. Obama hasn't made, but Mr. Romney claims it is a way to faster growth. His advisers say he doesn't favor a 25% tariff on Chinese goods as some in Congress do, but once a President unleashes protectionist furies they are hard to contain. His economic aides say this idea comes directly from Mr. Romney himself, which is even less reassuring. It looks like a political maneuver to blunt the criticism he'll receive because some of Bain Capital's companies sent jobs overseas, or perhaps this is intended to win over working-class precincts in Pennsylvania and Ohio. But giving Americans the impression that a trade war will bring those jobs back to the U.S. is offering false hope. It also distracts from the other fiscal and regulatory reforms that are needed to attract capital and create jobs.

### Turns Soft Power

#### Pressure jacks soft power and global cooperation

**Yu 00** (Peter K., Professor of Intellectual Property – Michigan State University, “From Pirates To Partners: Protecting Intellectual Property In China In The Twenty-First Century”, American University Law Review, October, 50 Am. U.L. Rev. 131, Lexis)

Coercion invites retaliation. [226](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n226) The first thing the United States needs to do is to abandon its coercive foreign intellectual property policy. As pointed out by the U.S.-China Business Council, the umbrella group for American firms doing business in China, "there is little evidence that unilateral U.S. sanctions can effectuate policy changes in other nations." [227](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n227) In fact, unilateral sanctions tend to hurt American businesses without any guarantee of change. [228](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n228) Today, goods produced in the United States are also produced in Europe and Japan. Because Europe and Japan do not impose similar demands on China, [229](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n229) "the Chinese government will react to sanctions  [\*168]  by becoming even more hostile to the United States and by switching from U.S. products to European and Japanese ones." [230](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n230) For example, when the United States threatened to sanction China over its lack of intellectual property protection, Chinese Premier Li Peng went to France to sign a $ 1.5-billion order for thirty short-haul Airbus planes, instead of Boeing planes. [231](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n231) China also gave a European consortium the rights to develop a new hundred-seat airliner. [232](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n232) As "the growth prospects for the U.S. economy ... have become increasingly dependent on exports," [233](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n233) a confrontational policy will  [\*169]  hurt American businesses even more. Due to the constant use of trade threats by the American government and the uncertain trade relations between the two countries, many risk-aversive American businesses have limited their business in China to avoid risks. [234](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n234) Unreliable as long-term suppliers, some of the American businesses have also been replaced by their foreign competitors. Even worse, the trade threats and constant bullying have sparked a new resurgence of nationalism and xenophobia in China. [235](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n235) Evidence of this resurgence includes two recent bestsellers, [236](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n236) the Chinese reaction to the United States's bombing of their embassy in Belgrade, [237](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n237) and China's recent standoff with the United States over the collision between its jet fighter and a U.S. reconnaissance plane. [238](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n238) If these sentiments continue to grow, they may even lead to boycotts of American products or harassment of American businesses. [239](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n239) At the global level, a coercive policy will threaten the integrity of the international trading system and may even lead to its collapse. [240](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n240)  [\*170]  China's responses to the United States's threats of trade sanctions  [\*171]  have demonstrated that a coercive policy always leads to retaliation and may even result in a global trade war. In such a war, resources tend to be allocated inefficiently, and the whole world will become worse off. A coercive policy would also lead to criticism from other countries, thus alienating the United States from its trading partners. [241](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n241) Even worse, in their transition from a command economy to a market economy, the emerging democracies are constantly looking to the policies of Western democracies, in particular the United States, for guidance. [242](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n242) A coercive policy would lead to unrevised adoption by these emerging democracies. [243](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca#n243) The United States has taken a tremendous effort to create the TRIPs Agreement and to build an international intellectual property system. Ironically, its foreign intellectual property policy is attempting to destroy what it has worked so hard to achieve. [244](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n244" \t "_self)

### Trade War Bad – US/China War

#### Trade wars go nuclear

**Taaffe 2005** (Peter Taaffe, “China, A New Superpower?,” Socialist Alternative.org, Nov 1, 2005, pg. <http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article11.php?id=30>)

While this conflict is unresolved, the shadow of a trade war looms. Some commentators, like Henry C.K. Liu in the Asia Times, go further and warn that "trade wars can lead to shooting wars." China is not the Japan of the 21st century. Japan in the 1980s relied on the U.S. military and particularly its nuclear umbrella against China, and was therefore subject to the pressure and blackmail of the U.S. ruling class. The fear of the U.S., and the capitalists of the "first world" as a whole, is that China may in time "out-compete" the advanced nations for hi-tech jobs while holding on to the stranglehold it now seems to have in labor-intensive industries. As the OECD commented recently: "In the five-year period to 2003, the number of students joining higher education courses has risen by three and a half times, with a strong emphasis on technical subjects." The number of patents and engineers produced by China has also significantly grown. At the same time, an increasingly capitalist China - most wealth is now produced in the private sector but the majority of the urban labor force is still in state industries - and the urgency for greater energy resources in particular to maintain its spectacular growth rate has brought it into collision on a world scale with other imperialist powers, particularly the U.S. In a new worldwide version of the "Great Game" - the clash for control of central Asia's resources in the nineteenth century - the U.S. and China have increasingly come up against and buffeted one another. Up to now, the U.S. has held sway worldwide due to its economic dominance buttressed by a colossal war machine accounting for 47% of total world arms spending. But Iraq has dramatically shown the limits of this: "A country that cannot control Iraq can hardly remake the globe on its own." (Financial Times) But no privileged group disappears from the scene of history without a struggle. Donald Rumsfeld, U.S. defense secretary, has stated: "Since no nation threatens China, one must wonder: why this growing [arms] investment? Why these continuing large and expanding arms purchases?" China could ask the same question of the U.S. In order to maintain its position, the U.S. keeps six nuclear battle fleets permanently at sea, supported by an unparalleled network of bases. As Will Hutton in The Observer has commented, this is not because of "irrational chauvinism or the needs of the military-industrial complex, but because of the pressure they place on upstart countries like China." In turn, the Chinese elite has responded in kind. For instance, in the continuing clash over Taiwan, a major-general in the People's Liberation Army baldly stated that if China was attacked "by Washington during a confrontation over Taiwan... I think we would have to respond with nuclear weapons." He added: "We Chinese will prepare ourselves for the destruction of all of the cities east of Xian. Of course, the Americans would have to be prepared that hundreds... of cities would be destroyed by the Chinese." This bellicose nuclear arms rattling shows the contempt of the so-called great powers for the ordinary working-class and peasant peoples of China and the people of the U.S. when their interests are at stake.

### Trade War Bad – China Economy 2NC

#### Trade war shatters the Chinese economy

**Yu 2000** (Peter K., Professor of Intellectual Property – Michigan State University, “From Pirates To Partners: Protecting Intellectual Property In China In The Twenty-First Century”, American University Law Review, October, 50 Am. U.L. Rev. 131, Lexis)

The word "strategic" implies that "neither side will treat the relationship as merely a bilateral one." [175](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n175" \t "_self) Rather, each country views the partnership as a combination that provides strategic advantages for itself and enhances its global competitiveness. [176](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n176" \t "_self) Needless to say, being the only remaining superpower after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the United States is a very important player in both the global economy and world politics. [177](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n177" \t "_self) The United States is also a very important trading partner to China, absorbing a third of China's exports. [178](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n178" \t "_self) A healthy and harmonious relationship with the United States is therefore very important and beneficial to China. If bilateral relations deteriorated and trade wars took place, the confrontation would disrupt China's modernization process and very likely would put an end to its continuous economic growth. Not only would  [\*158]  China fail to regain its past glory, [179](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n179" \t "_self) but it might remain dominated by the West for the rest of the twenty-first century. [180](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=33c5af39d901023e74103729b7997966&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAl&_md5=1fec310bea5c39c46390159ea4dc0eca" \l "n180" \t "_self)

#### That causes Taiwan war --- escalates and draws in major powers

**Kaminski 2007** (Antoni Z., Professor – Institute of Political Studies, “World Order: The Mechanics of Threats (Central European Perspective)”, Polish Quarterly of International Affairs, 1, p. 58)

As already argued, the economic advance of China has taken place with relatively few corresponding changes in the political system, although the operation of political and economic institutions has seen some major changes. Still, tools are missing that would allow the establishment of political and legal foundations for the modem economy, or they are too weak. The tools are efficient public administration, the rule of law, clearly defined ownership rights, efficient banking system, etc. For these reasons, many experts fear an economic crisis in China. Considering the importance of the state for the development of the global economy, the crisis would have serious global repercussions. Its political ramifications could be no less dramatic owing to the special position the military occupies in the Chinese political system, and the existence of many potential vexed issues in East Asia (disputes over islands in the China Sea and the Pacific). A potential hotbed of conflict is also Taiwan's status. Economic recession and the related destabilization of internal policies could lead to a political, or even military crisis. The likelihood of the global escalation of the conflict is high, as the interests of Russia, China, Japan, Australia and, first and foremost, the US clash in the region.

### China Bashing Bad – Economy

#### Sanctions jack the U.S. economy and competitiveness

Lee 2005 (Don, Reporter – LA Times, “No Easy Answers on China Trade”, Los Angeles Times, 6-4, Lexis)

If protectionist measures such as Schumer's take hold, analysts said, the outcome could prove as damaging to the U.S. economy as to China's. One big reason: So many things made in China and shipped to the U.S. originate from multinational corporations that have either established their own factories or contracted out to manufacturers in China that produce largely for the American market. The U.S. imported $197 billion of goods from China last year. At the current 30% pace of increase, those imports could reach $254 billion this year. A levy of 27.5% on those products would lead to $70 billion in total tariffs. Of that amount, 70% would be borne by American companies such as Dell Inc., Hewlett-Packard Co., Wal-Mart Stores Inc., Nike Inc. and Liz Claiborne Inc., according to estimates by economist Andy Xie of Morgan Stanley. He said that would deal a big blow to their earnings, jolting stock markets. Companies also may be forced to pass along some of those costs to their customers, which could result in them losing ground to other importers. "For trade-oriented economies," Xie said, "bilateral protectionism decreases competitiveness and simply won't work over time."

#### China will slow treasury purchases --- shattering the economy

**Engdahl 2005** (F. William, Current Concerns, Japan and China Tensions and Washington’s Asia Geopolitics, 4-24, http://www.currentconcerns.ch/archive/2005/03/20050312.php)

China holds one weapon it could conceivably use if pressure from Washington and Tokyo increases as it clearly seems set to. The Bank of China holds some 610 billion dollars in US Treasury debt. Japan holds more, some 840 billions, but the size of China’s holding is still strategic. At present, with the dollar dependent on huge daily inflows of foreign investment to avoid crash, were China, the world’s second largest dollar holder after Japan, to decide to even temporarily boycott dollar purchases, let alone to begin selling holdings of same, it would force Japan to again turn on the inflationary printing presses as it did in March 2004. Or there would be danger of dollar free-fall. Yet Japan is ill-equipped to repeat the Herculean dollar rescue of March 2004. The recent comments by the South Korean government about shifting from dollar to Euro assets, even though ‘retracted’ the next day, suggest that Korea and China could be brought to such drastic measures or threat of same if the pressure rises. Notably in this light, there are indications that trade between Japan and China has already begun to suffer. In February, Japan’s trade surplus with China shrank year-on-year for the second month in a row. It fell 22% to ten billion dollars, three times worse than forecast in Japan. More than one third all Japanese exports today go to China according to OECD data. Japanese economic growth is not looking robust and talk of entering yet another recession is growing. For now these tensions remain as background factors, but the trends have become clear enough to warrant growing concern in the region. Any escalation on any front could have devastating consequences for world economic growth and even for world peace.

### Climate Deal 2NC

#### Obama reelection is critical to a global climate deal

**Geman**, 1/5/**2012** (Ben, Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection, The Hill, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection-)

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast if President Obama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would **include big, developing nations such as China** — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the **hard task of negotiating a new global agreement** by 2015 almost impossible.

#### Climate leadership is critical to solve warming – prevents extinction.

**Moon** 10/25/**2009** (Ban Ki – secretary general of the United Nations, We Can Do It, New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/26/opinion/26iht-edban.html)

Every day, the critical December summit in Copenhagen grows closer. All agree that climate change is an **existential threat** to humankind. Yet agreement on what to do still eludes us. How can this be? The issues are complex, affecting everything from national economies to individual lifestyles. They involve political trade-offs and commitments of resources no leader can undertake lightly. We could see all that at recent climate negotiations in Bangkok. Where we needed progress, we saw gridlock. Yet the elements of a deal are on the table. All we require to put them in place is political will**.** We need to step back from narrow national interest and engage in frank and constructive discussion in a spirit of global common cause. In this, we can be optimistic. Meeting in London earlier this week, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown told the leaders of 17 major economies (responsible for some 80 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions) that success in Copenhagen is within reach—if they themselves engage, and especially if they themselves go to Copenhagen to push an agenda for change. U.S. leadership is crucial. That is why I am encouraged by the spirit of compromise shown in the bipartisan initiative announced last week by John Kerry and Lindsey Graham. Here was a pair of U.S. senators — one Republican, the other Democratic — coming together to bridge their parties’ differences to address climate change in a spirit of genuine give-and-take. We cannot afford another period where the United States stands on the sidelines. An engaged United States can lead the world to seal a deal to combat climate change in Copenhagen. An indecisive or insufficiently engaged United States will cause unnecessary — and ultimately unaffordable — delay in concrete strategies and policies to beat this looming challenge. Leaders across the globe are increasingly showing the engagement and leadership we need. Last month, President Barack Obama joined more than 100 others at a climate change summit at U.N. headquarters in New York — sending a clear message of solidarity and commitment. So did the leaders of China, Japan and South Korea, all of whom pledged to promote the development of clean energy technologies and ensure that Copenhagen is a success. Japan’s prime minister promised a 25 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions from 1990 levels by 2020, laying down a marker for other industrialized nations. The European Union, too, has pledged to make a 30 percent reduction as part of a global agreement. Norway has announced its readiness for a 40 percent cut in emissions. Brazil has unveiled plans to substantially cut emissions from deforestation. India and China are implanting programs to curb emissions as well.

### CTBT 2NC

#### Obama’s reelection is key to CTBT ratification

**Schneidmiller**, 7/18/**2011** (Chris – editor of Global Security Newswire, Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty, Nuclear Threat Initiative, p. http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/senate-decision-key-to-future-of-test-ban-treaty/)

The Obama administration is preparing for a lobbying campaign that could determine the future of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see GSN, July 15). Administration officials have declared in recent months that they intend to follow through on their long-stated pledge to seek the U.S. Senate’s advice and consent on the accord. Still to be determined are when that will occur and whether the White House can overcome entrenched divisions on Capitol Hill to secure necessary Republican support for ratification. The stakes are significant: U.S. approval could draw other holdout nations into the treaty regime, bringing it that much closer to becoming international law, proponents say. Failure would provide those states with continued reason to dismiss the pact -- though critics say they might do that anyway. Before seeking a vote, the administration intends to carry out a program to educate lawmakers and the public on the value of the treaty, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen Tauscher has said on multiple occasions this year (see GSN, May 11). The effort would address issues likely to be debated in the Senate -- the viability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal without testing, whether all CTBT member states have accepted an absolute ban on any trial blasts, and the ability to catch any state that attempts to cheat. “We continue a long, methodical process to lay the groundwork for Senate consideration of the CTBT,” the State Department said last month in a statement to Global Security Newswire. “Currently, we are in the process of engaging with members of the Senate and their staff on the importance of the CTBT.” It added: “We are not moving for a Senate vote, don’t expect one anytime soon, and will not push for one until we have done the engagement work needed to secure approval.” Several analysts agreed that the White House would not begin the fight until it felt secure the result would be an improvement on the last time a Democratic president tried to persuade the Senate to approve the treaty. The United States signed the pact in 1996, but three years later the Clinton administration ratification effort ran into a brick wall of skeptical lawmakers. The Senate voted 51-48 against approval. A two-thirds affirmative vote would be required for the United States to become a full participant in the accord. Washington is among 44 capitals that must ratify the test ban before it can enter into force. Thirty-five nations have taken that step, leaving only China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. President Obama might wait to make his push until after publication of a new National Academy of Sciences report on the treaty, said arms control specialist Jeffrey Lewis. The follow-up to a 2002 academy study is expected to assess the effect that ratification would have on the U.S. capability to keep its nuclear weapons in working order without testing and on the capacity to identify atomic detonations in other nations. The new report is undergoing classification review, which could take weeks or years, according to Lewis. A classified National Intelligence Estimate on the matter was sent to Capitol Hill last August, but has not been seen by most lawmakers, said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. The document is said to offer an updated, thorough assessment of the ability to detect secret nuclear tests, according to Kimball. Senator Robert Casey (D-Pa.) suggested at the Arms Control Association’s annual meeting in May that the Senate might not take up the treaty until after the 2012 election. "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don't have a high degree of confidence that we will," the lawmaker said, echoing time line estimates from other observers. “I don’t think [the Obama administration is], at least in the near term, serious about putting this to a vote,” said Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. “I don’t think there’s a desire to have a vote if they think they’re going to lose, and I don’t think the votes are there yet.” Only 41 lawmakers who considered the treaty in 1999 remain in the Senate, Kimball said in a recent issue brief. Newer senators must be briefed on the matter, while the chamber as a whole must be informed of technical developments since 1999 that would promote entry into force. Politics plays a role in congressional policy debates and nuclear security will be a topic of discussion during the 2012 presidential election campaign, Kimball said. The White House is already taking heat over what Republicans say are inadequate attempts to rein in suspected proliferation activities in nations such as Iran and Syria (see GSN, March 30). Still, the Senate’s ratification last year of the U.S.-Russian New START nuclear arms control pact is cause for optimism about the test ban’s chances on Capitol Hill, Kimball said. Thirteen GOP senators voted in favor of the bilateral agreement. The two years it took Moscow and Washington to negotiate and approve New START “was relatively fast for a treaty,” according to Kimball. He said the administration should take whatever time is needed to see the test ban passed. “I would hope that the issue of the test ban treaty does not become a partisan political football because there is strong Republican support for the test ban treaty out there,” Kimball said. “If the treaty is not seriously considered by the Senate until after 2012, that will be because it took that much time to sort through the issues and to develop enough support to go ahead with the final stages of the ratification effort.” That plan, though, would hinge on Obama’s re-election. Should he be defeated next year, the pact would almost certainly **remain frozen in place in Washington**.

#### Ratification of the CTBT prevents multiple scenarios for nuclear war

**Davis**, 4/11/**2007** (Ian – co-executive director of the American Security Information Council, Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track, Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dame-anita-roddick-and-dr-ian-davis/getting-the-nuclear-test-\_b\_45625.html+CTBT+obama+priority&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=10&gl=us)

The United States is key to progress. But the US Senate's highly partisan 1999 rejection of the CTBT, the opposition of the Bush administration, and the reluctance of the nine other CTBT hold-outs have left the treaty to languish. It never enjoyed formal entry into force and this inaction has left the door open to renewed nuclear testing. The new Senate leadership should make **reinvigoration of the global nonproliferation regime** a high priority. Ratifying the CTBT could provide a **centerpiece** to demonstrating a change in leadership: the US rejoining the rest of the world to promote international cooperative agreements, from reducing global warming to keeping lethal WMD material out of the hands of criminals and terrorists. This can't happen too soon. North Korea has marched through the open door with its first underground test of an atomic device. There is widespread agreement that the test has escalated tension in the region and raised the stakes in the stand-off with the United States. It could also destroy the prospects for the CTBT and open the floodgates to more nuclear-armed states. While we welcome the current agreement with Pyonyang which may ultimately eliminate the North Korean nuclear program, and lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, the details of implementation have yet to be worked out, and already, strong conservative opposition to the agreement is beginning to appear. The door to an alternative way forward is also still open, and the United States could seize the **moral high ground** by leading the world through it. If President Bush were to press the Senate to reconsider and support ratification of the treaty, it could be part of a far-reaching strategy for **shoring up the North Korean agreement**, peacefully **tackling the Iranian nuclear program** and for preventing a world with **40 or more nuclear powers**. The North Korean and Iranian nuclear crises exemplify an increasing number of damaging developments that make it clear that the non-proliferation system needs to be **strengthened** and updated, not neglected or discarded. The international community must not only work together to develop more effective diplomatic approaches towards North Korea and Iran, but it must also apply stricter international safeguards on all nuclear programs, prevent the spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, secure a global halt to the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, take new steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons and achieve the entry into force of the CTBT. If, in 1963, at the height of the Cold War, the US, UK, and USSR could negotiate a limited test ban treaty. Why can't we ratify a comprehensive treaty now? Were we less threatened then? Are Iran and North Korea greater threats to the United States than was the USSR? The CTBT is vital to a system of security that **does not rely on nuclear weapons**. Its entry into force would put a **cap on the nuclear age**. Posturing for domestic politics and insisting on a macho attitude in international relations has dangerous long-term implications, both for America and the rest of the world. Since the Bush administration has come to power, global non-proliferation has gone into a holding pattern at best, a **tailspin at worst**. That can only lead to a world overpopulated with nuclear weapons and a **nuclear war sooner or later**. The consequences do not bear thinking about. So it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the American and European political agenda and move to secure ratification by other key states.

### Ext – Obama Key to CTBT

#### Obama will pass CTBT if reelected --- new NRC report provides momentum

**Pifer**, 3/30/**2012** (Steven – senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe at the Brookings Institution, New Support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, p. http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0330\_nuclear\_pifer.aspx)

In 1996, the United States became the first country to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which would ban all nuclear explosions. The Senate, however, failed to ratify the treaty in 1999. If President Obama is reelected, he may ask the Senate to consider it again. On March 30, the National Research Council released a study that bolsters the case for ratification. Two concerns underlay the Senate vote not to ratify the treaty in 1999: the reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent absent testing, and the U.S. ability to verify that other states observed the test ban. The National Research Council report **addresses both issues**. Ellen Williams, who chaired the committee that prepared the report, stated that the United States “has technical capabilities to maintain safe, reliable nuclear weapons into the foreseeable future without the need for underground weapons testing.” This results from the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which was launched in the 1990s to maintain the deterrent without testing. That program has produced significant knowledge about the reliability, sustainability and operation of U.S. nuclear weapons, including yielding information that U.S. scientists never discovered in 47 years of tests. For example, we now know that the nuclear “pits”—the plutonium packages that are the heart of modern U.S. nuclear weapons—can last 85-100 years, far longer than originally believed. The National Research Council study also notes that the techniques for monitoring a comprehensive test ban have improved dramatically over the past decade and can reliably detect nuclear explosions with yields well below one kiloton—the equivalent of one thousand tons of TNT—and in some cases much smaller. In addition to U.S. national means, the Preparatory Commission for the CTBT Organization has brought on line more than 80 percent of its planned international monitoring system, which will ultimately consist of 337 facilities worldwide. When the North Koreans tested a small nuclear device in 2006, 61 international monitoring stations reported the event. The report adds that, while there may be ways to “hide” a very small nuclear test, such test scenarios involve serious costs and practical difficulties, might nevertheless be detected, and would not require that the United States resume nuclear testing.

#### Obama will push CTBT after the election --- prevents a South Asian arms race

**Reif**, 4/9/**2012** (Kingston – director of nuclear nonproliferation at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, The Case for the CTBT: Stronger Than Ever, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, p. <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/columnists/kingston-reif/the-case-the-ctbt-stronger-ever>)

As of March 2012, 157 countries have ratified the CTBT. However, the treaty will not enter into force until 44 states that have been deemed "nuclear capable" have also ratified it -- including China, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, and the United States. But a move forward by the United States would establish the leadership needed to bring other countries along. If nothing else, China has indicated that it will ratify if the United States does. This would further strengthen the global norm against nuclear testing and encourage other holdouts, such as India and Pakistan, to ratify, **reducing the possibility of a dangerous arms race in South Asia**. After the longer-than-anticipated effort to win Senate approval of New START, the administration postponed plans to seek a vote on the CTBT in its first term. Instead, the White House has begun a cautious campaign to engage with the Senate on the treaty in preparation for a possible Senate vote in Obama's second term (**should he win reelection**). A critical piece of this outreach has been to encourage senators to carefully examine the remarkable improvements in America's ability to maintain the arsenal (via the stockpile-stewardship program) and to detect nuclear testing. In order to assist senators, the administration commissioned both the NAS report and a classified National Intelligence Estimate on the US ability to verify compliance with the treaty.

### CTBT – AT: Obama Won’t Push

#### It’s Obama’s priority

**Deaton**, 9/19/**2011** (Paul – Daily Kos member, On the 15th Anniversary of the CTBT, Daily Kos, p. http://www.dailykos.com/story/2011/09/19/1018266/-On-the-15th-Anniversary-of-the-CTBT)

During his 2009 speech in Prague, President Obama said ratification of the CTBT would be a priority for his administration. Others in the administration indicate that this continues to be the case. Despite some significant action on the administration’s arms control agenda, including entry into force of the New START Treaty ratified by the United States Senate last December, few now believe the President will take up CTBT ratification with the Senate before the 2012 election. If President Obama fails to win re-election, the treaty seems unlikely to be ratified for a long time, if ever. It is not hard to read the tea leaves on this important issue. Despite the apparent hesitancy, the State Department has begun a conversation on the CTBT as part of its discussion about the administration’s arms control agenda with members and staff on the hill. Assistant Secretary of the State for Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, Rose Gottemoeller described the exchange of information to the Arms Control Wonk, “So it’s really like an information campaign and a discussion,” said Gottemoeller. “The reason I emphasize the discussion aspect of it is that clearly this is a debate, and it’s not like one side telling the other, and the other side is just in the ‘receive’ mode. But it is more like a true discussion and debate, and I think that’s the way people are going to come to their decisions about the treaty, through that process of very serious discussion and debate, and seeing the facts, and coming to understand them.” Gottemoeller indicated there was no deadline for ratification. The State Department has laid out the case for ratification in four points. The CTBT helps restrain further nuclear weapons proliferation, ratification of the CTBT is part of an integrated nuclear security strategy, the CTBT can be verified and the United States does not need to conduct nuclear tests. A simple and straightforward list, but for those of us advocating for ratification of CTBT, it is the same list we had when Democrats held 60 senate seats and ratification seemed assured. The trouble with time is it wears on a person and priorities change. If we take President Obama and the State Department at their word, ratification of the CTBT remains a priority on the administration’s arms control agenda.

### CTBT Good – Disarm

#### Ratifying CTBT is critical to the global nuclear disarmament movement

**Joseph 2009** (Jofi Joseph, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the Senate, April 2009, Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification, Washington Quarterly, p. 83)

As Obama himself recognizes, the road to a world free of nuclear weapons must include the entry into force of the nuclear test ban treaty. A global ban on nuclear weapons tests is an essential step to halting the entry of new states into the nuclear club: without the ability to demonstrate its mastery of nuclear weapons by detonating one, no proliferator can lay claim to a credible nuclear arsenal. Likewise, a test ban promises to halt destabilizing nuclear arms races between existing weapons states by ceasing the development and deployment of new types of nuclear weapons. Without the option of tests to verify their effectiveness and reliability, a nuclear power will be hard pressed to introduce new advanced weapons into their deterrent. Instead, an effective nuclear test ban will more or less freeze existing nuclear arsenals at their current levels and prevent future improvements to their explosive power or miniaturization of warheads for missile deployment. For that reason alone, the United States, which possesses the most advanced nuclear arsenal in the world, should be a strong supporter of a treaty that promises to lock in the nuclear weapons status quo. Furthermore, the CTBT entry into force would prevent China from further advances in fielding multiple warhead ballistic missiles. 10 It is no accident that the very first measure in the thirteen-step action plan adopted by the 2000 NPT Review Conference referenced the need for early entry into force of the CTBT. A nuclear free world cannot come into existence unless the international community first agrees to end the nuclear arms race and prohibit any further advances to existing nuclear arsenals. Obama, therefore, can best demonstrate the genuineness of his pledge to work toward a nuclear-free world by working toward CTBT ratification during his first term in office.

#### Multilateral disarm prevents inevitable nuclear war.

**Hari**, 10/20/**2004** (Johann – regular writer for the Times Literary Supplement, Will we wake up from our nuclear coma? – There is a strong chance of a nuclear bomb being used now, The Independent, p. Lexis)

But there is no such thing as a regional nuclear war. An exchange between India and Pakistan, or between Israel and Iran, would - quite apart from killing millions of people - **risk irreparable ecological damage to the planet**.Today, along with man-made climate change, nuclear weapons are the biggest threat to human lifeas we know it. So why is hardly anybody talking about it? Partly, it's because nobody seems to have any good answers. We all know that during the Cold War, nuclear weapons were regulated by a simple doctrine: Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). If you used a nuke, you were guaranteed to be nuked in return. What doctrine now regulates the use of these weapons? Some people believe that MAD is still a working principle. The conservative commentator Matthew Parris, for example, speaks for many on the right when he says that India and Pakistan are more stable because of nuclear weapons. "If India and Pakistan did not have nuclear weapons, they would have gone to war in 2002 ... the threat alone defused the situation. No lives were lost. This was the classic case for nuclear weapons, and it was demonstrated there ." So MAD got us through the Cold War; it will get smaller powers through their own conflicts with less bloodshed. Proliferation is a good thing. This argument is flawed for several reasons. Even when MAD was practised by two relatively stable super- power blocs for just 40 years, it nearly broke down and led to "rational suicide" on several occasions. Does anybody really think that if this is replicated across the world - in the most tense, dangerous and often fanatical regions - it will not break down sooner or later? Just one lapse, just one crazy leader testing the doctrine, condemns tens of millions of people to death. It requires delirious, wild optimism to believe MADness on every continent will keep us safe indefinitely. But more importantly, all over the world, even the strained logic of MAD is evaporating. The US government believes it will, within a generation, be safe from retaliation because of its missile shield, so MAD will no longer apply to them. Many ultra -nationalists in the Indian government in 2002 seemed to have a worrying lack of knowledge about the effects of a nuclear war, claiming that it would have "a limited effect" and "we could take it". MAD doesn't work if people don't understand the consequences. And Islamic fundamentalists who believe that death can be more glorious than life, who welcome "martyrdom", are obviously not going to be put off by retaliation. So, against our biggest security threat - al-Qa'ida - MAD is useless. I can only think of one long-term answer to the danger: phased, tightly monitored multilateral disarmament, reducing all the world's nuclear arsenals one step at a time. Right now, this is so far off the p olitical map it sounds crazy. But what is the alternative? There is Parris-style faith in MAD. Or there is the neoconservative solution, which is to keep thousands of nukes ourselves but deny them t o everybody else through raw force. This is not a tenable long-term solution. Perhaps an Israeli bombing raid on Iran's reactors will work this year - but can proliferation be dealt with that way indefinitely? How can we sustain such hypocrisy without making more countries eager to get nukes to spite us? Multilateral disarmament is deeply flawed, but the alternatives - endless proliferation or a neoconservative resort to force against any potential nuclear powers - are more dangerousstill. Even if slow, careful nuclear disarmament didn't seem the best option to you at the height of the Cold War, it should now. Yet the people who should be making this case - groups like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament - have gone off on a Trotskyite tangent, campaigning on causes that have nothing to do with nukes. (Their current crusade is to put Tony Blair on trial.)

### CTBT Good - Multilateralism

#### CTBT has enough support to be ratified but Obama’s political capital will be key. Ratification is critical to restore the signal of multilateralism and solve global proliferation

**Joseph 2009** (Jofi Joseph, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the Senate, April 2009, Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification, Washington Quarterly, p. 80)

The 1999 vote fell short of an absolute majority, much less the two-thirds majority required for treaty ratification under the U.S. Constitution. This failure undercut traditional U.S. leadership on nuclear nonproliferation issues, and offered an easy justification for China to continue to refuse to ratify the CTBT, as well as for India and Pakistan to avoid signing the treaty altogether. An announcement in Obama’s first year in office that he will call on the Senate to initiate the consideration of the CTBT by holding the appropriate hearings over the next year, with the goal of scheduling a ratification vote prior to the end of his first term in 2012, will send an unmistakable signal that the United States is once again committed to multilateral, rules-based cooperation with the international community to advance mutual interests. It will reenergize a flagging nonproliferation regime and offer the United States important leverage on key challenges like Iran and North Korea. With a healthy majority of Democratic senators in place, and close relationships with key moderate Republicans, Obama is within reach of the 67 votes necessary to secure ratification, and accomplish a significant foreign policy and national security goal. Why Push for CTBT Ratification Now? The Obama administration cannot take the decision to press the Senate for CTBT ratification before 2012 lightly. It will require a significant investment of political capital by the president and his senior national security team during his first term in office to closely coordinate with the Senate leadership and chairmen of the Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence Committees. The risks of failure are considerable: a second rejection by the Senate would likely doom the nuclear test ban treaty to oblivion and risk encouraging other states to end their informal moratoria on nuclear testing. So why should Obama forge ahead with a determined campaign for CTBT ratification?

#### Only multilateral cooperation prevents great power wars that make extinction inevitable.

**Dyer**, 12/30/**2004** (Gwynne – former senior lecturer in war studies at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurt, The End of War, The Toronto Star, p. lexis)

The "firebreak" against nuclear weapons use that we began building after Hiroshima and Nagasaki has held for well over half a century now. But the proliferation of nuclear weapons to new powers is a major challenge to the stability of the system. So are the coming crises, mostly environmental in origin, which will hit some countries much harder than others, and may drive some to desperation. Add in the huge impending shifts in the great-power system as China and India grow to rival the United States in GDP over the next 30 or 40 years and it will be hard to keep things from spinning out of control. With good luck and good management, we may be able to ride out the next half-century without the first-magnitude catastrophe of a **global nuclear war**, but the potential certainly exists for a major die-back of human population. We cannot command the good luck, but good management is something we can choose to provide. It depends, above all, on **preserving and extending the multilateral system** that we have been building since the end of World War II. The rising powers must be absorbed into a system that **emphasizes co-operation and makes room for them**, rather than one that deals in confrontation and raw military power. If they are obliged to play the traditional great-power game of winners and losers, then history will repeat itself and **everybody loses**.

### CTBT Good – Proliferation

#### Ratifying the CTBT restores U.S. non-proliferation leadership and builds coalitions against prolif

**Medalia 2008** (Jonathan Medalia, specialist of National Defense for the Congressional Research Service, 3/12/2008, Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: Issues and Arguments, p. 53-54)

Gen. John Shalikashvili, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, argued that the CTBT and nuclear nonproliferation were closely linked: Non-ratification [of the CTBT] has also complicated U.S. efforts to strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards that non-nuclear weapon state parties to the NPT must have on their civilian nuclear programs. Many countries are reluctant to accept new obligations while the United States is unwilling to approve the Test Ban Treaty.... Once we ratify the Test Ban Treaty, which the rest of the world views as vital for non-proliferation, we will be better able to enlist cooperation on export controls, economic sanctions, and other coordinated responses to specific problems.192 Former Secretary of State George Shultz, former Secretary of Defense William Perry, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and former Senator Sam Nunn argued the need to link the goal of disarmament and specific steps to achieve it: Reassertion of the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and practical measures toward achieving that goal would be, and would be perceived as, a bold initiative consistent with America’s moral heritage.... Without the bold vision, the actions will not be perceived as fair or urgent. Without the actions, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible. One of the eight steps they recommend is “Initiating a bipartisan process with the Senate, including understandings to increase confidence and provide for periodic review, to achieve ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, taking advantage of recent technical advances, and working to secure ratification by other key states.”193 By the same token, some CTBT supporters contend that U.S. failure to observe the disarmament end of the bargain will inevitably undermine the willingness of other nations to cooperate on nonproliferation. Margaret Beckett, former U.K. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, said, our efforts on non-proliferation will be dangerously undermined if others believe, however unfairly, that the terms of the grand bargain have changed, that the nuclear weapon states have abandoned any commitment to disarmament. The point of doing more on disarmament, then, is not to convince the Iranians or the North Koreans. I don’t believe for a second that further reductions in our nuclear weapons would have a material effect on their nuclear ambitions. Rather the point of doing more is this: because the moderate majority of states, our natural and vital allies on non-proliferation, want us to do more. And if we do not, we risk helping Iran and North Korea in their efforts to muddy the water, to turn the blame for their own nuclear intransigence back onto us. They can undermine our arguments for strong international action in support of the NPT by painting us as doing too little too late to fulfill our own obligations.194

#### Obama has broad support for the CTBT which will restore U.S. credibility on proliferation

**Joseph 2009** (Jofi Joseph, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the Senate, April 2009, Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification, Washington Quarterly, p. 89)

Obama won the presidency in part on his pledge to bring a new tone to U.S. relations with the world through enhanced multilateral cooperation and a pragmatic approach to international institutions and treaties. Substantively, Obama has identified the specter of nuclear terrorism as the gravest challenge to our national security and linked that threat to the breakdown of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. Accordingly, he concluded that only a renewed effort, led by the United States, toward a world of zero nuclear weapons can make real headway in reducing the threat of proliferation and nuclear terrorism. Senate ratification of the CTBT and its resulting entry into force would set a new tone for U.S. diplomacy while revitalizing the nuclear nonproliferation regime. It would restore U.S. credibility on this issue after years of moving in the opposite direction. Obama enjoys a broad mandate and the strong support of almost 60 Senate Democrats. Now is the time for a renewed push for CTBT ratification that can serve as a landmark national security accomplishment for the United States and for international peace and stability.

CTBT Good – Proliferation

#### Ratifying the CTBT restores confidence in the NPT

**Kimball 2008** (Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, 8/22/2008, The Enduring Value of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Prospects for Its Entry Into Force, p. http://www.armscontrol.org/node/3300)

Today, the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) remains a vital disarmament and nonproliferation instrument. By prohibiting all nuclear test explosions it impedes the ability of states possessing nuclear weapons to field new and more deadly types of warheads, while also helping to prevent the emergence of new nuclear-armed states. Moving forward quickly on the CTBT is also an essential step towards restoring confidence in the beleaguered Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) regime. The nuclear-weapon states’ commitment to achieve the CTBT was a crucial part of the bargain that won the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 and the 2000 NPT Review Conference document.

### CTBT Good – AT: Deterrence

#### No impact – conventional deterrence and current weapons are enough to solve

**Medalia 2008** (Jonathan Medalia, specialist of National Defense for the Congressional Research Service, 3/12/2008, Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: Issues and Arguments, p. 16)

CTBT supporters hold that current nuclear weapons suffice for deterrence; no adversary leader would gamble that they would not work, or that the United States would not use them if severely provoked. At the same time, supporters see nuclear weapons as most unlikely to be used, regardless of their characteristics or yield, because of the norm that has built up since 1945 against their use. Current nuclear weapons deterred a Russian or Chinese nuclear attack during the Cold War, it is argued, and will continue to do so, especially as the probability of such attack must be judged as remote. U.S. conventional forces, the treaty’s supporters claim, deter threats from other nations. Use of these forces is credible, they can be precisely targeted, and they would create very much less collateral damage than nuclear weapons. Further, it is argued, adversaries could readily counter new U.S. nuclear capabilities. Nuclear weapons to destroy chemical or biological weapons could be defeated by placing the weapons deep underground; even earth penetrator weapons could not destroy them because the heat and radiation of the blast would not reach down that far. More simply, the weapons could be moved to nondescript buildings in cities or to caves in rural areas; U.S. intelligence, in this view, could locate few if any sites. Earth penetrators could be defeated by deeper burial, greater hardening, tunneling under a mountain, or dispersing assets to secret aboveground locations.

#### The SSP will maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal – all evidence flows our way

**Kimball 2008** (Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, 8/22/2008, The Enduring Value of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Prospects for Its Entry Into Force, p. http://www.armscontrol.org/node/3300)

The other key issue is whether the United States can continue to rely on its stockpile stewardship program to maintain its arsenal under a permanent CTBT? The short answer is: yes. As the U.S. National Academy of Sciences reported in July 2002, the United States "has the technical capabilities to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of its existing nuclear-weapon stockpile under [a test ban], provided that adequate resources are made available to the Department of Energy's nuclear-weapons complex and are properly focused on this task." Though the Energy Department has determined each year for the last decade that the U.S. nuclear arsenal remains safe and reliable without nuclear testing, some claim—as they did in 1999—that as time goes on there may be age-related problems in the nuclear stockpile. (3) The good news is that all of the technical evidence available shows that such concerns are greatly overstated. New government studies on plutonium longevity completed in 2006 have found that the plutonium primaries of most U.S. nuclear weapons have a minimum lifetime of 85 years, which is twice as long as previous estimates. According to the National Academy panel, which included three former lab directors, age-related defects mainly related to non-nuclear components can be expected, but nuclear test explosions “are not needed to discover these problems and is not likely to be needed to address them.” Rather, the panel says, the key to the stewardship of the arsenal is a rigorous stockpile surveillance program, the ability to remanufacture nuclear components to original specifications, minimizing changes to existing warheads, and non-explosive testing and repair of non-nuclear components. Thomas D’Agostino, acting National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) administrator said in March 2007 that “stockpile stewardship is working. This program has proven its ability to successfully sustain the safety, security and reliability of the stockpile without the need to conduct an underground test for well over a decade.”

### Defense Cuts – Obama Will Cut

#### Obama plans to cut $480 billion, if not more, in Pentagon spending

**Baker**, **2012** (Peter Baker, staff writer for the New York Times, 5/24/2012, “Military Will Remain Strong With Cuts, Obama Tells Cadets,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/us/politics/military-will-withstand-cuts-obama-says.html)

President Obama vowed on Wednesday to keep the military strong even as he winds down the wars of the last decade and takes the budget knife to Pentagon spending in an age of increasing government austerity. Addressing the graduating cadets of the Air Force Academy, Mr. Obama said spending cuts were inevitable for the armed forces but he promised to guard against reductions that would compromise the nation's security. Dismissing talk of national decline, he described an ''American century'' in which the United States would continue to flourish. ''Yes, as today's wars end, our military, and our Air Force, will be leaner,'' he told a stadium filled with the blue uniforms of the next generation of pilots and other officers. ''But as commander in chief, I will not allow us to make the mistakes of the past. We still face very serious threats. As we've seen in recent weeks, with Al Qaeda in Yemen, there are still terrorists who seek to kill our citizens.'' He added: ''We'll keep our military, and our Air Force, fast and flexible and versatile. We will maintain our military superiority in all areas: air, land, sea, space and cyber.'' Mr. Obama's commencement address was his first at a military academy since the last American troops left Iraq, ending nearly nine years of conflict, and came just days after he agreed with NATO allies on a plan to close out the combat mission in Afghanistan. In effect, he used the occasion to outline a vision for the next stage in the nation's struggle against terrorism, one that shifts away from large commitments of ground troops and relies more on diplomatic and economic power while drawing on more help from allies. ''You are the first class in nine years that will graduate into a world where there are no Americans fighting in Iraq,'' Mr. Obama said. ''For the first time in your lives -- and thanks to Air Force personnel who did their part -- Osama bin Laden is no longer a threat to our country. We've put Al Qaeda on the path to defeat. And you are the first graduates since 9/11 who can clearly see how we'll end the war in Afghanistan.'' He said that his policies would end those wars while still making the country safer, and he noted that the graduates would have fewer deployments and more time to train and rest between missions than their predecessors. But Mr. Obama went into little detail about how financial restraints would affect the Air Force and the military at large. He has proposed a spending plan for the Pentagon that includes nearly $480 billion in cuts over 10 years, but that amount could increase sharply if his administration and Congress do not reach agreement on a plan to avoid deeper automatic cuts currently programmed into law. Republicans have said Mr. Obama is already cutting the armed forces too deeply. A budget plan released by the Obama administration in February called for reducing the number of active-duty Air Force personnel by 3,900 as well as an additional 6,000 from the Reserves and National Guard. Under that plan, about 500 aircraft would be retired as well. Since then, the Guard's political patrons have fought back and persuaded Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta to reverse some of those cuts, foreshadowing continued struggles in the months and years ahead over how to divvy up scarcer resources. Romney Reverse Military Cuts

#### Obama maintains military cuts

**O’Connor**, **2012** (Patrick O’Connor, staff writer for the Wall Street Journal, July 8, 2012, “Military Cuts Loom as Late Campaign Issue,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303292204577515220443609642.html)

The Obama administration, including Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, has warned about what these cuts would mean for military readiness and urged Congress to find savings elsewhere. But Mr. Obama has pledged to veto legislation offered by House Republicans in May that would roll back the military cuts using money saved by paring federal funds for food stamps, Medicaid and other social services.

Defense Cuts – Obama Will Cut

#### Obama cuts the defense budget and restructures military

**Rumbaugh 2012**(Russell Rumbaugh, co-director of the Stimson Center's Budgeting for Foreign Affairs and Defense program. The Stimson Center is a nonprofit organization that seeks to strengthen institutions for peace and security, build regional security and reduce weapons of mass destruction and transnational threats. Rumbaugh is a former Democratic staff member on the Senate Budget Committee, 1/6/2012, “Obama's defense cuts are too timid,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/06/opinion/rumbaugh-defense-cutbacks/index.html)

(CNN) -- The defense budget is going down. Thursday, President Obama personally announced a new strategy to align with the new limits created by the Budget Control Act of last fall. The announcement was light on the budget details to emphasize "strategy." But strategy documents come and go -- it's in budgets that we'll see actual change. The biggest change is a smaller Army — reports suggest troop numbers down to levels last seen in the late 1990s. This change is justified by the strategy's de-emphasis of stability operations like Iraq and Afghanistan and renewed focus on Asia, where naval and air forces are the main tool. If the strategy's blueprint is followed, we could see a fundamental change to our force structure and military posture—more airpower and naval, and fewer ground forces. But everyone Thursday went out of their way to hedge at every turn. Most notably, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey stressed that we weren't giving up the capacity to fight land wars. Deputy Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said his theme was reversibility. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said our military will never do just one thing. The President said our military will be ready for the full range of contingencies and threats.

### Defense Cuts – Romney Will Increase

#### Romney would boost defense spending

**Davis**, **2012** (Chelyen Davis, staff writer for the Free Lance-Star, May 4, 2012, “Romney critical of Obama,” The Free Lance Star, http://fredericksburg.com/News/FLS/2012/052012/05042012/699420)

Romney also said he would differ from Obama in his dealings with the military, and that instead of cutting back on defense spending, he would authorize more ships, more planes and 100,000 more active-duty troops. A victory for him in November, Romney said, would be "a change in Washington that removes this president and puts in someone who will keep America strong." Romney also said he would balance the federal budget by choosing different areas of that budget to cut than those chosen by Obama. "His cuts are wrong," Romney said.

#### Romney will reverse military cutbacks—expansion of naval shipbuilding and Air Force

**Peterson**, **2012** (Hayley Peterson, The Examiner Staff Writer, May 18, 2012, “Obama, Romney exchange blows over military,” The Examiner, p. Proquest)

President Obamas re-election campaign on Thursday cast his Republican opponent, Mitt Romney, as naive and inexperienced on national security matters even as Romney was accusing Obama of weakening the U.S. military through massive defense cuts. When it comes to foreign policy, Mitt Romney keeps getting it wrong, said Robert Diamond, an Iraq War veteran in charge of Obamas outreach efforts to veterans and military families. Diamond asserts that Romney would cut funding for veterans health care and accused the former Massachusetts governor of being out of touch with the militarys missions and needs. He can listen to advisers that think that the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are still around, he said. When it comes to honoring our veterans, leading our troops, and weighing foreign policy decisions, Mitt Romney is hopelessly out of touch with reality. Even as Obamas campaign targets Romneys lack of national security credentials, Romney is stepping up his own attacks on Obamas plans to downsize the post-war military by $487 billion over the next five years. Obamas proposal would shrink the Army and Marine Corps by about 14 percent, close several domestic bases, slash spending on new weapon programs and reduce Navy shipbuilding. Romney said such cuts would substantially weaken the nations defenses and leave the United States vulnerable to future threats. He pledged to nearly double naval shipbuilding. America must have a military so strong no one would ever think of testing it, Romney said at a campaign stop in Jacksonville, Fla., Thursday. So rather than cut back on the number of ships we buy per year as the president would ... Id go from the nine were planning on building to 17 a year. Romney has also promised to increase the Air Force and add about 100,000 active-duty personnel.

#### Romney wants to build the Navy and Air Force, increasing military spending

**Babington**, **2012** (Charles Babington, Associated Press and staff writer for the Tulsa World, April 28, 2012, “Romney's list of campaign vows raises questions: He says he wants to cut taxes, slash spending and try to balance the budget,” Tulsa World, p. Proquest)

Romney says he wants to put the nation on a path to a balanced budget while also cutting an array of taxes, building up the Navy and Air Force and adding 100,000 active-duty military personnel. He says he would slash domestic spending and reduce tax loopholes but has offered few details. His comments raise eyebrows in Congress, long accustomed to easier-said-than-done promises. And even some conservatives have their doubts. Christopher A. Preble, a vice president for the libertarian Cato Institute, says Romney's promise to push military spending to 4 percent of the national economy would require dramatic increases that would raise, not lower, the federal deficit.

Defense Cuts – Romney Will Increase

#### Romney differs from Obama on military spending—wants to preserve strong mil

**Peoples**, **2012** (Steve Peoples, staff writer for the Hutchinson News, May 29, 2012, “Romney promises world's strongest military,” Hutchinson News, p. Proquest)

SAN DIEGO - Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney promised Monday to maintain an American military "with no comparable power anywhere in the world." The likely Republican presidential nominee faced a San Diego crowd estimated at 5,000 in what was billed as a Memorial Day service paying tribute to the nation's war dead, not a campaign rally. The appearance came the day before Romney was expected to win enough delegates to claim his party's nomination, a formality that cements his status as President Barack Obama's general election opponent. Without naming his general election rival on Monday, Romney drew clear contrasts with Obama on the issue of defense. The Democratic president has proposed reducing the size of the military following the end of the U.S. combat role in Iraq and plans to remove troops from Afghanistan at the end of 2014. "We have two courses we can follow: One is to follow in the pathway of Europe, to shrink our military smaller and smaller to pay for our social needs," Romney said outside the city's Veterans Memorial Center and Museum. "The other is to commit to preserve America as the strongest military in the world, second to none, with no comparable power anywhere in the world."

#### Romney pledged to reverse Obama’s defense cuts

**Concord Monitor**, **’11** (Concord Monitor, October 2011, “Romney's wrong on defense spending,” Concord Monitor, p. Proquest)

It is easy to score points in a Republican presidential primary by talking tough and pledging to increase America's military might. That's exactly what Mitt Romney did in a speech this month, pledging to reverse President Obama's "massive defense cuts." Trouble is, no such cuts were ever made. Military spending is higher under President Obama than under George W. Bush. If elected, Romney said, he would expand the Navy, deploy carriers off Iran's coast, beef up missile defenses and increase spending on cyber-security. The latter is a necessity. Critical systems are far too vulnerable to internet attacks and cyber-snooping. But the rest of Romney's proposals are off-base. Defense spending should be cut significantly, not increased, and military priorities revisited.

### Defense Cuts Good – Military Effectiveness

#### Defense cuts are necessary for military efficiency and focus

**Concord Monitor**, **’11** (Concord Monitor, October 2011, “Romney's wrong on defense spending,” Concord Monitor, p. Proquest)

It is easy to score points in a Republican presidential primary by talking tough and pledging to increase America's military might. That's exactly what Mitt Romney did in a speech this month, pledging to reverse President Obama's "massive defense cuts." Trouble is, no such cuts were ever made. Military spending is higher under President Obama than under George W. Bush. If elected, Romney said, he would expand the Navy, deploy carriers off Iran's coast, beef up missile defenses and increase spending on cyber-security. The latter is a necessity. Critical systems are far too vulnerable to internet attacks and cyber-snooping. But the rest of Romney's proposals are off-base. Defense spending should be cut significantly, not increased, and military priorities revisited. Does it make sense, for example, to have more troops in military bands than there are foreign service officers whose negotiations can make the use of military force less necessary? Does the United States really need to subsidize our allies' defense budgets by stationing 40,000 troops in Europe? The answer to both is no. Military spending increased by 70 percent between the Sept.11 attacks and the end of 2009. It now totals more than $700 billion per year. If the bipartisan congressional "super-committee" charged with finding $1.5 trillion in budget cuts by Thanksgiving fails in its mission, $1.2 trillion in automatic cuts will go into effect. They will be split roughly evenly between defense and domestic spending other than on Social Security, Medicaid and anti-poverty programs. The defense cuts would total $600 billion or more over the next decade, but that much and possibly more can and should be cut. The Bowles-Simpson commission the president created in hopes of reaching a bipartisan compromise on the nation's budget recommend $750 billion in defense cuts over 10 years. Some security experts say even bigger reductions could be made without compromising national security. Excessive military spending, including the $150 billion spent each year to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, is making the United States weaker, not stronger. The United States spends almost as much money on defense as the rest of the world combined, yet the biggest enemy the nation faces is its debt. As the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan wind down, the armed forces should shrink, albeit not radically or rapidly. Military retirement and health care benefit systems should be revisited. They now consume one out of every three dollars of defense spending. Under current rules, a veteran who served multiple combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan can't qualify for a pension unless he or she has served at least 20 years. Meanwhile, a veteran who enlisted at 18 can retire at age 38 and collect a pension for 40 or more years. Partial pensions should be awarded veterans who serve for a minimum of eight or 10 years, but that should be offset by not allowing military pensions to be collected until a normal retirement age. Military spending should be retargeted, aimed less at building big ships and aircraft carriers, as Romney wants, and more on intelligence-gathering and the tools needed to fight stateless terrorists and rogue states. A strong American military is a deterrent that's worth paying for, but a strong military won't make up for a weak economy dragged down by debt.

Defense Cuts Good – Military Effectiveness

#### Obama’s cuts create a leaner, more versatile military

**Baker**, **2012** (Peter Baker, staff writer for the New York Times, 5/24/2012, “Military Will Remain Strong With Cuts, Obama Tells Cadets,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/us/politics/military-will-withstand-cuts-obama-says.html)

President Obama vowed on Wednesday to keep the military strong even as he winds down the wars of the last decade and takes the budget knife to Pentagon spending in an age of increasing government austerity. Addressing the graduating cadets of the Air Force Academy, Mr. Obama said spending cuts were inevitable for the armed forces but he promised to guard against reductions that would compromise the nation's security. Dismissing talk of national decline, he described an ''American century'' in which the United States would continue to flourish. ''Yes, as today's wars end, our military, and our Air Force, will be leaner,'' he told a stadium filled with the blue uniforms of the next generation of pilots and other officers. ''But as commander in chief, I will not allow us to make the mistakes of the past. We still face very serious threats. As we've seen in recent weeks, with Al Qaeda in Yemen, there are still terrorists who seek to kill our citizens.'' He added: ''We'll keep our military, and our Air Force, fast and flexible and versatile. We will maintain our military superiority in all areas: air, land, sea, space and cyber.'' Mr. Obama's commencement address was his first at a military academy since the last American troops left Iraq, ending nearly nine years of conflict, and came just days after he agreed with NATO allies on a plan to close out the combat mission in Afghanistan. In effect, he used the occasion to outline a vision for the next stage in the nation's struggle against terrorism, one that shifts away from large commitments of ground troops and relies more on diplomatic and economic power while drawing on more help from allies. ''You are the first class in nine years that will graduate into a world where there are no Americans fighting in Iraq,'' Mr. Obama said. ''For the first time in your lives -- and thanks to Air Force personnel who did their part -- Osama bin Laden is no longer a threat to our country. We've put Al Qaeda on the path to defeat. And you are the first graduates since 9/11 who can clearly see how we'll end the war in Afghanistan.'' He said that his policies would end those wars while still making the country safer, and he noted that the graduates would have fewer deployments and more time to train and rest between missions than their predecessors. But Mr. Obama went into little detail about how financial restraints would affect the Air Force and the military at large. He has proposed a spending plan for the Pentagon that includes nearly $480 billion in cuts over 10 years, but that amount could increase sharply if his administration and Congress do not reach agreement on a plan to avoid deeper automatic cuts currently programmed into law. Republicans have said Mr. Obama is already cutting the armed forces too deeply.

#### Obama plans for a leaner military and slows in defense budget growth

**Keyes**, **2012** (Charley Keyes, CNN Senior National Security Producer, Jan 5, 2012, “Obama unveils plans for pared-down military,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/05/politics/pentagon-strategy-shift/index.html)

Washington (CNN) -- President Barack Obama unveiled his administration's plans Thursday for a leaner, cheaper military, a reflection of Washington's fiscal belt-tightening and slower national economic growth. The president insisted the new strategy -- which eliminates the military's ability to actively fight two major wars at once -- will allow U.S. armed forces to effectively combat terrorism while confronting any new threats from countries like China and Iran. "Over the next 10 years, the growth in the defense budget will slow, but the fact of the matter is this: It will still grow, because we have global responsibilities that demand our leadership," Obama announced during a rare presidential visit to the Pentagon. "I firmly believe, and I think the American people understand, that we can keep our military strong -- and our nation secure -- with a defense budget that continues to be larger than roughly the next 10 countries combined." Security Clearance: Does a smaller military make sense? Alluding to the end of the U.S. military role in Iraq and plans to eventually withdraw from Afghanistan, Obama declared that "the tide of war is receding." "The question that this strategy answers is what kind of military will we need after the long wars of the last decade are over," the president told reporters. "Yes, our military will be leaner, but the world must know: The United States is going to maintain our military superiority with armed forces that are agile, flexible and ready for the full range of contingencies and threats."

### Global Zero 2NC

#### Obama reelection is key to continue the Global Zero agenda --- promotes multilateral nuclear talks.

**Wagner and Blachford**, 7/12/**2012** (Daniel – CEO of Country Risks and Director of Global Strategy with the PRS Group, and Kevin – research analyst with CRS, based in London, How to Enhance Obama’s Limited Progress on Arms Control, International Policy Digest, p. http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/07/12/how-to-enhance-obamas-limited-progress-on-arms-control/)

The Obama Administration realizes that in order to hope to achieve more progress on the path to a Global Zero world, it must conduct talks with other nuclear powers, and will be holding a nuclear security summit later this year. The objective will be to discuss nuclear safety and the prevention of terrorist acquisition or theft of nuclear materials. There is no reason why multilateral talks should not be extended to include security issues beyond just terrorism and nuclear safety. If Obama is serious about achieving his objective, he should encourage more talks with a greater range of nuclear-armed powers. This could perhaps be done by reviewing the terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and agreeing to engage in a regularized formal dialogue aimed at the reduction of nuclear weapons with all nuclear states. Doing so would likely encourage countries like China to act as a respected and responsible partner at the nuclear table. China has so far been reluctant to embrace its position as a leading emerging military power – preferring instead to be thought of as ‘developing’ – and has also dismissed talk of any cooperation along the lines of a G2 with America. But nuclear security ought to be an issue that China sees as a field for collaboration with other global powers – if for no other reason than to try to exert more influence on North Korea. Also, the last thing China should want is to discourage arms control, as doing so may encourage some other of its neighbors to want to develop their own nuclear weapons programs in an effort to counter China’s inevitable rise. If Obama is serious in achieving Global Zero in the nuclear arena, a serious multilateral approach is the key. The US needs to focus further on global co-operation concerning not just nuclear warheads, but the delivery systems attached to these weapons, tactical weapons, and the prevention of a terrorist acquisition of nuclear materials. Since 2009 there have only been incremental steps towards nuclear disarmament. Given the imminent prospect of greater nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, Mr. Obama needs to place more focus on this important objective he set for his Administration at the outset. If he is re-elected, it is our hope that this subject will receive the attention it deserves. If Mr. Romney is elected, that is unlikely to happen.

#### Multilateral disarm prevents inevitable nuclear war.

**Hari**, 10/20/**2004** (Johann – regular writer for the Times Literary Supplement, Will we wake up from our nuclear coma? – There is a strong chance of a nuclear bomb being used now, The Independent, p. Lexis)

But there is no such thing as a regional nuclear war. An exchange between India and Pakistan, or between Israel and Iran, would - quite apart from killing millions of people - **risk irreparable ecological damage to the planet**.Today, along with man-made climate change, nuclear weapons are the biggest threat to human lifeas we know it. So why is hardly anybody talking about it? Partly, it's because nobody seems to have any good answers. We all know that during the Cold War, nuclear weapons were regulated by a simple doctrine: Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). If you used a nuke, you were guaranteed to be nuked in return. What doctrine now regulates the use of these weapons? Some people believe that MAD is still a working principle. The conservative commentator Matthew Parris, for example, speaks for many on the right when he says that India and Pakistan are more stable because of nuclear weapons. "If India and Pakistan did not have nuclear weapons, they would have gone to war in 2002 ... the threat alone defused the situation. No lives were lost. This was the classic case for nuclear weapons, and it was demonstrated there ." So MAD got us through the Cold War; it will get smaller powers through their own conflicts with less bloodshed. Proliferation is a good thing. This argument is flawed for several reasons. Even when MAD was practised by two relatively stable super- power blocs for just 40 years, it nearly broke down and led to "rational suicide" on several occasions. Does anybody really think that if this is replicated across the world - in the most tense, dangerous and often fanatical regions - it will not break down sooner or later? Just one lapse, just one crazy leader testing the doctrine, condemns tens of millions of people to death. It requires delirious, wild optimism to believe MADness on every continent will keep us safe indefinitely. But more importantly, all over the world, even the strained logic of MAD is evaporating. The US government believes it will, within a generation, be safe from retaliation because of its missile shield, so MAD will no longer apply to them. Many ultra -nationalists in the Indian government in 2002 seemed to have a worrying lack of knowledge about the effects of a nuclear war, claiming that it would have "a limited effect" and "we could take it". MAD doesn't work if people don't understand the consequences. And Islamic fundamentalists who believe that death can be more glorious than life, who welcome "martyrdom", are obviously not going to be put off by retaliation. So, against our biggest security threat - al-Qa'ida - MAD is useless. I can only think of one long-term answer to the danger: phased, tightly monitored multilateral disarmament, reducing all the world's nuclear arsenals one step at a time. Right now, this is so far off the p olitical map it sounds crazy. But what is the alternative? There is Parris-style faith in MAD. Or there is the neoconservative solution, which is to keep thousands of nukes ourselves but deny them t o everybody else through raw force. This is not a tenable long-term solution. Perhaps an Israeli bombing raid on Iran's reactors will work this year - but can proliferation be dealt with that way indefinitely? How can we sustain such hypocrisy without making more countries eager to get nukes to spite us? Multilateral disarmament is deeply flawed, but the alternatives - endless proliferation or a neoconservative resort to force against any potential nuclear powers - are more dangerousstill. Even if slow, careful nuclear disarmament didn't seem the best option to you at the height of the Cold War, it should now. Yet the people who should be making this case - groups like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament - have gone off on a Trotskyite tangent, campaigning on causes that have nothing to do with nukes. (Their current crusade is to put Tony Blair on trial.)

### AT: Cuts Bad – No Impact to Deterrence

#### Nukes unnecessary for modern deterrence

**AP**, **2012** (Associated Press, 7/4/12, “Obama plans cutbacks in U.S. nuclear weapons,” Herald Net, http://www.heraldnet.com/article/20120704/NEWS02/707049866)

James Cartwright, the retired Marine Corps general who commanded U.S. nuclear forces from 2004-07, thinks the U.S. should acknowledge that a large nuclear force is of limited value in deterring today's major threats. "No sensible argument has been put forward for using nuclear weapons to solve any of the major 21st century problems we face," including threats posed by rogue states, terrorism, cyber warfare or climate change, Cartwright and his colleagues at Global Zero wrote in a report in May. Global Zero is an organization that advocates a step-by-step process to achieve the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons. The group argues that the U.S. could safely reduce its arsenal over the coming 10 years to 900 total nuclear weapons -- 450 deployed at any given time and a like number held in reserve. That compares with the current U.S. arsenal of about 5,000 weapons, of which 1,737 are deployed. Advocates of cutting below 1,550 argue that nuclear weapons serve an increasingly narrow purpose, and that their large numbers undercut the credibility of demands that Iran and other nations forgo acquiring their own. Opponents argue that the U.S. should not risk losing its predominant position in the nuclear arena while North Korea, Iran and other are pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. Obama himself has made clear in recent statements that he thinks the time is right to break with the past. "The massive nuclear arsenal we inherited from the Cold War is poorly suited to today's threats, including nuclear terrorism," he said March 26 in Seoul. He noted that last summer he ordered his national security team to undertake a comprehensive review of nuclear forces and policies, which was completed early this year. "We can already say with confidence that we have more nuclear weapons than we need," Obama said.

#### Nuclear deterrence has no meaning/use

**Drell and Goodby**, **’12** (Sidney D. Drell, physics professor emeritus at the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory and a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, James E. Goodby, a former U.S. negotiator on arms control, nonproliferation, and transparency issues, and a member of the American Academy of Diplomacy, June 2012, “Nuclear Deterrence In a Changed World,” Arms Control Today, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1021381150)

Unfortunately, many policymakers and planners in the United States, Russia, and elsewhere are still caught in a nuclear deterrence trap, believing, wrongly, that security can be maintained by fielding large stockpiles of nuclear weapons. U.S. tactical nuclear weapons deployed in western Europe and Russia's much larger holdings of tactical warheads are good examples. Policymakers need to rethink their assumptions about the kinds of threats nuclear weapons actually can help deter and how many of those weapons are needed to do that. A close examination of today's global security threats, whether in the Middle East, Afghanistan, or Northeast Asia, reveals that they cannot be effectively addressed with the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The weapons have little or no effect in coercing states, insurgent groups, or terrorists to abstain from actions that threaten international peace and security. The range of actions that nuclear weapons might deter never was very great. During the Cold War, one declared purpose for U.S. nuclear weapons was to prevent a Soviet land invasion of NATO Europe and the use of nuclear weapons by the Soviet Union against U.S allies. Yet, nuclear deterrence did not prevent the Soviets from taking aggressive actions on their side of the Iron Curtain. Two major wars involving the United States broke out in Asia despite nuclear deterrence. Nuclear deterrence did not affect the decisions of a number of governments to acquire or attempt to acquire nuclear weapons despite the intense desire of successive U.S. administrations to prevent that from happening. Today, it is difficult to come up with realistic scenarios that would justify the use of nuclear weapons by the United States, but nuclear deterrence still elicits a mystical faith. Speak of a world without nuclear weapons, and the reaction of some is akin to removing a magical spell that prevents the United States from being victimized by its enemies, real or imagined. "Containment," "nuclear deterrence," and "strategic stability" all were useful guides to U.S. policy during the Cold War. They contributed to the notion that nuclear weapons should be held in reserve for use in worst-case contingences. These concepts, however, did not translate well into guides for common international action. The ideas never were fully or comfortably shared in actual practice between the United States and the Soviet Union, and they are even less likely to become guides to joint action in the current multipolar world, marked as it is by regional rivalries, asymmetric warfare, and threats posed by organizations outside the control of states. It is obvious to nearly everyone that containment and nuclear deterrence have lost the meaning they had during the Cold War. Strategic stability also has a broader meaning, beyond the imperative of avoiding incentives for a first strike.

### Iran Strikes 2NC

#### Romney election results in Iran strikes --- Obama reelection defuses the situation with diplomacy

**Daily Kos**, 4/16/**2012** (President Obama versus Romney on Iran, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>)

3. Approach to foreign policy: Romney says he will “not apologize” for America and advocates a return to the Bush cowboy “my way or the highway” approach to dealing with other nations. When John Bolton is an endorser, that scares me. To me, however the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran. Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come. (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia."But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent a needless war. You can be sure that Mitt Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an **inch of difference between ourselves and Israel**”. As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. Bottom line, if somehow the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a more than likely bombardment of Iran. If the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.

#### Iran strikes escalates to a nuclear world war.

**Chossudovsky**, 12/26/**2011** (Michel, Preparing to attack Iran with Nuclear Weapons, Global Research, p. http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28355)

An attack on Iran would have devastating consequences, It would unleash an all out regional war from the Eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, potentially **leading humanity into a World War III** Scenario. The Obama Administration constitutes a nuclear threat. NATO constitutes a nuclear threat Five European "non-nuclear states" (Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey) with tactical nuclear weapons deployed under national command, to be used against Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu not only constitutes a nuclear threat, but also a threat to the security of people of Israel, who are misled regarding the implications of an US-Israeli attack on Iran. The complacency of Western public opinion --including segments of the US anti-war movement-- is disturbing. No concern has been expressed at the political level as to the likely consequences of a US-NATO-Israel attack on Iran, using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state. Such an action would result in "the unthinkable": a nuclear holocaust over a large part of the Middle East.

### Ext – Romney Will Strike Iran

#### Romney is unilateralist – he’ll attack Iran without consent.

**Berman**, contributing writer for The Nation, **’12** [Ari. Investigative Journalism Fellow at The Nation Institute. “Romney: Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb Iran” The Nation. June 19. http://www.thenation.com/blog/168478/romney-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-iran#/accessed:7/19/12]

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.

### Iran Strikes – AT: Campaign Rhetoric

#### GOP advisers mean that Iran strikes talk is not just rhetoric

**Maloney**, 3/5/**2012** (Suzanne – senior fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy, How to Contain a Nuclear Iran, The American Prospect, p. <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0305_nuclear_iran_maloney.aspx>)

The Republican determination to blunt Iran’s ambitions through military strikes or regime change should not be dismissed merely as campaign rhetoric, though. Over the past four years, the context for military action against Iran has been transformed, thanks to Tehran’s progress toward nuclear capability and its revived adventurism across a Middle East in flux. Most of the Republican advisers, including some who hesitated to endorse direct strikes on Iran during their time in the Bush administration, have now concluded that an attack is essential. For that reason, the Republican support for military strikes and regime change **deserves consideration**. Most of the candidates have been vague on the mechanics of implementing what they advocate. When asked for specifics in the interview with The Wall Street Journal editorial board, Romney ruled out the use of ground troops but added that “the range includes something of a blockade nature, to something of a surgical strike nature, to something of a decapitate the regime nature, to eliminate the military threat of Iran altogether.”

### Strikes Bad – Economy

#### Strikes destroy the economy and cause oil shocks

**Poor 2010** (Jeff. Staffer for the Business and Media Institute. “Dr. Doom Roubini to Synagogue Audience: Israeli Air Strike on Iran Would Lead to Another Global Recession” Business and Media Institute, 5/14/10, lexis)

With European economies on the brink and other emerging markets slowing down, is there any possible way things could get worse? As if the public needed any more evidence we’re living in perilous times, Dr. Nouriel Roubini, professor of economics at New York University's Stern School of Business and co-author of “Crisis Economics: A Crash Course in the Future of Finance,” warned that there is one single event that could push the global economy down even further. Roubini, who was the economist that predicted the current economic crisis, spoke to an audience at the Sixth & I Synagogue in Washington, D.C. on May 13. He said that, should Israel or the United States initiate an attack on Iran, as it is attempting to procure nuclear weapons, the price of oil would skyrocket. “And you know, on the issue of if there is a strike on Iran, the point I was making in the article was, if that were to occur, oil prices would double literally overnight and we would have another global recession.” Roubini cited other historical events that impacted a fragile global economy. “Oil spiked sharply in ’73 after the Yom Kippur War,” Roubini explained. “It doubled in ’79 after the Iranian Revolution, it spiked again in 1990 after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.” He also explained the 2006 Israeli invasion of Lebanon was a spark for the current global financial crisis, a point he had made earlier for Forbes back on April 22. He advised policy makers to keep this in mind when it comes to dealing with the rogue power. “So if an air strike were to occur, and I’m not making a statement whether Israel and/or the United States would be right – so I’m just pointing out that if that were to occur, the financial consequences would be a spike in the price of oil and that would lead to another global recession. So when it comes to some pros and cons that should be something we keep in mind.”

### Strikes Bad – Hezbollah

#### Strikes leads to Israeli-Hezbollah conflict

**Hanania 2012** (Ray – award-winning Palestinian American columnist, An Attack on Iran Will Only Ignite the Region, p. http://www.creators.com/opinion/ray-hanania/an-attack-on-iran-will-only-ignite-the-region.html)

An attack on Iran would provoke Hezbollah into another missile exchange with Israel, repeating the hellish war that took place in July 2006. Israel fired missiles at Hezbollah targets, but Hezbollah, which is more tenacious than any Arab military force, fired as many missiles back. Although the Hezbollah response to Israel was unprecedented in scope and power, in the end, it was Lebanon that was taken down the road to near disaster. That must have the Lebanese on edge as Israel and Iran ramp up their war of words.

#### Nuclear war

**Leyden**, 8/5/**2006** (Joel , Hezbollah Iran missiles slam Hadera Israel – Nuclear War Approaching?, Israel News Agency, p. http://www.israelnewsagency.com/haderaisraeliranrocketsnuclearwar4848070805.html)

Tel Aviv----August 5......The only good thing about the terror group Hezbollah (Hizbollah) or Islam Party of God is that they keep their promises. Just two days ago Hezbollah terror leader Hassan Nasrallah said from Lebanon that he would strike Tel Aviv, Israel with missiles if the Israel Defense Forces attacked parts of central Beirut. A few hours ago, Hezbollah launched three Iran missiles at the Israel city of Hadera. Hadera is 70 miles south from the Lebanese border and 30 miles north from Tel Aviv. The strike was the deepest inside Israel to date in the fighting between the Jewish state and the Lebanon-based terrorists. Hezbollah is believed to have missiles that can reach Tel Aviv, but such an attack would trigger a massive Israel response. One that would most likely include Syria and Iran. Iran admitted today that it did indeed supply long-range Zelzal-2 missiles to Hizbullah. The longer-range Zelzal missiles, manufactured by Iran and are capable of reaching Tel Aviv, Jerusalem and Beer Sheva in the Negev. In making this announcement, Iran reinforced its statement of "wiping Israel off the map" and though bullets are not flying yet between Israel and Iran, both nations are very much at war. Hadera, contrary to many reports, is not "northern" Israel but rather a blue collar working class city located on the coast in central Israel. Hadera is not Tel Aviv, but Israeli security forces see very little difference. Police have reported that the three missiles which slammed in and around Hadera caused little damage with no casualties. That is physical damage that I am referring to. Following the rocket attack on Hadera, IDF Colonel Yechiel Kuperstein, head of the Home Front Command's defense department, stated that the new procedures issued for residents south of Haifa apply to all residents on Israel's coastline plane, including Tel Aviv. According to Kuperstein, an evaluation of the situation will be held on Saturday and will be followed by renewed procedures to the public for next week. The colonel said that should the need arise residents of areas south of Haifa a warning one minute prior to the expected landing of a rocket or rockets. And this is what Hezbollah wants. Not rockets - but air raid sirens Hezbollah is waging a psychological war on the Israel public. Progressively hitting targets deeper into Israel. First it was Kiryat Shomena and Nahariya. Then Haifa and Afula. Hezbollah could have fired missiles into Tel Aviv weeks ago, but that would not have served their purpose. One must remember that Hezbollah is first and foremost a "terror" organization. Yes, they have a well trained army operating inside Lebanon, an army which should have been disarmed by Lebanon according to UN Security Council Resolution 1559 passed in 2004. An army which hides behind a civilian population. An army which stores and fires its weapons from residential buildings, hospitals, schools and Mosques. Why has Hezbollah not struck Tel Aviv? There are two answers. One - Hezbollah gets its orders directly from Iran and Iran is not yet prepared to hit Tel Aviv. Two - they want the Israel public to sweat. As the missiles reach further south, so does the psychological war. Yes, these rockets are capable of carrying half a ton of chemical or conventional warheads as far as Tel Aviv. The Zelzal-2, is not a missile, but a 610 mm heavy artillery rocket with a 1323 lb (600 kg) payload and range of 130 miles (210 km) But it is not explosives or chemicals that Hezbollah is counting on. It is fear. The Israel public has been traumatized by the constant sounding of warning sirens from Haifa to the Lebanese border. Now Hezbollah wants these same sirens to paralyze Tel Aviv. For the very true target of terrorism is to destroy the commercial infrastructure of its enemies. Modern Israel has lived with terrorism since its birth in 1948. Palestine Islam suicide bombers have blown up buses, restaurants, shopping centers and several other civilian targets. Yet, Israelis have not run away. One does not see thousands of Israelis relocating to Europe or North America. The same as after a hit at the symbolic commercial strike of the World Trade Center, New York's commercial infrastructure is stronger than ever. After the Holocaust, we Israelis learned that we needed to reestablish a homeland which would provide security for each and every Jew. If Syria and Iran think that they can keep pushing this psychological and explosives war down the throats of this Jewish nation, to force our population into bomb shelters, then they need to look again at New York after 9/11, Tel Aviv after several bus bombings, London after the underground and bus bombings, Spain's rail system and Turkey's stock exchange. These free democracies do not run and hide. And Israel, remembering the horrors of the Holocaust, remembering "never again," will not hesitate to use any weapons it may possess including nuclear, laser, electromagnetic, thermobaric and or any other conventional or non-conventional weapons to vaporize those who threaten our children.

### Strikes Bad - NATO

#### Iran strikes destroys NATO

**Tisdall 2007** (Simon, writer for The Guardian, “Merkel goes in search of a new German miracle”, 2/7, lexis)

"The common glue of the cold war has gone. The fight against terrorism has not replaced it. As for Iran, of course we are worried. Nobody wants a nuclear Iran. But our American friends have made major mistakes . . . We oppose military action. During the cold war, we talked to the communists. Now we must talk to the Iranians." All Ms Merkel's efforts to make Europe an equal partner with the US could be destroyed in a moment by a US military attack on Iran, Prof Sandschneider said. EU unity would also shatter. "It would be the end of Nato. It would be the end of the US-European consensus on how to deal with security threats. It would be disastrous."

#### Global nuclear war

**Duffield 94** (John, Assistant Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs – University of Virginia, Political Science Quarterly, 109, p. 766-767)

Initial analyses of NATO's future prospects overlooked at least three important factors that have helped to ensure the alliance's enduring relevance. First, they underestimated the extent to which external threats sufficient to help justify the preservation of the alliance would continue to exist. In fact, NATO still serves to secure its members against a number of actual or potential dangers emanating from outside their territory. These include not only the residual threat posed by Russian military power, but also the relatively new concerns raised by conflicts in neighboring regions. Second, the pessimists failed to consider NATO's capacity for institu­tional adaptation. Since the end of the cold war, the alliance has begun to develop two important new functions. NATO is increasingly seen as having a significant role to play in containing and controlling milita­rized conflicts in Central and Eastern Europe. And, at a deeper level, it works to prevent such conflicts from arising at all by actively pro­moting stability within the former Soviet bloc. Above all, NATO pessimists overlooked the valuable intra-alliance functions that the alliance has always performed and that remain rele­vant after the cold war. Most importantly, NATO has helped stabilize Western Europe, whose states had often been bitter rivals in the past. By damping the security dilemma and providing an institutional mech­anism for the development of common security policies, NATO has contributed to making the use of force in relations among the countries of the region virtually inconceivable. In all these ways, NATO clearly serves the interests of its European members. But even the United States has a significant stake in preserving a peaceful and prosperous Europe. In addition to strong transatlantic historical and cultural ties, American economic interests in Europe— as a leading market for U.S. products, as a source of valuable imports, and as the host for considerable direct foreign investment by American companies — remain substantial. If history is any guide, moreover, the United States could easily be drawn into a future major war in Europe, the consequences of which would likely be even more devastating than those of the past, given the existence of nuclear weapons.

### Strikes Bad – Russia

#### Strikes cause war with Russia

**Tarpley 2005** (Webster Griffin,- activist and historian, 8/29/ <http://inn.globalfreepress.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=743> )

In the case of Iran, the use of nuclear weapons by the US would have a dangerous complication: Iran is an important neighbor and trading partner of the Russian Federation, which is helping with Iran’s nuclear power reactor program. The threatened US/Israeli raid on Iran might kill Russian citizens as well. Such a US attack on Iran might prod the Russian government into drawing its own line in the sand, rather than sitting idle as the tide of US aggression swept closer and closer to Russia’s borders, as one country after another in central Asia was occupied. In other words, a US attack on Iran bids fair to be the opening of World War III, making explicit was already implicit in the invasion of Iraq. The Iran war project of the neocons is the very midsummer of madness, and it must be stopped.

#### US/Russian nuclear war causes extinction – its categorically different than other impacts

**Bostrom 2** (Nick, PhD Philosophy – Oxford University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios”, Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade 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]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn2" \o ") At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn3" \o ") 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]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn4" \o ")  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.

### Strikes Bad – AT: Just Nuclear Strikes Not Regime Change

#### Can’t control limited war --- escalation is inevitable

**White**, July/August **2011** (Jeffrey – defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, p. <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982>)

In general, the more expansive a war’s goals as a plan escalates from strike to campaign to broad offensive, the greater the force needed to achieve those goals, the greater the uncertainty in achieving them, and the greater the consequences of both success and failure. Moreover, a war’s goals at the outset of conflict may not remain stable. Early sudden successes or unanticipated failures can lead to the escalation of initially limited goals, particularly if terminating hostilities proves difficult. Lateral expansion as well as escalation is also possible: Iranian leaders might surrender or agree to a truce but be unable to enforce a similar decision on Hizballah leaders or terror agents around the world. This leads to yet another layer of complexity and uncertainty: Whose war would this be?

### Strikes Bad – AT: No Escalation

#### Escalation is likely – unintended consequences

**White**, July/August **2011** (Jeffrey – defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, p. <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982>)

In summary, an attack on Iran could produce dynamics that would push either or both sides to escalate the conflict even if neither had an interest or an initial intention to do so. Iranian civilian casualties, for example, could provoke Iran to step up its response. This becomes more likely as the scale of a U.S. attack increases. Downed U.S. aircrews could lead to search and rescue operations that could become significant military actions in their own right. The need to restrike targets that were missed or inadequately damaged could also prolong the conflict and involve additional forces. As the conflict developed, internal and external political pressures could press both antagonists to escalate the fighting.

### Strikes Bad – AT: Limited War

#### Pre-existing alliances and relations will draw in other powers

**White**, July/August **2011** (Jeffrey – defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, p. <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982>)

A U.S.-Iranian war would probably not be fought by the United States and Iran alone. Each would have partners or allies, both willing and not-so-willing. Pre-conflict commitments, longstanding relationships, the course of operations and other factors would place the United States and Iran at the center of more or less structured coalitions of the marginally willing. A Western coalition could consist of the United States and most of its traditional allies (but very likely not Turkey, based on the evolution of Turkish politics) in addition to some Persian Gulf states, Jordan and perhaps Egypt, depending on where its revolution takes it. Much would depend on whether U.S. leaders could persuade others to go along, which would mean convincing them that U.S. forces could shield them from Iranian and Iranian-proxy retaliation, or at least substantially weaken its effects. Coalition warfare would present a number of challenges to the U.S. government. Overall, it would lend legitimacy to the action, but it would also constrict U.S. freedom of action, perhaps by limiting the scope and intensity of military operations. There would thus be tension between the desire for a small coalition of the capable for operational and security purposes and a broader coalition that would include marginally useful allies to maximize legitimacy. The U.S. administration would probably not welcome Israeli participation. But if Israel were directly attacked by Iran or its allies, Washington would find it difficult to keep Israel out—as it did during the 1991 Gulf War. That would complicate the U.S. ability to manage its coalition, although it would not necessarily break it apart. Iranian diplomacy and information operations would seek to exploit Israeli participation to the fullest. Iran would have its own coalition. Hizballah in particular could act at Iran’s behest both by attacking Israel directly and by using its asymmetric and irregular warfare capabilities to expand the conflict and complicate the maintenance of the U.S. coalition. The escalation of the Hizballah-Israel conflict could draw in Syria and Hamas; Hamas in particular could feel compelled to respond to an Iranian request for assistance. Some or all of these satellite actors might choose to leave Iran to its fate, especially if initial U.S. strikes seemed devastating to the point of decisive. But their involvement would spread the conflict to the entire eastern Mediterranean and perhaps beyond, complicating both U.S. military operations and coalition diplomacy.

### US/Russia Relations 2NC

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

**Elliott**, 5/15/**1995** (Michael, Why Russia Still Matters to America, Newsweek, p. lexis)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a devastating nuclear attack on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East without resorting to nuclear weapons is a 21st-century nightmare. All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

### Ext – Obama Solves Russia Reset

#### Only Obama can continue the reset – Romney kills it

**Meir-Levi 12** (David Meir-Levi, writes and lectures on Middle East topics, until recently in the History Department of San Jose State University, 5/11/12, “Russia Wants Obama Re-Elected,” http://frontpagemag.com/2012/david-meir-levi/russia-wants-obama-re-elected/)

But according to the Wall Street Journal article, Russia’s alarming saber-rattling is really a façade to hide a “tacit agreement to put off serious talks until next year,” by which time Obama, if re-elected, could “clear the way for a deal” and work on Russia’s behalf against NATO to find ways to accommodate the Russian demands. The Russian presenter on Thursday was direct and unambiguous that Russia prefers to work with Obama as a second-term president, and to cooperate with his vision of a “reset” in the USA- Russia relationship, rather than to joust with Romney whose election they feel will make things “surely … more difficult.” So what the Russians have actually said is: if you want to keep the Russian bear from getting aggressive, elect Obama, not Romney. This is an unusually overt attempt by a foreign power to influence American elections, but it is not surprising since Romney has been harshly critical of Obama’s “reset” vision.

#### Obama reelection necessary for reset and relations – flexibility

**Clover 12** (Charles Clover, writer for Financial Times, 4/17/12, Financial Times, “G8 absence threatens US-Russian rapport,” http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/fa1060f2-a014-11e1-90f3-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz20zJEM0vt)

While US-Russia relations certainly look set for a rough patch, the future of the “reset” will likely be hostage to the US election results. “The US Republicans have started a crusade against the reset,” said Mr Rogov, who says he is worried by “the return of ideology to US-Russia relations”. However, if Mr Obama is re-elected, he will (as the world found out in March) have more flexibility to negotiate on the flashpoints such as missile defence. Mr Putin’s attitude, meanwhile, seems to be one of wait and see. “Putin certainly approved of the reset, otherwise it would never have happened,” said Mr Trenin.

#### Only Obama win facilitates better relations

**Zabrovskaya** **12** (Ekaterina Zabrovskaya, writer for Russia Beyond the Headlines, 6/19/12, Russia Beyond the Headlines, “Will the Magnitsky blacklist sour U.S.-Russian relations?” http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/06/19/the\_magnitsky\_blacklist\_may\_sour\_us-russia\_relations\_15900.html)

Markov believes that Presidents Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin have the potential to develop good personal relations. “Putin had the opportunity to receive evidence that Obama keeps his word. Putin values this most of all,” the analyst said. Markov thinks that Obama, in turn, respects Putin’s leadership potential. Maksim Grigoryev, president of the Foundation for the Study of Problems of Democracy, also believes that U.S.-Russian relations will improve relatively soon, at least after the U.S. presidential elections, should Obama win a second term. Grigoryev thinks that the discussion around the Magnitsky bill is all about political PR. “It is important for Obama to present himself as a strong man on the international arena and neutralize the Republican Party's attacks that he is not hard enough on Russia. For Republicans, it is important to show that they fight against totalitarianism in Russia,” said Grigoryev. “This is a PR move for both the Republicans and Obama.”

### Ext – Romney Kills US/Russian Relations

#### Romney’s policies would isolate Russia --- collapses relations

**Bandow**, 4/23/**2012** (Doug – senior fellow at the Cato Institute, Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relations, National Interest, p. <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/romney-russia-complicating-american-relationships-6836>)

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 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.

#### Romney election destroys any chance of working with Russia – global institutions won’t check

**Lyman 12** (John Lyman, Editor-in-Chief of International Policy Digest, 3/30/12, International Policy Digest “Romney’s Foreign Policy and Russia,” http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/03/30/romneys-foreign-policy-and-russia/)

In critiquing the president in several interviews, Romney also roiled the Russians with his suggestion that Russia is the “Number one geopolitical foe” of the United States. This of course negates what most observers would regard as the top foreign policy concern of the United States – whether it be Afghanistan, Israel, Iran, Syria, or North Korea. If Romney defeats Obama in November, he will need a very big “reset” button to attempt to make things right with Russian President-elect Vladimir Putin. Following Mr. Romney’s comments, Mr. Medvedev said during a news conference that Romney’s assertion that Russia should not be confused with the same country depicted in many Cold War espionage films said the comments “smells of Hollywood.” “Look at your watch,” Mr. Medvedev said to reporters. “It is 2012, not the mid-1970s. No matter what party someone belongs to, he should pay attention to political realities.” Romney explained to CNN’s Wolf Blitzer that he was alarmed by Obama’s casual conversation with Medvedev: “Russia continues to support Syria, supports Iran, has fought us with the crippling sanctions we wanted to have the world put in place against Iran. Russia is not a friendly character on the world stage…For this president to be looking for greater flexibility, where he doesn’t have to answer to the American people in his relations with Russia is very, very troubling, very alarming. I’m very, very concerned. I think the American people are going to feel the same way. This is a president who is telling us one thing and is doing something else, and is planning on doing something else even more frightening.” Obama, seeking to bury the story, told reporters following meetings in Seoul, “The only way I get this stuff done is if I’m consulting with the Pentagon, with Congress, if I’ve got bipartisan support and frankly, the current environment is not conducive to those kinds of thoughtful consultations.” Romney’s characterization is not necessarily untrue. Russia has used its veto power on the U.N. Security Council to block action on Syria and has shown, through its membership in the BRICS, a proclivity against tougher economic sanctions directed at Iran outside of the framework of the United Nations. U.S.-Russian relations transcend the United Nations and other multilateral institutions. The United States relies on Russian assistance in counterterrorism, Afghanistan, shoring up loose nuclear material in the former Soviet Republics, international narcotics trafficking, WMD proliferation and reducing American and Russian nuclear stockpiles, which has become a cause celeb for Mr. Obama. Obama has calculated that the Russians would be amendable to significant reductions in their nuclear stockpiles if he negotiates with the Russians in good faith over missile defense. This process was started several years ago in an effort to “reset” U.S.-Russian relations, when Obama ordered a different configuration to the missile defense system – the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) – planned for construction in Eastern Europe. The original system envisioned a radar base that was to be built in the Czech Republic with interceptors housed in Poland. The EPAA is designed to intercept ballistic missiles launched from “rogue” nations from interceptors housed in Poland and now Romania. The Russians have been highly critical of the system first announced by the Bush administration as they claim it would undermine their own nuclear deterrent. “This is not a matter of hiding the ball,” Mr. Obama said. “I want to see us gradually, systematically reduce reliance on nuclear weapons.” Now that Mr. Romney has antagonized the Russians, he might find it difficult to negotiate with them over a whole host of issues, much less getting Russia on board with prodding the Iranians to return to the negotiating table or facilitating America’s withdrawal from Afghanistan if he defeats Mr. Obama in November.

#### Romney win returns to Bush doctrine of Russian confrontation

**Macfie et. al 12** (Nick Macfie, writer for Reuters, Steve Gutterman, Reuters Reporter, Ed Lane and Alesandra Rizzo, editors for Reuters, 3/27/12, Reuters, “UPDATE 1-Medvedev says Romney's anti-Russia comment smacks of Hollywood,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/27/russia-usa-medvedev-idUSL3E8ER6TR20120327)

A senior lawmaker from Putin's ruling party said Romney's remark went "far deeper" than political posturing, warning a Republican win would likely revive a "line of confrontation with Russia" rooted in the administration of George W. Bush. "It's clear that this is a new edition of the old doctrine of American hegemony, and Romney is not alone in this approach," said Alexei Pushkov, chairman of the international affairs committee in the State Duma, the lower parliament house. "There is a whole group of senators who specialise in promoting the idea of U.S. domination of world affairs and ... in anti-Russian themes," he told a news conference. "The Republicans are going with the ideology of George Bush and John McCain, in essence, and on this basis they want to return to power. And that's the problem." (Additional reporting by Steve Gutterman in Moscow; Writing by Nick Macfie; Editing by Ed Lane and Alessandra Rizzo)

#### Romney election collapses relations – no cooperation

**Larison 12** (Daniel Larison, writer for The American Conservative 6/27/12, The American Conservative, “U.S.-Russian Relations Would Get Much Worse Under Romney,” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/u-s-russian-relations-would-get-much-worse-under-romney/)

The easier (and more accurate) answer is that Putin doesn’t actually want a “hard-line conservative in the White House.” Putin distrusts the U.S. because he believes that the Bush administration behaved in an ungrateful and untrustworthy fashion in the previous decade, and U.S.-Russian relations improved as much as they did because the current administration seemed to be more reliable. U.S.-Russian relations reached their lowest point in the last twenty years in no small part because of a “more active U.S. policy” toward the Middle East, the South Caucasus, and central Europe. Putin might be willing to deal with a more hard-line American President, but only so long as it this translated into tangible gains for Russia. Provided that the hard-liner was willing to live up to his end of the bargain, there could be some room for agreement, but there isn’t any. Since Romney’s Russia policy is essentially to never make any deals with the current Russian government, Putin doesn’t have much of an incentive to cooperate. That will guarantee that U.S.-Russian relations will deteriorate much more than they have in the last year.

Ext – Romney Kills US/Russian Relations

#### Conservative president hurts Russia relations and increases US-Sino tension

**Minchev 12** (Ognyan Minchev, writer for Real Clear World, 6/27/12, Real Clear World, “Understanding Russia's Anti-Americanism,” http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2012/06/27/understanding\_russias\_anti-americanism\_100107.html)

Yet, there would almost certainly be tradeoffs. A conservative president would likely engage in more assertive policies toward Moscow. A more active U.S. policy toward the Middle East, the South Caucasus, or Central Europe would risk clashing more openly with Russia's positions. Why would Putin want this, given the fragility of Russian power today? Threats have been a key driver of Russian power politics throughout the history of the Empire. Putin's calculations could take many forms. A more active U.S. policy on disputed issues might demonstrate not only American power but also reveal American weaknesses. A more assertive U.S. presence in the spheres of Russian interest might also provoke more active opposition by China, and Russia may benefit from greater competition between Beijing and Washington. Or Putin might prefer an immediate, open rivalry with what he perceives to be a weakened United States across a range of issues.

#### Romney openly wants to sever US-Russia relations

**Larison 12** (Daniel Larison, writer for The American Conservative 6/1/12, The American Conservative, “Gillespie: Romney Will Align U.S. and Russian Interests More Than Obama,” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/gillespie-says-that-romney-will-align-u-s-and-russian-relations-more-than-obama/)

Gillespie doesn’t seem to know that his candidate is campaigning on a pledge to undo the “reset” because he believes (falsely) it has been too favorable to Russia, and he must not know that an article appearing under Romney’s name made a point of stressing how generally pleased Moscow was with Obama’s Russia policy. The Romney campaign thinks this is a liability for Obama, and it was trying to change the subject from the mockery Romney was receiving after he labeled Russia “our number one geopolitical foe.” The funny thing here is that Gillespie must think he is doing Romney a favor by talking up how Romney will reduce Russian “hostility.” Perhaps someone failed to remind Gillespie that his candidate wants to antagonize Russia at every turn. Instead of helping his candidate, Gillespie has completely undermined Romney’s criticism of Obama on Russia. Romney has never claimed any interest in aligning U.S. and Russian relations. He claims that the effort to do so over the last three years has been misguided, and he seems to think that finding common interests isn’t possible. He isn’t concerned to reduce Russian hostility. Everything he has said about Russia seems designed to stoke it. What makes Gillespie’s comments so bizarre is that U.S.-Russian relations have demonstrably improved over the last three years. They have been relatively cooler and rockier in the last year because of disagreements over missile defense, the conduct of the Libyan war, and over how to respond to the conflict in Syria, but they are still far better than they were in late 2008 and early 2009. Even though Chuck Todd seems clueless on this point, the improvement in relations is not really in dispute. Gillespie has forgotten that Romney doesn’t want U.S.-Russian relations improved, and he has consistently opposed the attempt to improve them. The idea that Romney could preside over an even better U.S.-Russian relationship with his relentlessly anti-Russian posturing is not remotely credible. Gillespie’s interview is a remarkable breach of the Romney campaign’s normal discipline and its ability to stay on message.

Ext – Romney Kills US/Russian Relations

#### Romney’s Russia-relations policy is nonsensical and steeped in agression

**Adomanis 12** (Mark Adomanis, Forbes Contributor, 1/6/12, Forbes, “Mitt Romney's Russia Policy - A Lot of Nothing,” http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/01/06/mitt-romneys-russia-policy-a-lot-of-nothing/)

Romney’s suggestion that he will “enhance diplomatic ties, increase military training and assistance, and negotiate trade pacts and educational exchanges with Central Asian states” is realism 101, a perfectly Kissingerian response to a foreign threat. Indeed this is basically “containment” updated for the 21st century: we’ll work with anyone, anywhere in Central Asia, provided that they agree to work against Russian power. I personally fail to see how this actually serves the vital interests of the United States (we were ever in any danger from Central Asia when it was a constituent part of the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union?) but bolstering Central Asian states to stymie Russian influence is perfectly rational and can be an understandable and even rather banal component of a broadly realist vision for US foreign policy. The problem, though, is the very next bullet point where Romney promises that his administration will “forthrightly confront the Russian government over its authoritarian practices.” By itself this would make perfect sense as part of a broadly neoconservative, morality-driven vision for US foreign policy that places a premium on support for civil society and democracy. I would, of course, disagree with such a policy, I think the US has more than enough to worry about without obsessing over the internal politics of other countries, but there is an intellectually coherent and consistent case to be made that the US should make democracy promotion a primary objective. But when taken in combination with Romney’s promise to work hand-in-hand with Central Asian despots, his promise to confront Russian authoritarianism becomes totally contradictory, hypocritical, and nonsensical. Romney is proposing that he will angrily and aggressively confront the Kremlin over its human rights violations, while simultaneously giving weapons, money, and diplomatic cover to Central Asian states despite their far more egregious human rights violations. Romney’s Russia policy thus has hypocrisy built into its very foundations in the explicit admission that one country will be treated with one set of standards (forceful confrontation over any and all alleged human rights abuses) and that other countries will be treated with an entirely different set of standards in which their ability to “deter Russian ambitions” is paramount.

#### Electing Romney causes Russian crisis

**Armbruster 12** (BEN ARMBRUSTER is National Security Editor for ThinkProgress.org at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, 7.3.12, Think Progress, “Russian Official: Romney’s Hostile Rhetoric Could Bring ‘A Full-Scale Crisis’,” http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/07/03/510342/russian-official-romney-crisis/)

The Los Angeles Times reports that Alexey Pushkov, chairman of the international affairs committee of Russia’s State Duma, said in a recent interview that Russian leaders are wondering whether Mitt Romney’s aggressive rhetoric toward Russia is previewing a “full-scale crisis” should he be elected president in November. Pushkov is referring to Romney’s comment during the campaign that Russia is America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” “We don’t think that for us Romney will be an easy partner,” said Pushkov, an ally of President Vladimir Putin. “We think that Romney will be, on the rhetorical side, a replay of the Bush administration.” [...] “If he is serious about this, I’m afraid he may choose the neocon-type people…In the first year of his presidency, we may have a full-scale crisis,” he said. President George W. Bush’s secretary of state, Gen. Colin Powell, also recently criticized Romney’s comments on Russia. “When governor Romney not to long ago said ‘the Russian federation is our number one geo-strategic threat.’ Well, come on, Mitt, think. That isn’t the case,” he said. Even one of Romney’s own foreign policy advisers thinks the former Massachusetts governor went a bit too far on Russia. “I think Romney is right to make Russia an issue,” the adviser told the Daily Beast. “But when he said that, the campaign should have walked it back and moved on.”

### US/Russia Relations – Iran

#### Romney will end cooperation with Russia --- spills over to Iran proliferation, Afghanistan and CTR programs

**Lyman**, 3/30/**2012** (John – editor-in-chief of International Policy Digest, Romney’s Foreign Policy and Russia, International Policy Digest, p. http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/03/30/romneys-foreign-policy-and-russia/)

U.S.-Russian relations transcend the United Nations and other multilateral institutions. The United States relies on Russian assistance in counterterrorism, Afghanistan, shoring up loose nuclear material in the former Soviet Republics, international narcotics trafficking, WMD proliferation and reducing American and Russian nuclear stockpiles, which has become a cause celeb for Mr. Obama. Obama has calculated that the Russians would be amendable to significant reductions in their nuclear stockpiles if he negotiates with the Russians in good faith over missile defense. This process was started several years ago in an effort to “reset” U.S.-Russian relations, when Obama ordered a different configuration to the missile defense system – the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) – planned for construction in Eastern Europe. The original system envisioned a radar base that was to be built in the Czech Republic with interceptors housed in Poland. The EPAA is designed to intercept ballistic missiles launched from “rogue” nations from interceptors housed in Poland and now Romania. The Russians have been highly critical of the system first announced by the Bush administration as they claim it would undermine their own nuclear deterrent. “This is not a matter of hiding the ball,” Mr. Obama said. “I want to see us gradually, systematically reduce reliance on nuclear weapons.” Now that Mr. Romney has antagonized the Russians, he might find it **difficult to negotiate with them over a whole host of issues**, much less getting Russia on board with prodding the Iranians to return to the negotiating table or facilitating America’s withdrawal from Afghanistan if he defeats Mr. Obama in November.

#### Iranian proliferation causes nuclear war.

Henry **Sokolsky**, executive director – nonproliferation policy education center, 10/1/**2003**, Policy Review, p. lexis

If nothing is done to shore up U.S. and allied security relations with the Gulf Coordination Council states and with Iraq, Turkey, and Egypt, Iran's acquisition of even a nuclear weapons breakout capability could prompt one or more of these states to try to acquire a nuclear weapons option of their own. Similarly, if the U.S. fails to hold Pyongyang accountable for its violation of the NPT or lets Pyongyang hold on to one or more nuclear weapons while appearing to reward its violation with a new deal--one that heeds North Korea's demand for a nonaggression pact and continued construction of the two light water reactors--South Korea and Japan (and later, perhaps, Taiwan) will have powerful cause to question Washington's security commitment to them and their own pledges to stay non-nuclear. In such a world, Washington's worries would not be limited to gauging the military capabilities of a growing number of hostile, nuclear, or near-nuclear-armed nations. In addition, it would have to gauge the reliability of a growing number of nuclear or near-nuclear friends. Washington might still be able to assemble coalitions, but with more nations like France, with nuclear options of their own, it would be much, much more iffy. The amount of international intrigue such a world would generate would also easily exceed what our diplomats and leaders could manage or track. Rather than worry about using force for fear of producing another Vietnam, Washington and its very closest allies are more likely to grow weary of working closely with others and view military options through the rosy lens of their relatively quick victories in Desert Storm, Kosovo, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Just Cause. This would be a world disturbingly similar to that of 1914 but with one big difference: It would be spring-loaded to go nuclear.

### US/Russia Relations – Warming

#### US/Russia relations is the critical internal link to global warming

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

The summit between President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev in Moscow on July 6-8 comes in the middle of a packed international schedule of bilateral and multilateral meetings for the United States. on climate change. In the run up to the critical U.N. climate talks in Copenhagen at the end of this year, when the extension or successor to the existing Kyoto Protocol must be agreed upon, it is crucial that the United States and Russia—both major emitters of greenhouse gases and potentially leaders on this crucial issue—explore ways of working together to ensure a positive outcome at these talks. Enhancing cooperation on climate change and energy efficiency should be a major plank of U.S. Russia policy and should be discussed at the highest levels when President Obama meets with President Medvedev next week. Russia, like the United States, is a significant contributor to global warming. If the European Union is disaggregated Russia is the third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide behind the United States and China and still currently ahead of India. More importantly Russian per capita emissions are on the rise, and are projected at this point to approach America’s top rank as per capita emitter by 2030. Russia is also the third-largest consumer of energy and one of the world’s most energy-intensive economies. Making Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to advance a sound global climate change agenda.

#### Cooperation is the most effective warming solution --- solves in the short-term

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

One of the most striking features of Russia’s energy profile is its energy intensity—the amount of energy consumed per unit of gross domestic product—which is **higher than any of the world’s 10-largest energy-consuming countries**, 3.1 times greater than the European Union, and more than twice that of the United States. This massive potential for improvement makes working with the Russians to increase their energy efficiency the most effective short-term way to help them reduce emissions and points toward the clearest path for demonstrating the economic advantages of taking on climate change.

#### Cooperation solves a larger magnitude for solving --- international cooperation

**Light, Wong and Charap**, 6/30/**2009** (Andrew – senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Julian – senior policy analyst at CAP, and Samuel – fellow at CAP, U.S.-Russia Climate and Energy Efficiency Cooperation: A Neglected Challenge, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/06/neglected\_challenge.html)

Second, Russia could be one of the unacknowledged keys to success at Copenhagen given the likely structure of the treaty. According to the architecture of the first U.N. climate treaty the Kyoto Protocol could not have been enacted unless at least 55 countries signed and ratified it representing at least 55 percent of global carbon emissions. When the first round of commitments were announced enough countries were willing to ratify the treaty but their emissions did not add up to the required amount for implementation. So if Russia had not ratified the treaty in November 2004 it would have not gone into effect. Russian participation could again be critical this time because we can expect a similar proviso in the post-Kyoto treaty. We need to bring the Russians on board for an ambitious agenda before Copenhagen sooner rather than later to avoid a deadlock in the international climate negotiations. Immediate bilateral cooperation and engagement is key in **making Russia a partner in addressing climate change**—it is not in the U.S. interest for Russia to be a spoiler.

### Missile Defense Coop 2NC

#### Failure to reach an agreement on missile defense collapses relations

**Trenin et. al**, June **2012** (Dmitri – director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, Maria Lipman – editor-in-chief of Pro Et Contra, Alexey Malashenko – scholar-in-residence in Religion, Society and Security at the Moscow Center, Nikolay Petrov – scholar-in-residence in the Society and Regions Program at the Moscow Center, Russia on the Move, p. <http://carnegieeurope.eu/publications/?fa=48309>)

But strategically, the United States is still Russia’s de facto main potential adversary: Many influential Russians suspect that Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney, not Barack Obama, reflects the U.S. establishment’s real views on Russia. In their analysis, U.S. global missile defense efforts bespeak a consistent desire to neutralize Russia’s nuclear deterrent and make the country vulnerable to U.S. non-nuclear strategic weaponry. A U.S.-Russian agreement on missile defense, if it is reached in a second Obama term, could thus defuse a looming crisis in the relationship. However, a failure to agree could lead to deeper and more pronounced hostility. In today’s geopolitical context, that would probably mean Russia drawing further away from the West and closer to China, amounting to a major geostrategic shift on a global scale.

### Ext – Obama Will Promote MD Coop

#### Obama would be willing to negotiate on missile defense posture

**Boyer 12** (David Boyer, a White House correspondent for The Washington Times, 5/26/12, The Washington Times, “Hot mic: Obama begs Russians for ‘space’ on missile defense talks,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/mar/26/obama-begs-russians-space-missile-defense-talks/)

SEOUL — Unaware that a microphone was recording him, President Obama asked outgoing Russian President Dmitry Medvedev Monday for breathing room until after Mr. Obama’s re-election campaign to negotiate on missile defense. “On all these issues, but particularly missile defense, this, this can be solved, but it’s important for him to give me space,” Mr. Obama told Mr. Medvedev at the end of their 90-minute meeting, apparently referring to incoming Russian President Vladimir Putin. Mr. Medvedev replied, “Yeah, I understand. I understand your message about space. Space for you…” “This is my last election,” Mr. Obama said. “After my election, I have more flexibility.” The Russian leader responded, “I understand. I transmit this information to Vladimir.” The exchange was picked up by microphone of a Russian reporter as journalists were allowed into the meeting room for remarks by the two leaders. It was first reported by ABC News, which said it verified the conversation. A Washington Times reporter heard a portion of the tape that begins with Mr. Obama saying, “This is my last election.” The two leaders are in Seoul for a nuclear security summit involving the heads of more than 50 nations. Mr. Obama and Mr. Medvedev were huddling close together in their respective chairs when the conversation took place. White House deputy national security adviser Ben Rhodes, who attended the meeting, at first said he didn’t hear the exchange and couldn’t comment on it. Within an hour, however, Mr. Rhodes issued a statement via email that said the U.S. “is committed to implementing our missile defense system, which we’ve repeatedly said is not aimed at Russia.” “However, given the longstanding difference between the U.S. and Russia on this issue, it will take time and technical work before we can try to reach an agreement,” Mr. Rhodes said. “Since 2012 is an election year in both countries, with an election and leadership transition in Russia and an election in the United States, it is clearly not a year in which we are going to achieve a breakthrough. Therefore, President Obama and President Medvedev agreed that it was best to instruct our technical experts to do the work of better understanding our respective positions, providing space for continued discussions on missile defense cooperation going forward.”

#### Only Obama will work with Russia on moderate missile defense

**Gearan and Babington 12** (Anne Gearan and Charles Babington, writers for the Associated Press, 5/26/12, Christian Science Monitor, “Obama tells Russia that election will bring 'flexibility' on missile defense,” http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Latest-News-Wires/2012/0326/Obama-tells-Russia-that-election-will-bring-flexibility-on-missile-defense)

President Barack Obama told Russia's leader Monday that he would have more flexibility after the November election to deal with the contentious issue of missile defense, a candid assessment of political reality that was picked up by a microphone without either leader apparently knowing. Obama's Republican opponents pounced on the comment, saying the president has a hidden agenda that could include concessions to the Russians if he is re-elected this fall. "This is my last election," Obama is heard telling outgoing Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. "After my election, I have more flexibility." Medvedev replied in English, according to ABC News: "I understand. I will transmit this information to Vladimir," an apparent reference to incoming President Vladmir Putin. Obama and Medvedev did not intend for their comments, made during a meeting in Seoul, South Korea, to be made public. QUIZ: How much do you know about Russia? Once they were, the White House said Obama's words reflected the reality that domestic political concerns in both the U.S. and Russia this year would make it difficult to fully address their long-standing differences over the contentious issue of missile defense. Obama, should he win re-election, would not have to face voters again. "Since 2012 is an election year in both countries, with an election and leadership transition in Russia and an election in the United States, it is clearly not a year in which we are going to achieve a breakthrough," White House deputy national security adviser Ben Rhodes said. Obama made light of the flap at his next public meeting with Medvedev. Opening the nuclear security summit that brought both leaders to South Korea, Obama jokingly moved to cover his microphone as he and Medvedev took their seats. "Wait, wait!" Obama said, grinning. Obama's candid remarks Monday illustrated the political constraints that hem in any president who is running for re-election and dealing with a congressional chamber — in this case, the House — controlled by the rival party. Republicans have fought Obama fiercely on health care, taxes and other issues. They are eager to deny him any political victories in a season in which they feel the White House is within reach, although Obama's remarks suggested he feels good about his re-election prospects. Even if Obama was confiding a political reality in a supposedly private moment, the comments gave the GOP new openings to question his sincerity and long-range plans. Mitt Romney, the leading Republican contender to face Obama this fall, told a San Diego audience the unguarded comments were "an alarming and troubling development." "This is no time for our president to be pulling his punches with the American people, and not telling us what he's intending to do with regards to our missile defense system, with regards to our military might and with regards to our commitment to Israel," Romney said. Romney, a former Massachusetts governor who often faces charges of having been flexible on his own policies over the years, also issued a statement saying Obama "needs to level with the American public about his real agenda." Obama campaign spokesman Ben LaBolt said Romney "is undermining his credibility by distorting the president's words." Republican presidential candidate Newt Gingrich also questioned Obama's motives. "I'm curious, how many other countries has the president promised that he'd have a lot more flexibility the morning he doesn't have to answer to the American people?" Gingrich said on CNN. Rep. Mike Turner of Ohio, Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, wrote to the president requesting an "urgent explanation of (his) comments." Turner said Congress "has made exquisitely clear to your administration and to other nations that it will block all attempts to weaken U.S. missile defenses." The Republicans' sharp remarks underscore increased willingness of politicians to criticize a president on a foreign trip. The old adage "politics ends at the water's edge" is a casualty of the nation's heightened partisanship in recent decades. Tensions over missile defense have threatened to upend the overall thawing of relations between the U.S. and Russia in recent years. Both leaders acknowledged as much in their public statements to reporters following their meeting. Obama said there was "more work to do" to bridge their differences. Medvedev said each country had its own position on missile defense but there was still time to find a solution. Congress, as part of the fiscal 2012 defense authorization act, constrained Obama's ability to share classified U.S. missile defense information with Russia. Obama signed that legislation into law. Russia has strongly criticized plans for a U.S.-led NATO missile defense in Europe. Russian officials believe the planned missile shield would target Russia's nuclear deterrent and undermine global stability. The U.S. says the planned missile shield is intended to counter threats from Iran. Putin said earlier this month that Washington's refusal to offer Moscow written guarantees that its missile defense system would not be aimed against Russia deepened its concerns. Putin won elections earlier this year and will return to the presidency later this spring. He is expected to name Medvedev prime minister.

### Ext – Romney Promotes Aggressive MD

#### Romney would return to hardline missile defense – wouldn’t cooperate with Russia

**Oppel 12** (Richard A. Oppel, Jr., writer for the New York Times, 5/11/12, NYT, “Romney’s Adversarial View of Russia Stirs Debate,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/12/us/politics/romneys-view-of-russia-sparks-debate.html?pagewanted=2&\_r=2&pagewanted=print)

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.

#### Romney has hardline, uncooperative approach to missile defense – it fails

**Larison 12** (Daniel Larison, writer for The American Conservative, 6/19/12, The American Conservative, “When Romney Calls for “Resolve and Strength,” He Is Endorsing Recklessness and Aggression,” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/when-romney-calls-for-resolve-and-strength-he-is-endorsing-recklessness-and-aggression/)

Mitt Romney is still harping on the 2009 missile defense decision: 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. Let’s try a thought experiment. Suppose that Obama hadn’t cancelled the Bush-era missile defense plan, but had gone ahead with it as planned. This presumably would have proven American “resolve and strength” and put the Russians on notice that (horrible) Bush-era Russia policy was going to continue. Apparently, resolve and strength are proven by wasting money on something that doesn’t reliably work to maintain the fiction that the U.S. is being protected against an Iranian long-range missile threat that doesn’t exist, but never mind that. In fact, the very limited concession on the Bush-era missile defense plan was an essential gesture of goodwill that convinced Moscow that Obama was serious in trying to develop a more constructive relationship with Russia. If Romney had his way, that gesture would never have happened. What would U.S.-Russian relations be like today if those missile defense installations were being built over the last few years? We can’t know for certain, but everything we know about Russian reactions to U.S. missile defense proposals tells us that relations with Russia would be much worse. Relations between Russia and the host countries, Poland and the Czech Republic, would also be significantly worse than they are. Russian support for U.N. sanctions on Iran might not have been forthcoming, and there is no chance that Russia would be paying any attention to Washington’s pleas for cooperation in Syria. All of the Russian behavior that Romney and other critics find unsatisfactory or unacceptable would still be happening, and on top of it Russia would be less inclined to cooperate with the U.S. on those issues where there are common interests. Romney seems to assume that demonstrating “resolve and strength” impresses foreign governments and causes them to forget that they disagree with the U.S. on certain issues. Awed by our “resolve and strength,” they will hasten to be more cooperative. That’s the fantasy that Romney is indulging here. The reality is that foreign governments often perceive “resolve and strength” as insulting condescension and arrogance on our part, which makes them more defensive and suspicious of U.S. motives. After 2003, Bush repeatedly showed what his supporters considered to be “resolve and strength” in eastern Europe and post-Soviet space, and it was perceived with good reason as a U.S. effort to undermine and roll back Russian influence. That inevitably increased tensions between the U.S. and Russia that finally exploded in 2008.

Ext – Romney Promotes Aggressive MD

#### Romney has hardline aggressive approach to Russian relations – no cooperation

**Mataconis 12** (Doug Mataconis, Senior Editor for OTB, holds a B.A. in Political Science from Rutgers University and J.D. from George Mason University School of Law, 6.19.12, Outside the Beltway, “Romney Continues To Attack Russia,” http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/romney-continues-to-attack-russia/)

Mitt Romney made headlines back in March when he referred to Russia as “our number one geopolitical foe,” a comment that was immediately criticized by Russian leaders and many members of the foreign policy establishment. Additionally, as The New York Times noted in an article last month, Romney’s remarks and his continued hard-line position toward Russia have been the subject of controversy within Republican foreign policy circles, with even some of Romney’s own advisers quite obviously disagreeing with their boss on the matter. Any chance those advisers might have influenced Romney to tone down his rhetoric, though, seems to have gone out the window now that Romney has essentially doubled down on his previous comments: 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 position that has raised questions among Democrats and even some Republicansabout 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 G-20 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.” “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.

### Aggressive MD Bad – Arms Race

#### Aggressive missile defense sparks Russia first strike and nuclear buildup

**BBC 12** (BBC News, 5/3/12, BBC,“Russia warns on missile defence deal with Nato and US,” http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-17937795)

Russia says it is prepared to use "destructive force pre-emptively" if the US goes ahead with controversial plans for a missile defence system based in Central Europe. The warning came after the Russian defence minister said talks on missile defence were nearing a dead end. Moscow fears that missile interceptors would be a threat to Russia's security. But the US and Nato say they are intended to protect against attacks from Iran or North Korea. "A decision to use destructive force pre-emptively will be taken if the situation worsens," chief of the Russian defence staff Gen Nikolai Makarov said. 'Flawed assumptions' Two days of talks opened on Thursday in Moscow between Russia, the US and Nato. Russian Defence Minister Anatoly Serdyukov said the talks were "close to a dead end", but Nato said it remained hopeful of reaching a deal. Nato Deputy Secretary General Alexander Vershbow told the BBC that Russia's fears of a European missile defence shield were "based on some flawed assumptions" and did not weaken Russia's nuclear deterrent. Gen Makarov also said that if the European shield was built, Russia would respond by putting more powerful warheads on its own ballistic missiles.

### Aggressive MD Bad – Conflict

#### Hardline missile defense causes missile build up, arms race, Russian first strike, and collapse of relations

**Weir 12** (Fred Weir, Russia correspondent for CSM, 5/4/12, Christian Science Monitor, “Russia threatens to take aim at NATO's missile defense shield,” http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Europe/2012/0504/Russia-threatens-to-take-aim-at-NATO-s-missile-defense-shield)

A 50-nation conference aimed at airing differences between Russia and the US over missile defense ended today in Moscow, apparently having accomplished its purpose all too well: Russia's top general threatened to attack NATO missile defense positions. Yesterday Russian officials declared that talks aimed at finding a compromise have all but reached a dead end, and Russia's military chief of staff Gen. Nikolai Makarov threatened a preemptive rocket strike against NATO missile defense emplacements if current deployment plans go ahead. "A decision to use destructive force preemptively will be taken if the situation worsens," Gen. Makarov told the stunned gathering of delegations from almost 50 countries, including NATO, the US, former Soviet republics, China, South Korea, and Japan. Russian military experts used computer simulations and other graphic aids to make their case that current plans to deploy a European missile defense shield will undermine Russia's strategic nuclear deterrent in its later stages, and by 2025 may render Russia's nuclear forces obsolete. RELATED: How much do you know about Russia? Kremlin leaders have repeatedly warned that going ahead with the Pentagon's missile defense shield could lead to a new arms race and permanently undermine prospects for East-West cooperation. "We believe that we have outlined our concerns clearly, before the world, and everyone can see that our case is reasonable," says Sergei Markov, a political expert who has frequently advised incoming President Vladimir Putin. "We think the US should realize the plan it has suggested will lead to a new arms race, and they should return to the table with fresh approaches." Mr. Makarov warned that Russia will begin to deploy Iskander-M short range missiles in its western enclave of Kaliningrad, and also in Russia's south and far eastern territories, to be used in potential strikes against US antimissile systems around the world, not only in Europe. Ellen Tauscher, US special envoy for Strategic Stability and Missile Defense, told a Moscow press conference yesterday that Makarov is painting a picture of "Christmas future" (a reference to Charles Dickens's "A Christmas Carol"), a dire scenario that needn't come to pass if both sides keep talking constructively.

### Aggressive MD Bad – First Strike

#### Hardline missile defense causes Russia to strike first – biggest nuclear threat

**RT News 12** (RT News, 5/3/12, RT News, “Russia 'retains right' to pre-emptive strike on missile shield,” http://www.rt.com/news/russia-pre-emptive-strikes-abm-488/)

Russia is ready for a pre-emptive strike on European missile defense systems if the US refuses dialogue, stated Russia’s senior military official. Washington has responded by saying it doesn’t rule out giving Russia legally binding guarantees on ABM. “Russia is constantly speaking about guarantees of ABM systems not targeting it, but we think we need to come to cooperation. We provide guarantees after we start cooperating,” Ellen Tauscher, US Special Envoy for Strategic Stability and Missile Defense, told reporters at the end of the first day of the Moscow ABM conference. Earlier on Thursday Russia’s Chief of General Staff Nikolay Makarov stated that Russia might consider a pre-emptive strike an option in certain circumstances. “Considering the destabilizing nature of the [American] ABM system, namely the creation of an illusion of inflicting a disarming [nuclear] strike with impunity, a decision on pre-emptive deployment of assault weapons could be taken when the situation gets harder,” Makarov said. Among other measures, Russia has already promised to deploy short-range Iskander missiles in the Kaliningrad Region if NATO fails to reach agreement with it on missile defense. After Makarov`s remarks, the NATO delegation present at the conference hastened to take issue with the Russian general, saying that the ABM system would never target Russia. Russia is concerned that the ultimate aim of America’s global ABM shield is the gradual diminution of the effectiveness of Russia’s nuclear arsenal. Moscow says no country possesses any militarily significant quantity of nukes to pose a vital nuclear threat to the US other than Russia. Vice chairman of the Polish foreign affairs committee Tadeusz Iwinski told RT a pre-emptive strike on Poland represented the “worst case scenario.”

#### Proposed missile defense causes Russia nuclear first strike – only Obama will compromise

**Gomez 12** (Christian Gomez, writer for The New America, 7.2.12, The New America, “Russia's Continued Cold War,” http://thenewamerican.com/world-news/europe/item/11925-russias-continued-cold-war)

On May 3, 2012, Russian Chief of General Staff Nikolai Makarov warned that Russia would deploy its strategic nuclear rockets in Kaliningrad Oblast, potentially to destroy the U.S. antiballistic missile defense system, planned for Europe. Makarov went even further, warning of a possible preemptive nuclear attack. “A decision to use destructive force preemptively will be taken if the situation worsens,” Makarov said. The planned U.S. missile defense system to protect Europe from a nuclear missile attack has caused much friction between the Russia and United States. Russia considers the antiballistic missile system an encroachment on its traditional “sphere of influence” and a threat to its national security, seeing as it could neutralize Russia’s nuclear deterrence of Europe. In the event of a war, this would give the U.S. and NATO a considerable advantage; the U.S. or NATO would be able to launch a preemptive strike on Russia without having to fear nuclear retaliation. As a result, Russia views the system as an indication the U.S. and NATO intend to go to war with Russia. The U.S., on the other hand, has repeatedly stated that its intention is not to deter a missile launch from Russia, but from either Iran or North Korea. The U.S. and its NATO partners, including Britain, Poland, and the Czech Republic, are committed to its deployment, while Russia fiercely opposes it. Neither side will budge — that is up until now. “This is my last election. After my election I have more flexibility,” President Barack Obama privately told Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, at the Nuclear Security Summit, in Seoul, South Korea, on March 26, 2012. Medvedev replied, “I understand you. I transmit this information to Vladimir [Putin], and I stand with you.” Vladimir Putin was not the only person Obama’s “private message” was transmitted to. Unbeknownst to Obama or Medvedev, their conversation was recorded and broadcast live via an open microphone and camera. “Reset,” New START Treaty, the acceptance of Russian surveillance flights over the U.S., Russian troops training in Colorado, and “flexibility” over missile defense; over the last four years President Obama has gone forward with convergence toward Russia. The U.S. may have stopped fighting the Cold War, but Russia has not.

### Aggressive MD Bad – START

#### Cooperation necessary – continued missile defense allows START withdrawal and collapse of relations

**Weir 11** (Fred Weir, writer for CSM, 6.8.11, Christian Science Monitor, “New US-Russia arms race? Battle lines grow over missile defense.,” http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Europe/2011/0608/New-US-Russia-arms-race-Battle-lines-grow-over-missile-defense/(page)/2)

The Russians say rhetorical pledges aren't good enough. "Russia wants commitments and legal guarantees which the Obama administration is not able to provide," says Vladimir Dvorkin, an expert with the Security Center at the official Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow. "Political stubborness on both sides makes it difficult to have a constructive dialogue on this topic." The Kremlin appears deeply concerned about the Pentagon's "Phased Adaptive" missile defense plan, which envisages about 440 antimissile interceptors based on 43 ships and two European land bases, in Poland and Romania, by the end of this decade. The biggest worry, Russian experts say, is the later phases of the project, which will see large numbers of the advanced SM-3 "Block II" interceptors deployed beginning in 2018. "The situation completely changes with the realization of the (later) stages of the missile defense plan," Lt. Gen. Andrei Tretyak, of Russia's General Staff, told journalists last month. "This is a real threat to our strategic nuclear forces." Gen. Tretyak said that exhaustive studies ordered by Russia's Defense Ministry have concluded that the planned deployments would pose a sufficient menace to Russian intercontinental missiles that Russia's strategic parity with the US would be undermined, along with the basic principles of the New START treaty. Wording inserted into that treaty by Russia specifically allows it to withdraw if the West deploys antimissile weapons "capable of significantly reducing the effectiveness of the Russian Federation's strategic nuclear forces." Sign up now to receive our daily World Editor's Picks newsletter. Our best stories, in your inbox. A Russian withdrawal from New START might bring all progress in US-Russia relations to a halt, and greatly encourage foreign policy hardliners on both sides. Obama and Medvedev, both of whom face looming reelection battles, need to avoid that and find a formula that at least allows Russia and the US to continue talking amicably about missile defense cooperation, experts say. The outcome of Thursday's meeting between Mr. Gates and Mr. Serdyukov will be closely watched for the positive, or negative, signal it sends. "New START was the single real success of the US-Russia reset of relations, and it would be politically bad for both Obama and Medvedev if it were seen to be a failure," says Viktor Kremeniuk, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "But the only sure way to save it is to move forward and tackle the thorny issue of missile defense," he says. "The burning need of both presidents to win a political success can break the logjam in these talks and make the nuts-and-bolts negotiators move along faster. This can be solved, but it will take political will."

#### START collapse causes extinction.

**Collins and Rojansky**, 8/18/**2010** (James – director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ex-US ambassador to the Russian Federation, and Matthew – deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program, Why Russia Matters, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/08/18/why\_Russia\_matters)

Russia's nukes are still an existential threat. Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together.

### START Good – Nuclear War

#### START prevents US/Russia nuclear war

**Isaacs**, 12/4/**2009** (John – executive director of the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, Rebuttals to Arguments Against New START, p. <http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/nuclearweapons/articles/rebuttals_to_arguments_against_new_start/>)

Response: First, it is not necessarily the case that Russia will reduce its nuclear forces without a new arms control agreement. Nor is it true that Russia needs or wants a new arms control agreement far more than the U.S. does. Without limits on the size of U.S. and Russian nuclear forces, Russia would have less confidence in its ability to maintain a stable strategic nuclear relationship with the United States. This could give the upper-hand to hardliners in Moscow who want to slow or even halt plans to reduce the number of deployed warheads and delivery vehicles and invest in additional strategic modernization programs. Second, the Strategic Posture Commission found that “the sizing of U.S. forces remains overwhelmingly driven by Russia.” If the Russians are reducing nuclear weapons, it is appropriate for the U.S. to do so. Third, the fact the some Russian reductions might happen in any event is beside the point. If START I is allowed to expire without a new arms control agreement to replace it, so too would the limits on and the means of verifying the two countries’ still enormous nuclear stockpiles and delivery systems. These limits and verification provisions greatly enhance U.S. security by (1) bringing predictability and stability to U.S.-Russian nuclear relations, (2) giving each side confidence than neither side is attempting to retain a significant strategic advantage, and (3) reducing the chances for misunderstanding and worst-case scenario planning. Though the Cold War ended two decades ago, the risks of an accidental or mistaken U.S.-Russian nuclear exchange still exist. A new arms control treaty will reduce this risk.

### Syria Arms 2NC

#### Romney will arm Syrian rebels and Obama will not --- that destabilizes the Middle East.

**Cole**, 6/1/**2012** (Juan – public intellectual, prominent blogger and essayist, Richard P. Mitchell Collegiate Professor of History at the University of Michigan, Top Ten Reasons Romney Shouldn’t Arm Syrian Rebels, p. http://www.juancole.com/2012/06/top-ten-reasons-romney-shouldnt-arm-syrian-rebels.html)

GOP presidential hopeful Willard “Mitt” Romney has called on President Barack Obama to arm the Syrian opposition, accusing the president of lacking leadership for declining to do so. Romney can’t decide whether he is afraid of Muslims or wants to give them sophisticated weapons. He once explained that he did not want to focus on killing Bin Laden because he was just one leader, and the problem was ‘Sunni and Shia’ and ‘the Muslim Brotherhood and … Hizbullah… etc.’ In other words, Romney looks at a fifth of humankind and jumps out of his skin in fright that there might be Muslims out there. Romney does not seem to know that the ruling Baath Party in Syria is a secular party founded by Arab Christians and supported by many Syrian Christians, Alawis (folk Shiites) and secular Sunnis. Personally, I don’t have a problem with the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood being part of the coalition that overthrows the Baath, since the al-Assad version of the party has gone fascist and verges on the genocidal. But Romney at least tried to demonize the Muslim Brotherhood as somehow part of the same phenomenon as al-Qaeda (it is not). He is, let us say, being inconsistent. So here are some reasons Gov. Romney might consider as to why arming the Syrian rebels is a very bad idea. 1. Once a country is flooded with weapons, they don’t stay in that country. They get resold and spread around the region. Egypt has seen a spike in shootings because of the influx of Libyan guns, and the Egyptian military even intercepted a shipment of smuggled rocket-propelled grenades. The Israelis are petrified that some of the more sophisticated rocket propelled grenades that Qatar gave the Libyan rebels are making their way into Gaza and be used by Hamas against its soldiers. Arms given Syrian rebels will subsequently make their way into Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, the West Bank, Gaza and Egypt. Is that wise? 2. The Islamic State of Iraq, an al-Qaeda affiliate, is among those fighting the Syrian regime. So far it is a bit player in that country, but it certainly would be among the groups receiving American weapons from Romney. Since ISoI has killed a lot of US troops and keeps blowing up Baghdad (its attacks left 18 dead in Baghdad yesterday) — is that wise? 3. Armed militias are hard to demobilize. Libya still suffers from this problem outside the big urban centers. You can tell ordinary soldiers to turn in their weapons and go home. Militiamen will try to keep power, or will hold you hostage with their guns until you pay them off. A post-revolution Syria will be **much more stable** if it is brought to power by relatively peaceful crowds, as happened in Tunisia and Egypt, than if tribal and sectarian armed gangs come out on top. 4. Syria is geopolitically too important to flood with powerful arms. It abuts Israel, Jordan, Iraq, and Turkey. A US-supplied war that spills over onto these countries is a nightmare for US policy. 5. The conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians has entered a new and dangerous phase, with a significant expansion of Israeli theft of land and resources from Palestinians of the West Bank. The latter had been convinced to lay down their arms and join in a ‘peace process.’ The combination of the betrayal of all the promises made to the Palestinians about giving them a state and returning to them their territory, along with easy availability of US arms from Syria, might well provoke another violent Intifida or uprising. 6. The conflict in Syria is already threatening to destabilize Lebanon. That country’s disarming of its sectarian militias in the 1990s after the Ta’if Accords was a major achievement for stability in the Eastern Mediterranean. American arms given to Syrian rebels would risk **reviving armed militias in Lebanon**, where some groups (the Shiite Hizbullah e.g.) favor the al-Assad regime whereas others (many Sunnis) support the Syrian opposition. There have already been clashes between Allawis and Sunnis in the northern city of Tripoli. 7. The Syrian Muslim Brotherhood sympathizes profoundly with Hamas, the Palestinian militant group based in Gaza. A Syrian MB armed to the teeth with sophisticated US weapons would be tempted to share them with its sister organization, Hamas. Is that what Romney wants? 8. Turkey is set to grow 9% this year, and is among the few bright spots in the economy of the greater Mediterranean. Arms to Syrian rebels would certainly make their way into Turkey, which faces a challenge from the PKK (Kurdish Workers Party) terrorist group, which blows things up in eastern Anatolia. Destabilizing **Turkey would have negative effects on everything from European trade to that of northern Iraq**. 9. Highly armed Sunni militias, having taken over Damascus, are likely to oppose the Shiite government in Baghdad that Romney’s Republican predecessor, George W. Bush, established. Another big round of violence in Iraq is highly undesirable, with destabilizing implications for US allies in the Gulf, including Bahrain, and it would likely cause the Shiite government of Iraq to move even closer to Iran. 10. If the revolution does succeed, it is desirable that the victorious groups move toward parliamentary democracy. A set of militias armed to the teeth will impede that transition, especially if some of the groups are big and well organized, as with the Muslim Brotherhood.’’

### Ext – Obama Won’t Arm Syrian Rebels

#### Obama won’t arm Syrian rebels – looking for peace

**Parnes and Herb 12** (Amie Parnes and Jeremy Herb, white house correspondents at The Hill, 05/29/12, The Hill, Obama wil not arm Syran rebels; Romney sees a ‘lack of leadership’, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/229951-president-will-not-arm-syrian-rebels-romney-says-he-should)

But on Tuesday, the White House — seemingly aware of a war-weary American public — didn’t appear to want to engage militarily in the conflict. Instead, Carney said, the Obama administration would continue to give a peace plan by U.N.-Arab League envoy Kofi Annan support and “hope the pressure on Assad has an effect.” At the same time, Carney added, “We will continue to work with both the Security Council and the broader coalition of friends of Syria to place pressure on the Assad regime.” When it comes to arming the rebels, there are concerns in Congress in both parties about who the opposition is and whether al Qaeda is involved, although those concerns have dissipated somewhat as the violence has increased. “I didn’t hear an easy way forward,” said Sen. Mark Udall (D-Colo.), who spoke to reporters on a conference call Tuesday during a congressional trip to Egypt and Israel. “There’s concern still about arming the opposition, who nobody seems to know very well, even in the region.” The administration still has some diplomatic levers it can pull, including further sanctions against Syria to try to stanch its cash flow. On Tuesday, the United States expelled the top Syrian envoy to Washington as part of a coordinated effort by countries around the world. One of the biggest diplomatic obstacles that remains is Russia, which has backed the Assad regime but joined the U.N. Security Council in condemning Syria this weekend. Jon Alterman, director of the Middle East Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, said that convincing Russia is key to finding an internationally backed solution. “Russia has its own set of interests to protect, and it’s worth talking to the Russians both about what they want in Syria and what they don’t want in Syria,” he said. On Tuesday, Carney reiterated that no options — including military action — are off the table. But, he added, “We believe very strongly that Assad has to go.” Carney’s comments come a day after Obama — who campaigned on the platform of ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan — spoke about the “light of a new day on the horizon.” “As commander in chief, I can tell you that sending our troops into harm’s way is the most wrenching decision that I have to make,” he said during remarks on Memorial Day. “I can promise you I will never do so unless it is absolutely necessary and that when we do, we must give our troops a clear mission and the full support of a grateful nation.” Observers say Obama will keep up the diplomatic approach as long as he is able. The administration “hates to see what’s happening in Syria, but the idea of another engagement is something they don’t want to contemplate,” said Cal Jillson, a professor of political science at Southern Methodist University.  In the middle of its election-year battle with Romney, Team Obama is conscious of an American public that would like to see the administration focus on domestic issues, including the down economy. “The American public is very much pro-freedom, but after 10 years of war, the desire to help other people gain their freedom is a long, hard road,” Jillson said. “The country is tired of war, they know our pocketbook is thin, and the Obama administration playing the diplomatic game in Syria is the right way to go electorally.” But critics of Obama’s policies in Syria say that the calls for Assad to leave power aren’t going to be effective unless they are backed up with action, something the administration thus far has yet to provide. “Rhetoric alone isn’t going to change the Syrian regime,” said Michael Rubin, an analyst at the conservative-leaning American Enterprise Institute. “The Obama administration will keep bumping up against the same decision on the use of military action.”

### Ext – Romney Will Arm Syrian Rebels

#### Romney will arm Syrian rebels --- Obama will not.

**Parnes and Herb 12** (Amie Parnes and Jeremy Herb, white house correspondents at The Hill, 05/29/12, The Hill, Obama wil not arm Syran rebels; Romney sees a ‘lack of leadership’, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/229951-president-will-not-arm-syrian-rebels-romney-says-he-should)

President Obama and Mitt Romney on Tuesday offered clashing views over whether to arm insurgents in Syria after a weekend massacre left more than 100 people dead and drew international condemnation. Romney called for the United States and partner nations to “arm the opposition so they can defend themselves” against the government of Syrian President Bashar Assad, but White House press secretary Jay Carney warned that would lead to more “chaos and carnage” and was “not the right course.”  The deep divide highlighted the realpolitik approach in Syria favored by an Obama administration focused on convincing Syrian ally Russia to pressure Assad and concerned about where weapons intended for insurgents might end up.  It also offered an opening of sorts for Romney — who clinched the Republican nomination on Tuesday night — to hammer Obama on foreign policy, which has been one of the president’s biggest strengths during his time in office. As violence in Syria has escalated, Romney has ramped up his attacks on Obama’s handling of the events.

#### Romney will arm the Syrian rebels.

**Bolton 12** (Bolton, Alexander, writer for The Hill, 04/01/12, The Hill, Senior members of House Intelligence Committee oppose arming Syrian rebels, http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/219399-senior-members-of-house-intelligence-committee-oppose-arming-syrian-rebels)

The top-ranking Republican and Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee said Sunday that they would not support arming rebels in Syria, signaling that Congress could oppose any such effort by the administration. Rep. Mike Rogers (R-MI), the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, said it would be risky to arm the rebels, members of the Sunni Muslim population in Syria. “I think we both agree that’s probably a bad idea. Mainly because we just don’t know who they are,” Rogers said on CNN’s “State of the Union” when asked about the possibility of arming the rebels. The United Nations estimates more than 9,000 people have been killed in the uprising that has pitted Sunni Muslims against Syria’s ruling Alawite sect, a branch of Shia Islam, to which President Bashar al-Assad belongs. Rep. C.A. “Dutch” Ruppersberger (D-MD), the senior Democrat on the panel, suggested Syrian defense forces could give weapons of mass destruction to terrorist groups in retaliation or the rebels could form allegiances with terrorists, such as al Qaeda, a Sunni Muslim group, after winning power. “They have a cadre of weapons that are very dangerous. And we are concerned, just like we were in Libya that if they -- if these weapons of mass destruction, if the chemical or biological weapons get in the hands of -- of terrorists or other groups, that could be very detrimental to the Middle East. But also to -- to the national security of the United States,” he said. Rogers said he did not see the Assad regime losing control of the country anytime soon, in part because of support from outside powers. “We don't really see Assad's inner circle crumbling. Remember, they're having a lot of victory supported by external forces like Iran, like Russia,” he said. Rogers said there are other ways to help the rebels and highlighted working with the Arab League. “I think the Arab League is willing and ready to step up, to take more aggressive action against Assad in Syria. We should be a part of that in a support role that I think is much better for the United States in the long run,” he said. He said that strategy would be preferable to “sending in arms and hoping for the best.” Romney will Arm

### Syrian Conflict Impact – Saudi/Iran War

#### Syrian conflict draws in major powers. This sparks a Saudi-Iran conflict.

**Nasr**, 8/27/**2011** (Vali – professor at Tufts University, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, If the Arab Spring Turns Ugly, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/28/opinion/sunday/the-dangers-lurking-in-the-arab-spring.html?pagewanted=all)

Syria today stands at the edge of such an upheaval. The brutality of Bashar al-Assad’s regime is opening a dangerous fissure between the Alawite minority, which rules the country, and the majority Sunni population. After Mr. Assad’s butchery in the largely Sunni city of Hama on July 31, on the eve of the holy month of Ramadan, the Muslim Brotherhood, a Sunni group, accused the regime of conducting “a war of sectarian cleansing.” It is now clear that Mr. Assad’s strategy is to divide the opposition by stoking sectarian conflict. Sunni extremists have reacted by attacking Alawite families and businesses, especially in towns near the Iraq border. The potential for a broader clash between Alawites and Sunnis is clear, and it would probably not be confined to Syria. Instead, it would carry a risk of setting off a regional dynamic that could overwhelm the hopeful narrative of the Arab Spring itself, replacing it with a much aggravated power struggle along sectarian lines. That is because throughout the Middle East there is a strong undercurrent of simmering sectarian tension between Sunnis and Shiites, of whom the Alawites are a subset. Shiites and Sunnis live cheek by jowl in the long arc that stretches from Lebanon to Pakistan, and the region’s two main power brokers, Shiite Iran and Sunni Saudi Arabia, are already jousting for power. So far this year, Shiite-Sunni tensions have been evident in countries from Bahrain to Syria. But put together, they could force the United States to rethink its response to the Arab Spring itself. Sectarianism is an old wound in the Middle East. But the recent popular urge for democracy, national unity and dignity has opened it and made it feel fresh. This is because many of the Arab governments that now face the wrath of protesters are guilty of both suppressing individual rights and concentrating power in the hands of minorities. The problem goes back to the colonial period, when European administrators manipulated religious and ethnic diversity to their advantage by giving minorities greater representation in colonial security forces and governments. Arab states that emerged from colonialism promised unity under the banner of Arab nationalism. But as they turned into cynical dictatorships, failing at war and governance, they, too, entrenched sectarian biases. This scarred Arab society so deeply that the impulse for unity was often no match for the deep divisions of tribe, sect and ethnicity. The struggle that matters most is the one between Sunnis and Shiites. The war in Iraq first unleashed the destructive potential of their competition for power, but the issue was not settled there. The Arab Spring has allowed it to resurface by weakening states that have long kept sectarian divisions in place, and brutally suppressed popular grievances. Today, Shiites clamor for greater rights in Lebanon, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, while Sunnis are restless in Iraq and Syria. This time, each side will most likely be backed by a nervous regional power, eager to protect its interests. For the past three decades the Saudi monarchy, which sees itself as the guardian of Sunni Islam, has viewed Iran’s Shiite theocracy as its nemesis. Saudis have relied on the United States, Arab nationalism and Sunni identity to slow Iran’s rise, even to the point of supporting radical Sunni forces. The Saudis suffered a major setback when control of Iraq passed from Sunnis to Shiites, but that made them more determined to reverse Shiite gains and rising Iranian influence. It was no surprise that Saudi Arabia was the first Arab state to withdraw its ambassador from Damascus earlier this month. The imprint of this rivalry was evident in regional conflicts before the Arab Spring. Saudis saw Iran’s hand behind a rebellion among Yemen’s Houthi tribe — who are Zaydis, an offshoot of Shiism — that started in 2004. Iran blamed Arab financing for its own decade-long revolt by Sunni Baluchis along its southeastern border with Pakistan. And since 2005, when Shiite Hezbollah was implicated in the assassination of Rafik Hariri, a popular Sunni prime minister who was close to the Saudis, a wide rift has divided Lebanon’s Sunni and Shiite communities, and prompted Saudi fury against Hezbollah. The sectarian divide in Lebanon shows no sign of narrowing, and now the turmoil in Syria next door has brought Lebanon to a knife’s edge. Meanwhile, Hezbollah’s audacious power grab has angered Saudi Arabia. Officials in Riyadh see the turn of events in Lebanon as yet another Iranian victory, and the realization of the dreaded “Shiite crescent” that King Abdullah of Jordan once warned against. In March, fearing a snowball effect from the Arab Spring, Saudi Arabia drew a clear red line in Bahrain, where a Shiite majority would have been empowered had pro-democracy protests succeeded in ousting the Sunni monarchy. The Saudis rallied the Persian Gulf monarchies to support the Sunni monarchy in Bahrain in brutally suppressing the protests — and put Iran on notice that they were “ready to enter war with Iran and even with Iraq in defense of Bahrain.” The Saudis are right to be worried about the outcome of sectarian fights in Lebanon and Bahrain, but in Syria it is Iran that stands to lose. Both sides understand that the final outcome will decide the pecking order in the region. Every struggle in this rivalry therefore matters, and every clash is pregnant with risk for regional stability. The turn of events in Syria is particularly important, because Sunnis elsewhere see the Alawite government as the linchpin in the Shiite alliance of Iran and Hezbollah. The Alawite-Sunni clash there could quickly draw in both of the major players in the region and ignite a broader regional sectarian conflict among their local allies, from Lebanon to Iraq to the Persian Gulf and beyond.

#### Saudi-Iran conflict draws in great powers – escalates to a world war.

**Forostenko**, 4/22/**2011** (Anna, Worst Case Scenario: Will Ongoing Conflicts Lead To a World War? Global Research, p. http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=24453)

The conflicts in the Middle East and Africa are growing. An opinion poll conducted among experts by the Voice of Russia shows that they believe that in a worst-case scenario, these conflicts could lead to a world war. The outcome of presidential election triggered clashes in Nigeria. According to official reports, incumbent president Goodluck Jonathan, a Christian from the south, won 60 percent of votes, while his opponent, Muhammadu Buhari won only little more than 30 percent. The opposition is dissatisfied with the results. As a result, Buhari’s supporters launched attacks on Christians and even set fire to several churches. In response, young Christians attacked mosques. Some experts draw a parallel between Nigeria and Cote d’Ivoire, disintegration of which into North and South was averted only after the interference of the UN peacekeepers and the French forces. This means that Nigeria may experience a similar fate. It will have to get foreign assistance or it will disintegrate. Meanwhile, the foreign factor could trigger disintegration of Libya, says a senior lecture of the political science faculty of the St. Petersburg University, Gumer Isaev. “Libya will disintegrate only in case its situation is deadlocked. This will depend on whether there will be foreign interference or not. If foreign countries interfere, Libya will be divided into at least two parts,” Gumer Isaev said. The head of the department of Central Asia and Kazakhstan of the Institute of the CIS countries, Andrei Grozin disagrees with him. The historical borders of Libya were established artificially after colonial rule, and consequently, the country will hardly remain within these borders in the future, says the expert. It’s a different case that ongoing uprisings in several countries have been triggered only by internal problems such as unemployment, poor income, dissatisfied young people and privileges to a small group of people. Lately, a third force has been backing these uprisings, says Andrei Grozin. “This is happening not so roughly and blankly like during the colour revolutions in the former Soviet republics. Clearly, the coordinators of these processes have learned to assess the specifics of each country creatively. At present, all is done skillfully, delicately, and accurately using various aspects of information technology for each country by taking into account local specifics, Andrei Grozin said. Possibly, Salafis could be such a group in Syria. According to Syrian authorities, they are behind the unrest in Homs and Baniyas. However, this could only be the tip of the iceberg. According to several experts, Syria is becoming the battlefield where the interests of Saudi Arabia and Iran clash. Most likely, Saudi Arabia has a country to lean on, the United States. This means the entire region will face a serious conflict and world powers will be involved. This will be a conflict between various political orientations. Saudi Arabia will be backed by the U.S. and several countries of the European Union, while Iran will be supported by third world nations and perhaps China.

### Ext – Syrian Conflict Escalates

#### Syrian conflict will destabilize the region --- creates an anarchic environment which sparks aggression and conflict.

**Javedanfar**, 9/2/**2011** (Meir – author of The Nuclear Sphinx of Tehran, runs the Middle East Economic and Political Analysis Company, Why Iran Eyes a Syrian Civil War, The Diplomat, p. http://the-diplomat.com/2011/09/02/why-iran-eyes-syrian-civil-war/)

But what if there is instead a civil war? After all, as prominent Middle East analyst Vali Nasr noted in a recent op-ed for the New York Times, in the Arab world, ‘when dictatorships crack, budding democracies are more than likely to be greeted by violence and paralysis.’ Clearly, chaos in Syria could have region-wide implications, and Iranian government officials have already started to warn the international community about the possibility of such a scenario unfolding. It’s unclear how Iran would respond if this does transpire, but one thing seems certain – Iran is extremely unlikely to play the part of spectator. In fact, the opposite may very well end up being true, with Iran likely to back the Alawites by providing them with material and economic support. The Alawites are a subset of the Shiite sect of Islam, and Iran, the biggest Shiite country in the world, whose supreme leader sees himself as God’s representative to all Shiites, would support them. But religious proximity isn’t the only reason Iran would support the Alawites. To Iran’s leaders, alliances are there to serve the regime’s interests, meaning that if supporting fellow Shiites serves Iran’s interests then Tehran will do so. But by the same token, if assisting Shiites undermines the regime's interests, Tehran isn’t afraid to steer clear – one only has to look at the relative indifference Iran shows to the many hundreds of Shiites killed each year in Pakistan by Sunni extremists simply because it isn’t in Iran’s interests to fall out with the Pakistani government. So if not just for religious reasons, why would Tehran back the Alawites in the chaos of a civil war? Because it would help Tehran undermine Israel’s security and Saudi Arabia's interests. Civil war in Syria would be a nightmare for Israel, worse even than the Muslim Brotherhood taking over in Damascus. After all, should the Brotherhood come to power, Israel would at least have someone to hold to account for attacks launched from Syrian territory. But the anarchy of civil war would leave Israel with no one to turn to, and no single authority to threaten reprisals against. If this happens, expect Iran to encourage its allies to attack Israelin an attempt to undermine its security further. But a civil war could be welcomed in Tehran for another reason – because it would also undermine Saudi interests. Saudi Arabia and Iran have for years been engaged in their own Cold War, especially since Iran’s Islamic Revolution in 1979. They’ve competed for power and influence in Iraq, Lebanon, Yemen and Bahrain – and now Syria. According to David Ignatius, writing in the Washington Post, the Saudis have been ‘pumping money to Sunni fighters in Syria.’ Meanwhile, Iran has been backing the Alawite dominated government of Assad. In the case of civil war in Syria, Iran would use the opportunity to undermine Sunni groups as a means of limiting Saudi influence in Syria. Iran has already lost Bahrain to the Saudis – it’s determined not to lose Syria as well. Fighting a proxy war in Syria on behalf of the Alawites wouldn’t be without risks for Iran. For a start, it could place Iran’s relations with Hamas under severe strain as an overwhelming majority of Palestinians in Syria, as well as the Hamas movement itself, are Sunni. But it could also impact Iran’s relationship with Hizbollah as Iran would most probably require their assistance in backing the Alawites in the event of civil war. Securing Hizbollah’s backing could affect that group’s standing in the Islamic world, as its popularity in the region has until now come from its portrayal of itself as an Islamic resistance force. Helping to put down Sunnis in Syria would risk undermining this image. And of course fighting a proxy war in Syria could also impact Iran’s relationship with Turkey, itself a Sunni country whose priority is stability in Syria. Still, such costs are unlikely to dissuade Iran from taking part, should the opportunity present itself. In Tehran’s cost/benefit analysis, the chance to undermine Israel and Saudi Arabia in one go is likely to outweigh the potential dangers. With Syrian demonstrators burning Iranians flags, Tehran may find that a rapprochement with the Sunni opposition may prove to be too cumbersome, or even impossible. A civil war might suit it better, as would the ensuing grief for Israel and Saudi Arabia.

### Syrian Conflict Impact – Sectarian Conflict

#### Violence in Syria spills over to sectarian conflict throughout the region including Pakistan.

**Kauravi** **2011** (Waqar Khan – peace and conflict studies, Syria: Powder keg of sectarianism, Pakistan Observer, p. <http://pakobserver.net/detailnews.asp?id=109664>)

What appears to be a continuum of Arab Spring in Syria is actually a simmering volcano with potential to engulf the entire Middle East as well as the rest of Islamic World. Going back into history, Middle East was divided on tribal blood lines, disregarding the strategic fault lines it would create, thanks to Lawrence of Arabia and the British neo colonist policy of divide and rule. These fault lines, mainly of sectarianism have existed in almost every Arab Country from Iraq to Syria and onwards to Lebanon and Kingdome of Saudi Arabia included. Whereas Iraq was made as a test bed,(where ruling tribe of Saddam Hussain kept the other communities like Shiites and Kurds under suppression),the Coalition under US auspices accentuated the problem by not only encouraging the sectarian violence but also providing fuel to fire. The memories of perception of Shia-Sunni conflict in Iraq( as it was made to appear by the Western media),have strained the relations between the two big players of the Gulf, Iran and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Recent Wiki leaks relating to statements by Arab leadership against Iran were timed to synchronies the strategic effects of the entire drama now unfolding in the Middle East. The message being aired by the Western media and propagated by their cohorts in the Middle Eastern media is going across in the region like fire, a sustained Shia-Sunni conflict is in the making. This is nothing new; the Western think tanks have been airing this idea since the first Gulf war against Saddam Hussain. In the hearts of their hearts the US lead coalition and their political leadership knew that a fractured Iraq after Saddam Hussian could become a model for further destabilizing of the Middle East. The psychological feeling of uneasiness between Sunnis and Shias in the Middle East can be inflamed by projecting it as a deadly struggle for dominance between two Patriarch of both communities, Iran for Shias and KSA for Sunnis. The Arab spring that started in the Maghreb and Egypt with higher ideals of democracy and impacted the entire Middle East had a catalytic effect on the intelligentsia in Middle East and the rest of Islamic World. After Tunis and Egypt, enough time was available with the political leadership of the region to usher in democratic reforms and heed to voices of the people. Unfortunately, Qaddafi and Al Assads adopted a coercive approach and the results are there for everyone to judge the outcome. Syria, where the demographic imbalance between the ruling House of Al Assads and the majority Sunni community could have logically led to reforms by the Syrian Government at fastest possible pace, unfortunately has chosen the path of self-destruction. But Syria politically aligned with Iran has the potential of a powder keg which can, not only self explode, but also ignite the sectarian divide to unimaginable proportions. If sense does not prevail in the political leadership of the Middle East, the West will not need to exploit these simmering currents, the Middle East can gradually slip into an abyss of a sectarian conflagration and affect the entire region as well as rest of the Islamic World. Even countries like Pakistan and Afghanistan where the sectarian fault lines have been managed with resolve, the conflagration within the Middle East could become another nightmare.

#### Sectarian violence overwhelms deterrence --- the result is Indo/Pak nuclear war.

**Schulz**, 7/19/**2001** (John – professor of international communication at Boston University, former National War College professor, South Asia’s Nuclear Powder Keg, The Boston Globe, p. http://www.commondreams.org/views01/0719-04.htm)

FOR MOST AMERICANS, news of the failed Pakistan-India Summit talks may be ''interesting,'' but of little consequence. Indeed, we will likely take comfort in knowing that the four-decades-long nuclear confrontation between Moscow and Washington resulted in mutual deterrence. We may find this a comforting paradigm for South Asia today: Nuclear war is as unlikely there as it was during the Cold War nuclear stalemate. But nothing could be further from the truth. Any number of potential issues could provide the spark leading to nuclear war between Pakistan and India - issues that never existed between the United States and the now-defunct Soviet Union. First, throughout the post-war era, with the buildup of nuclear arsenals and ever-more sophisticated delivery systems on both sides, no American troops ever engaged in battle with Soviet troops. Pakistan and India have fought three bitter wars since the two states were created in 1947, and skirmishes and artillery exchanges continue to kill soldiers on either side of the line of demarcation near the Siachen Glacier. For many in both societies, another unforgiven remembrance of things past includes India's treatment of 90,000 Pakistani POWs, the brutality of the fighting, and the merciless rape and slaughter of noncombatants by both sides, especially in the final weeks of the 1970-71 Bangladesh secessionist war, when India intervened on the side of Bangladesh. Second, despite arsenals that grew to as many as 30,000 nuclear warheads on both sides from 1950 to 1990, Moscow and Washington had no outstanding territorial disputes. Islamabad and New Delhi have two of immediate importance. The predominantly Muslim and hotly disputed ''Indian State'' of Kashmir, along Pakistan's eastern border, could provide the biggest spark of all. Last year, insurgent Pakistani forces fighting inside Indian-controlled territory brought the two states to the brink of war. The Siachen boundary issue could also spark war. In interviews with top generals and at the Strategic Institutes in the early 1990s, both sides referred to the ''strategic'' Siachen Glacier, thus underscoring the emotional content in the rivalry, and the fuzzy thinking that often clouds their bilateral disputes. When pressed, these generals and think tank experts conceded that the daily, hot-war artillery exchanges in one of the highest mountain regions of the world could not, by definition, be ''strategic'': It is simply not possible to build up, then launch a major military offensive where geography prohibits creation of a huge staging area for men or war machines. Cold-eyed analysis such as this, by senior officers or in the two strategic institutes (heavily populated by retired generals), is desperately needed and virtually nonexistent. During the Cold War, the two superpowers worked to guarantee that mutual assured deterrence was imbedded in ''mutual assured destruction.'' India and Pakistan have warheads, aircraft, and missiles sufficient to assure the deaths of tens of millions on both sides. Moscow and Washington had clearly articulated, mutually understood doctrines, spelling out conditions under which nuclear weapons might be used. Warning signs were thus posted to prevent actions, activities, and miscalculations that spark war. Moreover, both sides developed highly sophisticated systems to maintain tight control over the handling and - in worst case scenario - launch of such weapons. The full package, command, control computers, communication, and intelligence - referred to as ''C-cubed-I'' - was more expensive and extensive than the weapon systems. Pakistan and India have only the most rudimentary of strategic doctrines, and despite assurances that these are now in place, they remain unclear and unwieldy. Measures designed to command and control handling and release of nuclear weapons are rudimentary at best. The C-cubed-I ''package'' must be as invulnerable and sure-fire as the arsenals, but every aspect of C-cubed-I is vulnerable in South Asia. Other potential sparks could also light the South Asian nuclear powder keg: Roughly as many Muslims live in India as in Pakistan, a country of about 140 million. Sectarian violence, religious clashes, and perceptions that the Hindu majority is persecuting its Muslim citizens are recurring problems which, on any day, at any time, can cause violence and death. Mobs then take to the streets, demanding political and military action by political leaders. None of these emotional historical factors was present in the ideological, geostrategic superpower rivalry.

### Syrian Conflict Impact – AT: No Middle East War

#### Recent events have changed the game. Middle East conflict will now escalate to conflict.

**Singh**, 9/22/**2011** (Michael, What has really changed in the Middle East, Foreign Policy, p. <http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/09/22/what_has_really_changed_in_the_middle_east>)

Third, and most troubling, the Middle East is likely to be a more dangerous and volatile region in the future. For the past several decades, a relatively stable regional order has prevailed, centered around Arab-Israeli peace treaties and close ties between the United States and the major Arab states and Turkey. The region was not conflict-free by any means, and Iran, Iraq, and various transnational groups sought to challenge the status quo, albeit largely unsuccessfully. Now, however, the United States appears less able or willing to exercise influence in the region, and the leaders and regimes who guarded over the regional order are gone or under pressure. Sensing either the need or opportunity to act autonomously, states like Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Iran are increasingly bold, and all are well-armed and aspire to regional leadership. Egypt, once stabilized, may join this group. While interstate conflict is not inevitable by any means, the risk of it has increased and the potential brakes on it have deteriorated. Looming over all of this is Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon, which would shift any contest for regional primacy into overdrive.

### Taiwan F16s – Romney Will Sell

#### Romney is in favor of new F16s --- Obama is not

**Taipei Times**, 1/6/**2012** (Romney, Santorum favor Taiwan, p. http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2012/01/06/2003522571)

Former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney, front-runner for the US Republican presidential nomination, has a distinctly pro-Taiwan political record. He is in favor of selling F-16C/D aircraft to Taiwan and has criticized US President Barack Obama for refusing to do so.

#### Romney campaigns on new F16s.

**Rogin**, 9/21/**2011** (Josh – reports on national security and foreign policy from the Pentagon to Foggy Bottom for the Cable at Foreign Policy, Taiwan arms sales decision announced, Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/09/21/taiwan\_arms\_sales\_decision\_announced)

GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney issued a statement criticizing the administration for not offering Taiwan the 66 new F-16 C/D fighter jets they had requested. "President Obama's refusal to sell Taiwan new military jets is yet another example of his weak leadership in foreign policy," Romney's statement said. "President Obama has ignored Taiwan's request and caved into the unreasonable demands of China at the cost of well-paying American jobs. This decision raises serious questions about his commitment to our closest partners and to the policies that have sustained American leadership abroad."

#### Romney criticizes the lack of new F16s as weakness.

**Munoz and Herb**, 5/1/**2012** (Carlo – Deputy Editor at AOL Defense, and Jeremy – award-winning journalist and Washington correspondent for the Star Tribune, Obama Takes Harder Line Against China, The Hill, p. http://www.cnas.org/obama-takes-harder-line-against-china)

The tougher actions and tone on China come after criticism from Romney, who argues that Obama has been too soft with Beijing. Romney over the weekend pressured Obama to protect Chen, the activist thought to be seeking asylum at the U.S. embassy. On his first day in office, Romney promises, he would label Beijing a currency manipulator as a means of closing a trade imbalance. He’s also used China’s growing holdings of U.S. debt to argue that Obama has driven the United States into debt and made the country weak with regards to China. “President Obama came into office as a near supplicant to Beijing, almost begging it to continue buying American debt so as to finance his profligate spending here at home,” Romney wrote in a Wall Street Journal op-ed in February timed for a state visit to Washington by Xi Jinping, who is expected to be China’s president next year. When the Obama administration last September declined to ship new F-16 fighter jets to Taiwan, Romney said it was “yet another example” of Obama’s “weak leadership in foreign policy.”

### Taiwan F16s Bad – South China Sea

#### Romney will sell arms to Taiwan --- causes Chinese aggression in the South China Sea.

**Drezner**, 5/25/**2012** (Daniel – professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, Romney: Year One, Foreign Policy, p. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/25/romney_year_one?page=0,7>)

DAY 250: In the run-up to Romney's first East Asian trip, his administration updates the "pivot" with three new initiatives. First, as part of his pledge to coordinate closely with Taiwan on that country's defense needs "with adequate aircraft and other military platforms," the United States agrees to sell F-16 fighter jets to the Republic of China. Second, Romney proposes renaming the Trans-Pacific Partnership the "Asia-Pacific Reagan Economic Zone." Third, Romney says his envoys would "persuade China to commit to North Korea's disarmament" by "demonstrat[ing] to the Chinese that they should join the coordinated effort or be left behind as a regional counter-proliferation partner." The effect: These combined moves provoke a very strong Chinese response. Beijing blasts the arms sales and accuses the Romney administration of intruding into matters of exclusive Chinese sovereignty. In response, the PLA Navy aggressively expands its operations in the South China Sea to put pressure on U.S. allies in the region. China further rejects the offer to join a Reagan Economic Zone. On the other hand, China is quite taken with the Romney administration's efforts to persuade Beijing that, after more than a half-century of backing North Korea and enduring almost two decades of American harangues, it is now in its best interests to pressure North Korea. Hah -- just kidding!! Romney's efforts at persuasion bear no fruit.

#### Aggression over the South China Sea escalates --- miscalculation leads to nuclear war.

**Fisher**, 10/31/**2011** (Max – associate editor at the Atlantic, 5 Most Likely Ways the U.S. and China Could Spark Accidental Nuclear War, The Atlantic, p. http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/10/5-most-likely-ways-the-us-and-china-could-spark-accidental-nuclear-war/247616/#slide1)

After 10 years of close but unproductive talks, the U.S. and China still fail to understand one another's nuclear weapons policies, according to a disturbing report by Global Security Newswire. In other words, neither the U.S. nor China knows when the other will or will not use a nuclear weapon against the other. That's not due to hostility, secrecy, or deliberate foreign policy -- it's a combination of mistrust between individual negotiators and poor communication; at times, something as simple as a shoddy translation has prevented the two major powers from coming together. Though nuclear war between the U.S. and China is still extremely unlikely, because the two countries do not fully understand when the other will and will not deploy nuclear weapons, the odds of starting an accidental nuclear conflict are much higher. Neither the U.S. nor China has any interest in any kind of war with one other, nuclear or non-nuclear. The greater risk is an accident. Here's how it would happen. First, an unforeseen event that sparks a small conflict or threat of conflict. Second, a rapid escalation that moves too fast for either side to defuse. And, third, a mutual misunderstanding of one another's intentions. This three-part process can move so quickly that the best way to avert a nuclear war is for both sides to have absolute confidence that they understand when the other will and will not use a nuclear weapon. Without this, U.S. and Chinese policy-makers would have to guess -- perhaps with only a few minutes -- if and when the other side would go nuclear. This is especially scary because both sides have good reason to err on the side of assuming nuclear war. If you think there's a 50-50 chance that someone is about to lob a nuclear bomb at you, your incentive is to launch a preventative strike, just to be safe. This is especially true because you know the other side is thinking the exact same thing. In fact, even if you think the other side probably won't launch an ICBM your way, they actually might if they fear that you're misreading their intentions or if they fear that you might over-react; this means they have a greater incentive to launch a preemptive strike, which means that you have a greater incentive to launch a preemptive strike, in turn raising their incentives, and on and on until one tiny kernel of doubt can lead to a full-fledged war that nobody wants. The U.S. and the Soviet Union faced similar problems, with one important difference: speed. During the first decades of the Cold War, nuclear bombs had to be delivered by sluggish bombers that could take hours to reach their targets and be recalled at any time. Escalation was much slower and the risks of it spiraling out of control were much lower. By the time that both countries developed the ICBMs that made global annihilation something that could happen within a matter of minutes, they'd also had a generation to sort out an extremely clear understanding of one another's nuclear policies. But the U.S. and China have no such luxury -- we inherited a world where total mutual destruction can happen as quickly as the time it takes to turn a key and push a button. The U.S. has the world's second-largest nuclear arsenal with around 5,000 warheads (first-ranked Russia has more warheads but less capability for flinging them around the globe); China has only about 200, so the danger of accidental war would seem to disproportionately threaten China. But the greatest risk is probably to the states on China's periphery. The borders of East Asia are still not entirely settled; there are a number of small, disputed territories, many of them bordering China. But the biggest potential conflict points are on water: disputed naval borders, disputed islands, disputed shipping lanes, and disputed underwater energy reserves. These regional disputes have already led to a handful of small-scale naval skirmishes and diplomatic stand-offs. It's not difficult to foresee one of them spiraling out of control. But what if the country squaring off with China happens to have a defense treaty with the U.S.?

### Taiwan F16s Bad – US/China Relations

#### F16s undermine US/China cooperation --- spills over to Syrian, North Korea and Iran.

**Munoz and Herb**, 5/1/**2012** (Carlo – Deputy Editor at AOL Defense, and Jeremy – award-winning journalist and Washington correspondent for the Star Tribune, Taiwan fighter deal could hamper key security talks with China, The Hill, p. <http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/224809-taiwan-fighter-deal-could-hamper-key-security-talks-with-china->)

The White House's decision to open the door to potential arms sales to Taiwan could hinder U.S.-Chinese negotiations on a number of pressing security issues. On Monday, the Obama administration surprisingly switched gears on its policy regarding sales of U.S. warplanes to Taiwan. For the first time, administration officials acknowledged that Taiwan's current fighter fleet was inadequate to counter a potential Chinese incursion across the Taiwan Strait. The White House's previous policy stance had been that Taiwanese air power was sufficient to repel a Chinese attack, and the United States only needed to provide incremental upgrades to their fighters. The policy shift came just days before high-level meetings between Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner and their Chinese counterparts in Beijing. However, the administration's shift on Taiwan could prompt Beijing to pull its support for a number of key security initiatives being pursued by the United States. Consideration of arms sales to Taiwan has “real potential to sour the tenor of the discussions" between U.S. and Chinese officials this week, Chris Johnson, an analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and a former senior China analyst at the CIA, said. Weighing fighter sales to Taiwan can "really can throw a wrench in the ability to move forward” on a number of pressing issues concerning North Korea, Syria and Iran. China, a key member of the U.N. Security Council, has backed a Syria peace plan proffered by U.S.-Arab League envoy Kofi Annan after weeks of intense negotiation. But Beijing could theoretically pull its support for the plan in protest of any proposed arms sales to Taiwan. China also continues to hold out on supporting U.S. sanctions against Iran, which are designed to curb the country's continued nuclear work. China, the biggest consumer of Iranian oil exports, also continues to exchange key technologies with Iran in violation of U.S. sanctions. Beijing's relations with Tehran will almost assuredly grow stronger if the United States does end up supplying fighters to Taiwan.

#### Arm sales hurt US/China relations.

**Rogin**, 4/27/**2012** (Josh – reports on national security and foreign policy from the Pentagon to Foggy Bottom for the Cable at Foreign Policy, White House: Taiwan needs new jets to counter China, The Cable at Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/27/white\_house\_taiwan\_needs\_new\_jets\_to\_counter\_china)

Arms sales to Taiwan, especially offensive arms like F-16s, are a major irritant in the U.S.-China relationship, as China regards Taiwan as a renegade province and a core interest. The United States has maintained a balance between arming Taiwan and trying to avoid friction with China over the issue since the Taiwan Relations Act was signed in 1979.

### Taiwan F16s – AT: Non-Unique – F16 Upgrades

#### Prior sales toed the line for China, new sales would rock the boat.

**Meidan**, 10/18/**2011** (Michal – analyst at the Eurasia Group, Beijing’s Fine Balance, Foreign Policy, p. http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/18/beijings\_fine\_balance)

Such conciliatory logic prevailed around the $5.9 billion arms sale to Taiwan that the United States announced last month. The Obama administration agreed to refurbish the F-16 jets it sold to Taiwan in 1992, but did not sell the island the latest model of the fighter plane, as some in both Washington and Taipei had hoped. China's response was low-key: Beijing called off a few military-to-military dialogues but did not sever ties (as it did after the previous announcement, in January 2010), despite strong calls at home to be more assertive. As long as Washington keeps its side of the bargain, Beijing can get away with such moderation.

#### The U.S. sold A/B planes --- distinct from the C/D upgrade that Taiwan wanted.

Hou, 7/16/**2012** (Elaine, Taiwan signs F-16 A/Bs upgrade deal with U.S., Focus Taiwan News, p. http://focustaiwan.tw/ShowNews/WebNews\_Detail.aspx?Type=aALL&ID=201207160032)

The proposal, sent to Taipei by Washington in early May, contained listed prices totaling some US$3.8 billion that were in line with the budget approved by Taiwan's Cabinet, military officials have said. Included in the retrofit of Taiwan's A/B fighters is the installation of Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar. Equipping the fighters with AESA radar is a new initiative, officials said. Other items on the list include AIM-9X Sidewinder air-to-air missiles and Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) guidance kits, according to the officials. The proposal came after the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama last September approved the sale of a retrofit and training package for the F-16 A/Bs instead of offering Taiwan the F-16 C/D fighters it had long wanted.

#### F-16 A/B upgrades moderated the impact to US/China relations.

**Bloomberg News**, 9/22/**2011** (U.S. to Upgrade Taiwan F-16s in Move China Can ‘Live With’, p. http://www.businessweek.com/news/2011-09-22/u-s-to-upgrade-taiwan-f-16s-in-move-china-can-live-with-.html)

The retrofitting for the 145 F-16 A/B models is part of a package including advanced radar, guided bombs and other technology and training, the Pentagon said yesterday. Taiwan said it needs new jets to replace an aging fleet as China deploys missiles across the strait separating the civil war foes as part of Asia’s biggest military spending program. The U.S. proposal aims to meet the government’s legal obligation to provide Taiwan arms without undoing repairs to relations with China that were damaged by a weapons sale two years ago. China condemned the announcement, stopping short of threatening action that would mar a planned U.S. visit by Vice President Xi Jinping this year. “China should view this as, if not an outright victory, then an outcome that they can live with,” said Frank Lavin, a former U.S. ambassador to Singapore and chairman of public affairs at Edelman Asia Pacific, a communications firm. “It doesn’t behoove them to escalate this.” China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs urged the U.S. to withdraw its offer, spokesman Ma Zhaoxu said in comments posted on its website. U.S. “wrong actions” will damage China-U.S. relations and military ties, he said. Ambassador Gary Locke was summoned to the foreign ministry, the U.S. Embassy said. No Surprise The U.S. decision was widely expected, according to Douglas Paal, vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington. “The U.S. did not surprise China,” said Paal, former Asia director at the National Security Council. “Since late 2010, Beijing has been avoiding unnecessary friction. This time Washington reciprocated.”

### Unilateralism 2NC

#### Romney will ruin the system with unilateralism – he’s adopting a Cheney-Bush Doctrine

**Smith**, Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee, 7/12/**2012** [Adam. “The Romney-Cheney Doctrine.” Foreign Policy. July 12 2012. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/12/the_romney_cheney_doctrine?page=0,1/accessed>: 7/19/12]

A large majority of Americans agree that President Barack Obama has a strong record protecting our nation's security and that he has the right vision for American leadership in the world. Governor Mitt Romney's proposals, in contrast, promise to return us to the discredited doctrines and reckless policies of the George W. Bush administration. We've seen that movie before, and it doesn't end well.¶ That is why it's particularly worrisome that on Thursday, July 12, Governor Mitt Romney is attending a GOP fundraiser hosted by former Vice President Dick Cheney at his home in Wyoming. It's fitting, really, since Romney has called Cheney a "person of wisdom and judgment."¶ As Romney considers possible running mates, it's worth remembering that he pointed to Dick Cheney as the "kind of person I'd like to have" working with him. Likewise, the policies that Romney has advocated -- like indefinitely leaving our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, for example -- are continuations of the Bush-Cheney doctrine, version 2.0.¶ It's no secret that Cheney was the driving force behind the Bush administration's failed foreign policies: starting the war in Iraq with no plan to finish it, bullying our allies around the world, and watching while Iran and North Korea moved forward with their nuclear programs because the Bush White House couldn't bring the international community together to confront these threats.¶ Out of Romney's 24 special advisors on foreign policy, 17 served in the Bush-Cheney administration. If Romney were to win, it's likely that many of these people would serve in his administration in some capacity -- a frightening prospect given the legacy of this particular group. The last time they were in government, it was disastrous.¶ For example, one of Romney's top surrogates on the campaign trail is John Bolton, who served as President George W. Bush's ambassador to the United Nations. Bolton embodies the reckless neoconservative thinking that was largely responsible for getting us into Iraq under false pretenses. Today, he openly roots for diplomacy with Iran to fail and is all-too-eager to send our men and women in uniform into war. Last year, for instance, Bolton said that, "It would be in our interest to overthrow this regime in Syria." The idea of Bolton and other Bush-Cheney officials serving in a Romney administration should be a scary prospect for all Americans.¶ Critics might object that employing former Bush staffers does not necessarily mean implementing all of their advice. But voters can only judge candidates by what they say they will do if in office, and the recklessness of Dick Cheney is clearly reflected in the foreign policies that Romney has advocated so far on the campaign trail.¶ Romney supported the invasion of Iraq and opposed ending the war last year. In December, as Obama welcomed home our troops from Iraq after almost nine years of conflict, Romney said, "It is my view that the withdrawal of all of our troops from Iraq is unfortunate. It's more than unfortunate, I think it's tragic." Cheney echoed that sentiment, saying a few months before we ended the war in Iraq that "it would be a real tragedy if we leave too soon before they are ready to fend for themselves."¶ On Afghanistan, though Obama and all of our international coalition partners have agreed on a timetable to transfer all security responsibility to Afghan control by the end of 2014, Romney contends that we should stay in Afghanistan indefinitely, with no strategy behind his rhetoric and no plan to bring troops home. Again, Cheney has said that we don't "need to run for the exits" in Afghanistan.¶ And Romney, like Cheney, remains stuck in a Cold War mentality. Romney has called Russia our "number one geopolitical foe" -- an outlandish statement that stunned foreign policy experts across the political spectrum. When former Secretary of State Colin Powell, who served under President Bush, was asked about Romney's comments, he replied, "C'mon, Mitt, think. That isn't the case." Romney's rhetoric toward Moscow has the ring of comments Cheney made in 2008, asserting that Russia posed a "threat of tyranny, economic blackmail, and military invasion" to its neighbor, Ukraine.¶ Obama has demonstrated that he is a strong and coherent leader on foreign policy issues. He kept his promise to end the war in Iraq responsibly. He refocused our efforts on crushing al Qaeda and ordered the bold raid to take out Osama bin Laden. He has repaired our alliances abroad and led the international community in putting the most crippling sanctions on Iran in history. During his tenure, he has also provided more security funding to Israel than any of his predecessors and always stood up for our friend in the international community.¶ A Romney presidency promises to take us back to something all too familiar: a Bush-Cheney doctrine -- equal parts naïve and cavalier -- which eagerly embraces military force without fully considering the consequences. That "attack now and figure it out later" mindset had disastrous consequences for our country. We can't afford to go back to the failed policies of the past, not when we've come so far and had so much success. America's security depends on moving forward to confront the threats of the future. That's what's at stake in this election.

### Ext – Romney Leads to Bush Doctrine

#### Romney will use a reckless and aggressive foreign policy that is worse than the Bush Doctrine.

**Larison**, contributing editor at The American Conservative, **’12** [Daniel. Ph.D. in history. April 18. “Romney’s Foreign Policy Could Be More Ideological and Reckless Than Bush’s.” The American Conservative. <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/romneys-foreign-policy-could-be-more-ideological-and-reckless-than-bushs/accessed>: 7/18/12]

Miller is being absurdly optimistic here. Considering how many bad policies have received bipartisan backing in the last decade, it isn’t very reassuring to think that Romney would govern from “the center.” There appears to be no shortage of “centrists” willing to use force against Syria and Iran. “Centrism” is no guarantee against recklessness and folly. It must also be comforting to pretend that Republican hawkish interventionists are far removed from “the center” politically, when they are often the ones dictating the terms of debate to “the center.”¶ Would Romney be similarly constrained by circumstances and limited resources? Yes. Do we have every reason to believe that he would pursue policies overseas that increase the risk of squandering those limited resources in unnecessary conflicts? Yes. Some people assume that ideologues will not have much influence on someone so famously unprincipled as Romney, but this gets things backwards. It is someone with no firm principles and no serious grounding in international affairs who is most vulnerable to embracing his advisers’ simple, ideological answers to complex international problems.¶ If Congress is “broken” when it comes to many domestic issues, bipartisanship is still alive and well when it comes to pursuing misguided and counterproductive policies abroad. The more paralyzed the government is on fiscal matters, the more tempting it will be for Romney to focus his attention on international issues. In addition to having more freedom of action in foreign policy, Romney would unfortunately face fewer domestic political risks from ordering military interventions than he would in pursuing entitlement reform.¶ When thinking about Bush’s recklessness, we should remember that the Bush administration was fixated on Iraq before 9/11, and the administration was full of people who wanted to overthrow Hussein. 9/11 created the political atmosphere that made it easier to build support for the invasion, but we shouldn’t assume that Bush’s foreign policy would have been much less reckless had the attacks not happened. The “Bush was an aberration” idea is one that a lot of people would like to believe. It creates the impression that Bush’s foreign policy decisions did not have significant bipartisan support for the first four or five years, and treating Bush’s foreign policy as an unusual overreaction to the 9/11 attacks helps to divert attention from the fact that “centrists” share many of the same assumptions and goals as the people who were making policy during the Bush years.¶ Romney’s way of dealing with the “changing nature of the world” so far has been to deny that the world is really changing and to emphasize the importance of American exceptionalism-as-hegemonism. So far he gives us every reason to think that he will conduct foreign policy in an even more reckless and provocative way than Bush did. Romney is famous for wanting to consult with “experts,” and so far on foreign policy issues the “experts” he has chosen to consult and include on his campaign are advising him to pursue confrontational and dangerous policies.¶

### AT: Palestinian Peace Process

#### Romney can’t resolve relations – believes that peace will only occur via exceptionalism

**Kilgore**, Contributing writer to Washington Monthly, **’12** [Ed. managing editor for The Democratic Strategist, a senior fellow at the Progressive Policy Institute, and a Special Correspondent for The New Republic. “We Will Not Have an Inch of Difference.” January 27. Washington Monthly. <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/political-animal-a/2012_01/we_will_not_have_an_inch_of_di035036.php#/accessed>: 7/19/12]

Foreign policy has not been a particularly important topic in the 2012 presidential cycle to much of anyone other than Ron Paul. But there was an interesting moment in last night’s GOP candidate debate when Mitt Romney said something that just seemed jarring in the context of his and his party’s commitment to an ideology of American Exceptionalism and rhetoric of truculent unilateralism. Asked (by an audience member identifying himself as Palenstinian-American) about U.S. Middle Eastern policy, Romney replied:¶ The best way to have peace in the Middle East is not for us to vacillate and to appease, but is to say we stand with our friend Israel; we are committed to a Jewish state in Israel; we will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and our ally Israel.¶ Newt Gingrich promptly said “Governor Romney is exactly right.”¶ Now forget about the first two clauses of Romney’s statement, and in fact—please, I am not, repeat not, trying to start a debate about what the U.S. should and shouldn’t do in the Middle East—forget about the merits of the entire Middle East dispute. Isn’t it a bit odd, even somewhat unprecedented, for a prospective U.S. president to announce in advance that he is giving an ally a blank check to control U.S. policy in a major region of the world? It’s certainly not the kind of unconditional support the current government of Israel would reciprocate, and nor should they. Even the closest allies maintain some freedom of maneuver once the terms of explicit diplomatic agreements are discharged, and given its power, the U.S. is in the habit of insisting on an independent course as a matter of both principle and expediency.¶ There are obviously a lot of reasons that most Republican leaders, and for that matter a lot of Democrats, have abandoned the “honest broker” posture towards the Middle East that was taken for granted when George W. Bush and Al Gore debated this subject during the 2000 election cycle. Still, it’s one thing to suggest that the U.S. will naturally favor its historic ally in intractable disputes. It’s another thing altogether to outsource your policies unconditionally to a foreign government whose positions on matters of war and peace are more than a little controversial to its own people, particularly if your represent the supposedly hard-core U.S. nationalist party that claims it doesn’t trust anybody or anything other than naked self-interest and military power. Perhaps the refusal of contemporary conservatives to see allies anywhere else in the world—certainly not among those debt-ridden socialists of Europe—has made them hold Israel all the closer. But an awful lot of Israelis would tell you that giving this sort of total leverage over the United States to Bibi Netanyahu is not an act to be taken lightly. He will not hesitate to use it.

### AT: Romney Will Be Moderate

#### The GOP guarantees Romney will be conservative and will drive his agenda.

**Weisman and Steinhauser**, 4/15/**2012** (Jonathan and Jennifer, GOP in Congress would obstruct Romney shift to center, Contra Costa Times, p. http://www.contracostatimes.com/news/ci\_20405073/gop-congress-would-obstruct-romney-shift-center)

If Mitt Romney is considering a quick pivot to the center as he heads into the general election, he will find an imposing impediment: fellow Republicans in the House. As Congress was set to reconvene on Monday, House Republicans said Romney could go his own way on smaller issues that may help define him as separate from his congressional Republican counterparts. But, they said, he must understand that they are driving the policy agenda for the party now. "We're not a cheerleading squad," said Rep. Jeff Landry, an outspoken freshman from Louisiana. "We're the conductor. We're supposed to drive the train." With Rep. Paul D. Ryan's budget plan, Republicans have already set the agenda on the key issue that divides the two parties in an age of austerity: how to manage the federal budget and its related entitlement programs. Romney has eagerly embraced it, campaigning with Ryan by his side, and calling him "bold and brilliant." But a disagreement between the parties over spending levels has paved a path for the sort of clash that led to the near shutdown of the government last year, and it could leave Romney in the position of having to choose between a loud public battle and a budget compromise with Democrats in the closing weeks of the fall campaign. Romney, a former Massachusetts governor, and House Republicans diverge on some legislative issues -- notably what to do about Chinese currency manipulation, an issue that has become a centerpiece of the Romney campaign. And that could further highlight the differences within the Republican Party. In 1999, as House Republicans grappled with far more modest spending cuts, George W. Bush was able to underscore his claim to "compassionate conservatism" by denouncing House efforts. "I don't think they ought to balance their budget on the backs of the poor," he said Sen. Roy Blunt of Missouri, a Republican House leader at the time, recalled that as a "defining moment" for the Bush campaign -- one that blindsided Republicans. As Romney's designated liaison to congressional Republicans, Blunt said that one of his jobs was to make sure no one is surprised like that again. In the past two weeks, he has set up meetings between Romney's policy shop and key representatives and staff. They included a meeting between Romney and Ryan, as well as one between the Romney staff and the Republican Study Committee, a group of the most conservative House members. "There will be issues where the governor needs to steer his own course, no doubt about that," Blunt said. "My biggest interest is that they have all the information they need to have." Congress returns this week after a two-week recess, the first time it convenes since Romney emerged as the presumed nominee. Both chambers are expected to move quickly to take up a variety of fiscal measures, with the Republican-controlled House voting on small-business tax cuts and beginning planning sessions on a tax overhaul, and with the Senate, controlled by Democrats, bringing to the floor the so-called Buffett Rule, which would raise the minimum effective tax rate for the wealthy. Undoubtedly, House Speaker John Boehner and Rep. Eric Cantor, the majority leader, will move mountains to make sure House Republicans and the Romney campaign speak and act in lockstep toward the greater goal of defeating President Barack Obama in November and retaining the House. At the same time, Obama has shown a desire to take advantage of the public's low regard for Congress by likening Romney's agenda to that of House Republicans. But Romney may learn the lesson that has been imparted to Boehner throughout the 112th Congress -- that the most conservative members will steer their own course, and loudly. Freshmen as well as veteran members of the Republican Study Committee, led by Rep. Jim Jordan of Ohio, have shown no hesitation to buck the leadership. And Romney has even less leverage with them.

## States

### Swing States – Spending Link

#### Spending will galvanize conservative voters in swing states --- causing Romney to win Iowa, New Hampshire and Virginia.

**Kraushaar**, 5/16/**2012** (Josh – executive editor of the National Journal, Romney’s Targeted Deficit Messaging, 2012 Decoded at the National Journal, p. http://decoded.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/romneys-targeted-deficit-messa.php)

But spending and debt are big issues in the American heartland, too. And that's why Romney spent time on the trail in Des Moines Tuesday, with a speech decrying excessive government spending. Concern over federal spending is what drove the tea party movement into existence in 2009, and it's an issue that hasn't gone away in 2012. It's what's driving Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's momentum in next month's gubernatorial recall, with a deficit-conscious GOP base showing high levels of enthusiasm. (It's also an effective message with independents: Check out this new ad from Republican New Mexico Senate candidate Heather Wilson that's focused squarely on the debt, deficit and spending -- in a Democratic-leaning state.) When pollsters ask voters what their most important issue is, the catch-all "jobs and the economy" comes first. But the number of voters naming the deficit rose in 2010 and has remained largely constant, and it's an issue that's driving conservatives to the polls. It's also a way for Romney to criticize the president on the economy in states that haven't suffered the brunt of the downturn. New Hampshire is another state with a solid economy, but one receptive to Romney's small-government messaging. Indeed, the RNC held a conference call today, featuring former New Hampshire Gov. John Sununu and former New Hampshire Rep. Jeb Bradley, decrying Obama's record on debt and deficits. Obama may be leading in early Granite State polls, but the Romney campaign is optimistic about their chances there, hoping to take advantage of the state's "live free or die" sentiment. If Obama needs high levels of youth and minority turnout to win a second term, Romney needs a restive base anxious about the fiscal future of the country to show up in big numbers. That's the ticket to a Romney victory in states like Iowa, New Hampshire, and Virginia -- where the economy is pretty good but voter dissatisfaction still runs high.

### Swing States – Economy Key

#### A strong economy is key to picking up swing states and negating the “grumpy voter” effect.

**Politico**, 5/31/**2012** (president Obama’s good news-bad news economy, p. <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76928.html>)

President Barack Obama has watched a stubborn national economy dim his reelection chances.

But the real economic battle for election 2012 will take place in the states. Some key battlegrounds are doing better than the nation as a whole. And even if the president’s policies didn’t cause the improvement, it could help his case that the economic outlook has brightened under his stewardship. The state numbers take on an added significance after another weak jobs report Friday. The national rate inched up to 8.2 percent and the economy added just 69,000 jobs in May — well below expectations of 150,000. The unemployment rate for the nation isn’t likely to be much below 8 percent on Nov. 6 —and could be higher. But auto and steel workers in battleground Ohio are getting jobs again. The unemployment rate in the state on Election Day is expected to be close to 7 percent. “Most of the swing states by the third quarter of this year will have a lower unemployment rate than the national average,” said Xu Cheng, a senior economist at Moody’s Analytics who compiled the latest state-by-state economic data and updated Moody’s voting model for POLITICO. “And most of the battlegrounds will be below 8 percent unemployment, which will negate the ‘grumpy voter effect.’” Cheng was referring to data suggesting voters will discount by half any improvement in joblessness if the national rate remains above 8. The Moody’s model, which accounts for unemployment, historical voting patterns, per capita income and other factors, currently predicts Obama will win at least 26 states and 303 electoral votes. The model is one of the few to forecast voting patterns based on economic statistics and other data. In 2008, it came within 25 votes of Obama’s margin in the Electoral College. Of course, a lot can change between now and November. Europe is again on the cusp of crisis, with Greece possibly leaving the euro. Markets could grow skittish over the prospect of the “fiscal cliff” that will hit early next year when up to $7 trillion in tax cuts expire and spending cuts could slam the economy. Home prices appear to have bottomed out in many key places, but they could fall further. And the national numbers do still matter. Headlines on weak jobs reports don’t help Obama. The stock market, which took a big hit in recent weeks as fears about Europe mounted, has a big impact on consumer confidence and voting behavior. A falling Dow often means a faltering incumbent. The economic situation faced by voters in swing states, though, is a major factor, one that also could hurt Obama in states that are doing worse than the national average, such as Florida.

#### States key - Swing States depend on unemployment rate

**Dwyer**, Bloomberg view editorial board, 7/6/**12** [Paula. “Swing-State Unemployment Is the Number to Watch.” Bloomberg. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-06/swing-state-unemployment-is-the-number-to-watch.html/accessed>: 7/17/12]

The market's reaction to the U.S. monthly jobs report has been desultory. And for good reason: The modest gain in U.S. nonfarm payrolls of 80,000 in June is less than the 100,000 median estimate in a Bloomberg News survey. Private employment, which excludes government jobs, increased by only 84,000, the weakest jump in 10 months.¶ The overall rate of unemployment remained steady at 8.2 percent. Hours and wages rose slightly, but for the third consecutive month, there were too few jobs. Wage earners continue to take it on the chin as the economic recovery slows.¶ So that means President Barack Obama's re-election is in serious trouble, right? Not necessarily. Unemployment figures offer important clues to the outcome of a presidential election; as many commentators have pointed out, only one president since World War II has been re-elected with a jobless rate above 7.2 percent. That president was Ronald Reagan, who won his second term in 1984 with unemployment at 7.2 percent, a rate that had fallen almost three percentage points over the previous 18 months.¶ This year, however, the overall jobless rate may be the wrong number on which to fixate. If you look just at the dozen swing states that could decide the Nov. 6 election, unemployment is much lower at 7.5 percent -- not far from Reagan's 7.2 percent benchmark. The numbers range from Nevada's high of 11.6 percent to New Hampshire's low of 5 percent. With four more months of' payroll reports to go, Obama could beat or match the lucky number.¶ Some political scientists say that the overall condition of the economy influences voters more than regional variations. It's also possible that the economy will continue to weaken and both the national and 12-state averages could look worse come Nov. 6. In which case, Obama could well lose to Mitt Romney, the likely Republican nominee.¶ If you narrow the lens even more to the four states that some political junkies insist are the only battlegrounds that truly matter -- Colorado, Iowa, New Hampshire and Virginia -- the average unemployment rate is surprisingly low at 6 percent. If you want to keep score at home, watch those states.

### Swing States – Core Four (FL/NC/OH/VA)

#### Romney needs the entire Core Four or he will lose.

**Mataconis**, 3/10/**2012** (Doug, The Six States That Will Likely Decide the 2012 Election, Outside the Beltway, p. http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/the-six-states-that-will-likely-decide-the-2012-election/)

In 2008, President Obama was able to win election in part because he won in states that had been traditionally Republican such as New Hampshire, Indiana, Virginia, and North Carolina , as well as picking up the still-crucial swing states of Florida and Ohio. This time around, the only way the GOP can win the Presidency is by picking up a good portion of those states, and specifically by picking up the core four states that are part of Rasmussen’s poll. When I saw this poll this morning, I immediately started playing around with various Electoral College scenarios at 270ToWin.com (a great site for political junkies, by the way) and it looks to me like, absent the unlikely event of a landslide, there is no way the GOP can win the Presidency without winning all four of these states. They can lose Iowa. They can lose New Hampshire. They can once again fail to flip New Mexico (which seems likely given their problems with the Latino vote). But, even under the most optimistic scenario there is no way they can afford to lose any one of these states. (Nevada is another state the GOP may try to flip this year but it’s six Electoral Votes are unlikely to be the deciding factor in this race) The task becomes more difficult, of course, if the GOP somehow manages to lose a state that they won in 2008. For example, John McCain won Missouri in 2008 by the narrowest of margins, just 3,903 votes. Right now, due in large part to the fact that the state has definitely shifted red in the past three years I’m going to assume that the GOP holds on to the state. Similarly, the GOP lost Indiana in 2008 for the first time since 1964 but there’s plenty of reason to believe that the state will return to the Republican fold this year. If one or both of those states ends up in Obama’s column, then winning the “Core Four” won’t matter at all. So, perhaps it’s better to say that the GOP must hold on to all of the states it won in 2008 and flip Indiana and the “Core Four.” If it doesn’t do that, Barack Obama will be re-elected. So, if you’re looking for numbers to pay attention to over the coming eight months, these are the six states — Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Virginia, North Carolina, and Florida — to keep an eye on because they’re likely to decide the election.

### Swing States Key

#### Winning the key swing states guarantees Obama a win.

**Reuters**, 6/27/**2012** (Obama takes lead in swing states, economy still weighs, p. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-usa-campaign-swingstates-poll-idUSBRE85Q0YJ20120627)

President Barack Obama is carving out a clear lead in swing states that are key to the November 6 presidential election, even as national polls show him neck-and-neck with Republican rival Mitt Romney. Helped by the White House's recent loosening of immigration rules, Obama leads Romney in Ohio, Pennsylvania and Florida, according to a Quinnipiac University survey on Wednesday. An NBC/Wall Street Journal national poll showed Obama ahead of his challenger by just 3 points: a lead of 47 percent to 44 percent which is within the margin of error. However, the Democrat's lead stretches to 8 points when the race is measured in 12 tightly contested states. Voters are still deeply worried about the economy, and Obama's campaign could suffer a heavy blow if the Supreme Court rules against his healthcare overhaul on Thursday. But on paper, Obama seems to have an easier path than Romney to winning 270 electoral college votes, and thus the election, if he can hold on to some of the big swing states he won in 2008. Among the most contested battleground states today, Obama won Ohio, Pennsylvania and Florida in 2008. "If he can keep those leads in all three of these key swing states through Election Day he would be virtually assured of re-election," said Peter Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute.

### AT: Link Turn – Jobs Key to Swing States

#### Increasing jobs will not swing key states --- it does not translate into economic growth.

**Huffington Post**, 7/9/**2012** (Swing States Where Unemployment is Dropping Rapidly, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/06/swing-state-unemployment\_n\_1653972.html)

The jobs gains in a handful of swing states has been a bright spot for Obama's campaign. Of the ten states that made the most rapid employment gains over the last year, five are swing states. The recent economic success in states like Florida -- where unemployment has fallen by 2 percent -- may be worrying Republican strategists. Republican lawmakers in successful swing states have reportedly been told to play down their home state's recovery by the national party in an aim to prevent the President from benefiting politically in the November elections. But swing state job growth may not guarantee Obama's reelection. In New Hampshire, New England's only swing state, the unemployment rate was 5 percent in May. Despite the state's stellar jobs numbers, a recent NBC News/Marist Poll shows that the race in the Granite State is in a statistical dead heat. Nor do rising employment numbers necessarily indicate 'strong' economic recoveries. Wages have fallen in every one of the ten states posting the most rapid job gains, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The National Employment Law Project estimates that 71 percent of re-employed -- individuals who lost their jobs and subsequently found new work -- received a lower wage than the one they earned at their previous job, with half of this group earning a paycheck 25 percent lower than what they had earned previously.

### AT: Link Turn – Swing State Economy

#### The overall state of the economy is more important than state economies.

**Bernstein**, 7/8/**2012** (Jonathan – political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post blogs Plum Line and PostPartisan, Five myths about swing states, Tampa Bay Times, p. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/five-myths-about-swing-states/1239046>)

Ever since political scientists showed that the economy is a major factor in presidential elections, they have struggled to determine what exactly that boils down to. Is it voters' personal experience? What their friends and neighbors believe? The answer matters a lot. If the local economy is the deciding factor, then it would make sense for the candidates to focus on how the economy is doing in, say, Dade County or Hamilton County, Ohio. It turns out, however, that impressions of the national economy are what really move votes. As one recent study of voting and the economy concluded: "Evidently, voters believe the president has little effect on their local economy, and they **do not form their evaluation of the national economy based on surrounding conditions**. ... People form their opinions of the national economy based on nonlocal factors, such as the national media."

#### National economic trends outweigh state-level developments.

**Sorsensen**, 2/15/**2012** (Adam, Why Obama’s Re-Election Fortunes Are Suddenly Looking Up, Time, p. http://swampland.time.com/2012/02/15/why-obamas-re-election-fortunes-are-looking-up/)

For one, swing states may decide presidential elections, **but their economic health does not**. As George Washington political science professor John Sides explains: First, Thomas Holbrook found that state-level economies—measured with unemployment or changes in real per capita income—had no relationship to presidential election outcomes in the states in 1960-84, once measures of the national economy were taken into account. Second, Daniel Eisenberg and Jonathan Ketchum’s study of the 1972-2000 elections also finds that the national economy outweighs the effect of state and county economies.

### Arizona – Not Swing State

#### Arizona not a swing state – leans republican

**Silver**, Accurate predictor of elections and life, 4/27/**12** [Nate. American statistician, sabermetrician, psephologist, and writer. Establisher of the blog FiveThirtyEight. “Arizona Is (Probably) Not a Swing State.” Five Thirty Eight on NY Times. http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/27/arizona-is-probably-not-a-swing-state/]

But is Arizona really a swing state?¶ Let me remind you about how I use the term “swing state” here at FiveThirtyEight. When I employ the term, I mean a state that could swing the outcome of the election. That is, if the state changed hands, the victor in the Electoral College would change as well.¶ The most rigorous way to define this is to sort the states in order of the most Democratic to the least Democratic, or most Republican to least Republican. Then count up the number of votes the candidate accumulates as he wins successively more difficult states. The state that provides him with the 270th electoral vote, clinching an Electoral College majority, is the swingiest state — the specific term I use for it is the “tipping point state.”¶ From Barack Obama’s perspective in 2008, for instance, his easiest three electoral votes were in the District of Columbia. The next-easiest were the four electoral votes in Hawaii, giving him seven total. Repeat this process and you find that Colorado was the tipping point state in 2008, putting him over the top with 278 electoral votes. (Although, winning Iowa but not Colorado would have sufficed to give Mr. Obama 269 electoral votes, an exact tie in the Electoral College.) Note that the swing states are not necessarily the closest states. In fact, they won’t be, unless the election itself is very close. In 2008, the closest states were Indiana, North Carolina and Missouri. However, those states were superfluous for Mr. Obama — North Carolina, for instance, brought him to 365 electoral votes, nearly 100 more than he needed.¶ Likewise in 1984, when Walter Mondale was clobbered by Ronald Reagan, the closest states were Minnesota and Massachusetts. But Michigan was the tipping point state; its 20 electoral votes were the ones that put Mr. Reagan over the top.¶ If you’re not going through all this work to sort the states in order — and it does require some work, since you need to project the outcome in every state as well as account carefully for the uncertainty in the forecast — a reasonably good alternative is just to compare the average of state polls to the average of national polls. The closer the state is to the national average, the more likely it is to play a decisive role in the election.¶ Right now, for instance, Mr. Obama leads Mr. Romney by about four percentage points nationally, so the swingiest states are those where Mr. Obama also holds about a four point lead. In Ohio, for instance, Mr. Obama leads Mr. Romney by about five percentage points in recent surveys, so it is (unsurprisingly) a swing state again this year.¶ How about Arizona? The two most recent polls should show a rough tie there — but since Mr. Obama leads in national polls, it’s still about four points away from the tipping point.¶ And those polls may have been modest flukes. A longer-term average has Mr. Romney three percentage points ahead there, meaning that Arizona leans a net of seven points more Republican than the average of national surveys.¶ Arizona showing a seven-point Republican lean relative to national numbers would be fairly normal. That’s about where it was from 1992 through 2004, for instance. The gap was wider in 2008, but presumably because its native son, Mr. McCain, was on the Republican ticket. None of this is to say that Mr. Obama couldn’t win Arizona — he certainly could. Bill Clinton won Arizona in 1996 when he won the election by about eight percentage points nationally. If Mr. Obama won by a similar margin, he’d be at least even-money to pick up the state as well.¶ But if he does win Arizona it will probably be superfluous, since in all likelihood he’ll already have won states like Ohio, Colorado and Virginia that are closer to the tipping point.

### Colorado – Swing State

#### Colorado is a swing state --- major events can shift it.

**The Denver Post**, 6/11/**2012** (Colorado shapes up as a key swing state in presidential election, p. http://www.denverpost.com/politics/ci\_20828446/colorado-shapes-up-key-swing-state-presidential-election)

Colorado basked in its newfound status as a swing state in 2008, playing host to the Democratic National Convention and candidate appearances from Denver to Durango. But for all that attention, several dynamics this year make the Centennial State even more competitive — and critical to winning the White House. Unlike 2008, when then-Sen. Barack Obama rode a wave of anti-Republican sentiment with promises of hope and change, there are fewer states this time around that are truly up for grabs. And while Florida and Ohio with their double-digit electoral votes are the big prizes, Obama and Mitt Romney are eyeing Colorado's nine electoral votes — in combination with other Western states such as Nevada, New Mexico and Arizona — to give them the win. "If you look at the map, Colorado and Nevada are two of the true battleground states," said Ethan Axelrod, communications director for Project New America, a progressive Denver-based research and strategy organization. "Both states are still very, very close, and I think they're going to stay that way until November." Paths to victory The campaigns use a combination of history, demographics and polling to determine which states are solidly or leaning red or blue and which states are considered tossups. From there, it's a matter of doing the math — finding ways to combine victories in winnable states to get the candidate to 270 electoral votes, the total needed to win the presidency. A series of polls released last week showed the race tightening in Colorado. A poll of 600 Coloradans by Purple Strategies found 48 percent favored Obama and 46 percent favored Romney. The poll's margin of error was plus or minus 4 percentage points. A Rasmussen Reports poll of 500 likely voters showed both candidates with 45 percent, while 6 percent preferred another candidate and 5 percent were undecided. The margin of error was plus or minus 4.5 percentage points. In a video posted online June 4, Obama campaign manager Jim Messina said he believed that if the election were held that day, the president would win enough states to reach 243 electoral votes. Romney would have 191, while 104 electoral votes would be "up for grabs," Messina said. Those votes came from eight states: Colorado, Iowa, Wisconsin, Ohio, New Hampshire, Virginia, North Carolina and Florida. Also last week, Politico obtained a Power Point report compiled by a Romney pollster. It listed seven battleground states in the campaign's "route to 270": Colorado, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, Ohio and Virginia. Focus on unaffiliated voters Over the next five months, some of those states will move from tossup to leaning toward one candidate or the other, depending on which campaign is talking, the events of any given week or other factors on the ground. But it's clear both campaigns are keeping Colorado on their shortlist — and that the campaign appearances, voter-registration drives and TV ads will continue.

#### Colorado key – independent votes, jobs and votes

**Chebium**, Writer for Gannet Washington Bureau, 7/7/**12** [Raju.”Colorado not the largest swing state, but still a critical one.” Coloradoan. <http://www.coloradoan.com/article/20120707/NEWS01/307070022/Colorado-not-largest-swing-state-still-critical-one/accessed>: 7/19/12]

WASHINGTON — Colorado may have only nine electoral votes, but the waves of political ads hitting the state reflect its importance in this year’s presidential race.¶ “Colorado’s electoral votes may or may not decide the election, but certainly, given that there are relatively few competitive states, both campaigns view this as a vital state to compete in,” said University of Denver political scientist Peter Hanson, who worked on Capitol Hill for former Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D.¶ If President Barack Obama or Mitt Romney wins all or most of the larger swing states, then smaller states such as Colorado and Nevada (with six electoral votes) won’t be crucial, according to University of Colorado political scientist Ken Bickers.¶ “If, on the other hand, there’s a split between Florida, Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, then these western states are absolutely going to become more important,” Bickers said Friday. “At that point, Colorado, Nevada and even Arizona become states that one side or the other is going to have to carry.”¶ The two presidential campaigns and super PACs — independent groups that can spend unlimited amounts on ads supporting or opposing candidates — already are running ads in Colorado.¶ Colorado is among the top 10 states for ad expenditures by Democrats, Republicans and independent groups, according to a study by Kantar Media’s Campaign Media Analysis Group.¶ The candidates and super PACs spent $2.8 million on television ads in Colorado between April 10 — when Romney effectively became the GOP nominee — and May 29, according to the study, published by National Journal magazine.¶ Colorado has never seen so many ads, especially not in the summer, analysts say.¶ “I am at the point now where I’m excited when ... I see an ad for mattress deals,” joked Colorado State University political scientist John Straayer. “We are being carpet-bombed.”¶ The winner needs 270 electoral votes to win. True tossup states — Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio and Virginia — have a combined 85 electoral votes, according to the Cook Political Report, a Washington-based elections newsletter. These states are likely to draw the most attention from the two candidates.¶ Other states in play this year include two traditionally Democratic states (Pennsylvania with 20 electoral votes and Wisconsin with 10 electoral votes), and two traditionally Republican states (Arizona with 11 electoral votes and North Carolina with 15 electoral votes), according to Cook.¶ In 2008, Obama became only the second Democratic candidate in 20 years to carry Colorado, winning 54 percent of the vote. The other was Bill Clinton, who beat President George H.W. Bush with 40 percent of the vote in 1992.¶ President George W. Bush carried the state in 2000 and 2004. Obama won four years ago, thanks to the enthusiasm generated by his campaign and strong anti-Bush sentiment among Colorado voters, analysts say.¶ Obama was the only Democratic presidential candidate to win more than 50 percent of the vote statewide since President Lyndon Johnson in 1964, said Nathan Gonzales, an analyst for Rothenberg Political Report, a nonpartisan campaign newsletter published in Washington.¶ Polls show Obama with a 2-to-3-percent lead over Romney, but “that could change between now and November,” Straayer said.¶ “I don’t know how you can call it a slam dunk for Obama,” he said. “I don’t know how you can call it a slam dunk for Romney. I just don’t see any arguments either way. If I had to bet right now, I’d pick Obama (but) I wouldn’t bet a lot of money.”¶ Demographic changes are largely responsible for transforming Colorado from a conservative stronghold to a swing state, analysts say.¶ In the 1990s, hundreds of thousands of new residents flocked to the state from California and other Democratic regions, lured by the booming high-tech industry along Interstate 25, Bickers said.¶ Hispanics — who overwhelmingly vote for Democrats — have also flocked to Colorado. They account for 21 percent of the state’s population, up from about 17 percent a decade ago.¶ But many Coloradans continue to be skeptical of both major parties, and favor smaller government and individual freedom, analysts say. Democrats, Republicans and independents each make up a third of the state’s 3.4 million registered voters, according to voter registration figures.¶ The candidate who wins the independent vote will win Colorado, Hanson said.¶ “Just like you see across the rest of the country, those voters tend to be very concerned about the economy,” he said. “Their vote will swing toward the candidate they feel is best able to deal with issues like jobs.”¶ In that sense, Romney has it easier than Obama because he doesn’t have a national record. Obama will have a tougher time wooing independent voters as long as national unemployment remains stubbornly high and the state’s unemployment rate continues to inch upward, analysts say.¶ New federal figures released Friday showed the unemployment rate remains stuck at 8.2 percent. Colorado’s unemployment rate inched up 2 percentage points to 8.1 percent in May compared to April, the latest state figures show.

### Florida – Romney Winning

#### Romney leads Florida, especially independents – Poll

**Purple Poll 7/9** (Purple Poll, Doug Usher, PhD, editor, July 2012, Fielded 7/9-7/13, Purple Insights, http://www.purplestrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/7.2012-Purple-Poll.pdf)

Mitt Romney maintains a small but steady advantage in Florida, currently holding a 3-point lead over President Obama. He leads by a substantial margin among independents (51% to 41%). In all four Purple States we have singled out, a gender gap exists, showing up most strongly in Ohio. Not surprisingly, Obama comes out on top in Ohio and Virginia where his margin among women is higher than his deficit among men (it is even in Colorado), and Romney enjoys a robust advantage among male voters in Florida for the time being (54% to 37%).

### Florida Key

#### Florida key – winning in Florida means winning in most states

**Fox News** 7/3/**12** [Associated Press. Fox News Latino. “Obama, Romney Battle Over Florida's I-4 Corridor.” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2012/07/03/in-florida-fight-obama-and-romney-scrap-along-4/accessed>:7/17/12]

This year, the stakes are hard to overstate: Obama's re-election is nearly assured should he repeat his 2008 victory in Florida, based on how the states lean now. His standing in Florida is far more precarious than it is in other contested states — so if he wins Florida, it's likely that he's won in many other states as he looks to cobble together the 270 Electoral College votes it takes to win. Romney's state-by-state routes to reaching the magic number are more limited than the president's, and a Florida victory would make it far more probable that he could win the presidency.¶ The electorate in Florida is virtually unchanged from 2008 because the ailing economy stifled the population growth of the previous decade. And in this campaign, the economy dominates.¶ The recession took a deep toll on the state's recreation industry, especially around Orlando. A decline in foreign trade hurt the Port of Tampa, Florida's largest shipping port. The housing crisis fueled widespread home foreclosures and severely hampered the construction industry on which much of the region's immigrant-heavy workforce relies.¶ Florida's unemployment rate was 8.6 percent in May, slightly higher than the national average and all other presidential battleground states except Nevada.¶ A little more than four months before the Nov. 6 election, Obama narrowly leads Romney in statewide polls.¶ The president and his Democratic allies spent roughly $17 million in television advertising in Florida from April, when Romney effectively became the GOP presidential nominee, through last week. Romney's campaign hasn't been on the air in the state since then, but his allies have doled out $12 million during that time. The ads are heavily concentrated on the Tampa and Orlando media markets, which are cheaper than Miami's and reach far more swing voters.¶ Of the $2.8 million spent on TV ads in the state last week, $1.8 million was in this region.¶ Obama is on defense in the I-4 corridor, which he won by a very slim majority in 2008 after Bush won it in 2000 and 2004. Republicans hope that holding their national convention in Tampa in August will give them an edge.¶ In a close race where anything could be determinative, organization could count hugely and, on this point for now at least, Obama has an advantage. He never dismantled his 2008 campaign infrastructure in the state and has 36 campaign offices. Romney has quickly opened 23, run jointly with the Republican National Committee.¶ "In a race like this, that is so close and so hard-fought, door-to-door, mail and telephones could make the difference," said Republican Sally Bradshaw, a top Florida aide to Romney during his failed 2008 presidential bid.

#### Florida, Nevada and Michigan key – housing policy

**Kolko**, Chief economist in Trulia, 7/13/**12** [Jed. leads the company’s housing research and provides insights on market trends and public policy. “Housing Misery in the Swing States.” The Huffington Post. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jed-kolko/swing-states-housing_b_1668467.html?utm_hp_ref=elections-2012/accessed>: 7/17/12]

How will housing play out in the election? Because candidates need to focus on swing states, they'll have to face housing head-on. Even though the national housing market is clearly in recovery, housing misery is concentrated in several swing states, including Florida, Nevada and Michigan. When candidates are in Romney territory, which covers much of the South, the Plains and the Mountain regions, where the Housing Misery Index is low, they can safely ignore housing. But the states clearly in the Obama or Romney camp won't determine the presidential election outcome; the swing states will. Voters in key swing states will want to hear what the candidates have to say about housing. And what will they say? As the incumbent, Obama needs to point to some clear housing-policy successes; as the challenger, Romney needs to point to some fresh new ideas about housing. They've both got their work cut out for them.

Florida Key

#### Florida and Michigan key – unemployment is the core

**Good**, Political Reporter for ABC, 7/3/**12** [Chris. “Charts: Swing-State Economies in 2012 Election.” ABC News. <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/07/charts-swing-state-economies-in-2012-election/accessed>: 7/17/12]

One thing is clear: If state unemployment rates can swing elections, Obama has it far better than his two economically challenged incumbent predecessors.¶ Since last August, unemployment has dropped in all nine of these swing states: Colorado, Florida, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. In five perennial swing states more suited to historical comparison–Florida, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Pennsylvania–Obama has seen unemployment drop an average of 1.46 percentage points since August.¶ In 1992 and 1980, by contrast, unemployment had risen in these states.¶ In June 1992, George W. Bush had seen unemployment rise .66 of a percentage point on average in the five swing states listed above, since the previous August. It rose in all except Missouri (where it fell .2 points), and Bush won only Florida. Carter had it much worse. Unemployment rose an average of 2.2 percentage points in those five states, increasing in all, and Carter lost all five to Ronald Reagan. Not only has Obama averaged a better trend in these nine states, he’s experienced a lot more months of good news in each of them.¶ Since last August, unemployment has risen in swing states during four months. In the five states for comparison, it has risen only once–in Michigan in May–while it’s fallen 39 times.¶ In June 1992, George W. Bush had seen the unemployment rate rise 26 times in the same five states, while rates fell only three times–twice in Missouri in the fall, and once in Michigan in April. In 1980, Carter had seen unemployment rise in those states 33 times and fall three times–for three consecutive months in Michigan.¶ Both Carter and Bush, of course, lost their elections, but but the historical comparisons are far from perfect. Ross Perot’s presence on the ballot in 1992, for instance, makes it difficult to correlate Bush’s performance to other variables, and the competitiveness of each “swing state” varied over the years.¶ Neither of these elections, however, offer a true test of Obama supporters’ hypothesis that the trajectory of unemployment, not the rate on Election Day, determines a presidential winner. At this moment in 1992, swing-state economies had declined over the previous 10 months, and they were just beginning to turn around. Between July and Election Day, most of them did, but Bush lost most of them regardless. In July 1980, some swing-state economies had worsened since the previous August, while some had improved–but they were all getting worse over the summer; none would get better until the fall, and Carter lost all of them.¶ Last month brought bad news, with the national rate climbing from 8.1 percent to 8.2 percent. Unemployment rose in both Colorado and Michigan–a troubling sign for Obama, politically.

### Iowa 2NC – Rural Voters

#### Rural voters support transportation infrastructure.

**Davis**, 9/14/**2010** (Stephen Lee – Deputy Communications Director for Transportation for America, USA Today on infrastructure spending: what do Americans want?, Transportation for America, p. http://t4america.org/blog/2010/09/14/usa-today-on-infrastructure-spending-what-do-americans-want/)

And as our 2010 poll showed, more than four-in-five voters (82 percent) say that “the United States would benefit from an expanded and improved transportation system, such as rail and buses” and a solid majority (56 percent) “strongly agree” with that statement. Fully 79 percent of rural voters agree as well, despite much lower use of public transportation compared to Americans in urban areas.

#### Iowa key to the election --- particularly true in close elections.

**Sale**, 7/17/**2012** (Anna – reporter for It’s A Free Country, Anna in the Swing States: Iowa’s Political Migrations, WNYC, p. http://www.wnyc.org/articles/its-free-country/2012/jul/17/anna-swing-states-iowas-political-migrations/)

This year, it will come down to which campaign can woo Iowa’s ticket-splitting rural voters and swing Catholic voters, while establishing a edge in the politically diversifying cities. George W. Bush narrowly won Iowa in 2004 over John Kerry, before Obama won by nine points. Iowa is down one electoral vote to six, but both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney see this state as winnable. "Normally, Iowa falls off the face of the earth politically the day after the Iowa caucuses. It just doesn’t matter,” said Dennis Goldford, a political scientist at Drake University. “But when an election looks to be extremely close as the 2000 and 2004 elections were, even Iowa’s six electoral votes matter.”

### Iowa – Economy Key

#### The state of the economy will swing Iowa.

**Sale**, 7/17/**2012** (Anna – reporter for It’s A Free Country, Anna in the Swing States: Iowa’s Political Migrations, WNYC, p. http://www.wnyc.org/articles/its-free-country/2012/jul/17/anna-swing-states-iowas-political-migrations/)

Of course, elections are won as much by convincing swing voters as by running up margins where candidates are strongest. This is what makes Polk County of particular interest in 2012. “Central Iowa, particularly if you think of Des Moines, is not the Democratic machine that it used to be,” Drake’s Dennis Goldford told me. Since 2008, there are 18,000 fewer active Democrats registered and about 9,000 fewer independents in the state, while Republicans are up about 4,000 voters. Part of that, of course, could be a factor of all the Republican organizing activity before the caucus while Democrats waited. Another factor, described Goldford, is population shifts within the state. “Typically in Iowa, the old saw is the further east you go, the more urban, the more Catholic, the more Democratic you get. And the further west you go, the more rural, the more Protestant, the more Republican you get.” Population declines in rural counties, though, are changing that political geography is changing. “There’s been a lot of internal migration, and they tend to go to the more urbanized counties because that’s where the jobs are and that’s where the opportunities are, particularly for the younger folks,” Goldford explained. “But they take their religious orientation with them.” And that religious orientation, and the political histories that come with it, are shifting. Shifting Catholic Voters There’s not much racial diversity among Iowa voters — 91 percent were white in 2008 — but there is religious diversity. About a quarter of the electorate in 2008 were Catholics, while three in five were Protestant. “Catholics have been the quintessential swing voters nationally, and in Iowa I think that’s the case as well,” said Drake's Professor Goldford. Catholics in Iowa favored Obama over McCain by twenty points, a swing back after George W. Bush made gains in 2004 among Catholics. Obama carried heavily Catholic Dubuque County by fifteen points. About half of Dubuque County residents were Catholic in 2010, according to the the most recent data available from the Association of Religion Data Archive. "You used to figure that the Democratic party was primarily catholic voters and the Republicans tended to be a Protestant party,” said Art Neu, a former Republican lieutenant governor who describes himself as a moderate Republican. “I don’t think those lines are as important anymore.” Neu supported Romney in the GOP caucuses but plans to vote for Obama in the general election, and he blames these shifts in part for the more conservative bent in his party. “I thought they would moderate themselves on the abortion issue, but around here, if you run for public office, you’d better be pro-life, or you’re in trouble.” This year, Iowa caucus entrance polls didn’t track the number of Catholic voters who participated --on the percentage of evangelical protestant voters, who accounted for 57 percent of total Republican participation. Of course, with 71 percent of Iowa voters naming the economy as their top issue and a summer drought crippling local agriculture, religious considerations for voters, Catholic or otherwise, may not be all that decisive. “If the economy turns sour, for reasons totally unrelated to Obama, then I think Romney’s probably going to win,” Obama supporter Art Neu said. Then, he added with a laugh, “So you just pray that the EU stays together and we get rain.”

### North Carolina – Swing State

#### North Carolina can swing the election if it’s close.

**Cohn**, 6/21/**2012** (Nate – founder and writer for Electionate at the New Republic, former Whitman debater, Can North Carolina Be a Tipping Point State?, The New Republic, p. http://www.tnr.com/blog/104187/can-north-carolina-be-tipping-point-state)

In 2008, Obama won North Carolina by less than 1 percent while winning by 7 percent nationally. After four years, Obama’s big national lead has vanished, but Obama and Romney are spending away in the populous and diverse mid-Atlantic state. According to the Washington Post’s ad-tracker, the two campaigns spent $1.7 million in North Carolina last week, similar to the other big battleground states like Florida ($1.8m), Ohio ($1.9m), and Virginia ($1.5m). The FiveThirtyEight tipping point state index, designed to estimate the chance that a state might prove decisive in a tight national election, judges North Carolina nearer to New Jersey than any competitive state. So why are the campaigns pouring millions into the Tar Heel State? The answer lies in the state’s unique demographic profile, which creates scenarios where Obama might need to win North Carolina in the event of a close national election. The current national polling outlines the demographic contours of a closely contested race: Obama would hold most of his non-white support from 2008, but suffer big losses among white voters, and particularly white working class voters. If one averages the demographic subtotals from the most recent Pew and Gallup polls and weights them to 2008 turnout, Obama would hold 49 percent of the vote—just what he would hold in the event of a tied election. There is no guarantee that the electorate looks just like 2008, and Obama’s share of the vote based on current polling changes with the composition of the electorate. Today, the Obama campaign indicated that whites would make up just 72 percent of the electorate this year, down from 74 percent in 2008. That is certainly possible, but so is decreased youth and African American turnout rates along with a surge of conservative white voters who didn’t participate in 2008. Given the national polls, a closely contested election would entail unusual polarization along racial/ethnic lines. In that context, North Carolina could play a critical role in a close national election. As a general rule, Obama should hold firm in states where Obama’s political fortunes are least dependent on the support of whites, and particularly working class whites, and suffer big losses in states where Obama was heavily dependent on whites without a college degree. Of all the battleground states, Obama’s coalition in North Carolina is the least dependent on white voters and the second least dependent on support from the white working class: 50 percent of Obama’s supporters in North Carolina were African American and only 27 percent of his supporters were whites without a college degree. The same demographic characteristics that potentially make North Carolina resilient to the national headwind eroding Obama’s support nationally also make Obama vulnerable to big losses in the Upper Midwest. Obama’s support in Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio is overwhelmingly white, and nearly 50 percent of his 2008 supporters were whites without a college degree.

### North Carolina – Not Swing State

#### North Carolina not swinging – leaning republican

**Davis**, North Carolina policy analyst, 7/8/**12** [John. state’s leading authorities on evaluating the strengths of candidates and predicting the outcome of political races. “N.C. not a swing state; it’s clearly Romney’s to lose.” Charlotte Observer. <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2012/07/08/3368095/nc-not-a-swing-state-its-clearly.html#storylink=cpy/accessed>: 7/19/12]

On May 14, I stated the following: “North Carolina will soon be taken off most ‘Swing States’ lists and relabeled ‘Leaning Romney.’ Obama will redirect N.C. resources to greener pastures.”¶ In writing about that forecast, I drew the following conclusion:¶ How could the Obama political organization misread North Carolina so badly?¶ • Obama won by 14,179 votes out of 4,310,623 cast in 2008.¶ • Obama won because President Bush had a job approval of 25 percent.¶ • Obama won because McCain was feared as a third Bush term.¶ • Obama won because the GOP took the state for granted.¶ • Obama won because he had the surprise factor (no one saw it coming).¶ • Obama won because he beat the GOP with registration and early voting turnout.¶ The big mistake the Obama camp made was in thinking that Obama carried North Carolina because he was a Democrat or because he was progressive or because he was charismatic. Wrong. He was the only other option on the ballot at a time when voters had lost trust in the Republican leaders and their ideas.¶ The North Carolina Democratic Party was already in freefall without the help of President Obama. With the help of Obama in 2010, Democrats suffered the greatest losses since 1896.¶ Since 2010, Democrats have lost the majority party/majority district status in North Carolina. And they no longer have the leverage of political power to gain a fundraising advantage.¶ Since 2010, Republicans have gained the leverage of power for a fundraising edge and 30 Senate districts likely to elect a Republican to only 18 for the Democrats. Republicans only need 26 to keep their majority in the Senate. There are 70 GOP-friendly House districts to only 42 for the Democrats. Republicans need 61 to keep their majority.¶ The Republican edge in the 13 congressional districts has grown from seven to 10.¶ The lack of strong Democratic leaders in North Carolina gives the Obama camp no other choice but to begin to discreetly redirect the campaign’s North Carolina resources to greener pastures.

### Ohio – Obama Winning

#### Obama winning Ohio, helped by independents – poll

**Purple Poll 7/9** (Purple Poll, Doug Usher, PhD, editor, July 2012, Fielded 7/9-7/13, Purple Insights, http://www.purplestrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/7.2012-Purple-Poll.pdf)

Ohio has moved from one side to the other and back in our recent polling. In April, we showed President Obama with a 5-point lead. Last month, Mitt Romney held a 3-point lead. And today, we show President Obama taking a 3-point lead in this critical state (48% to 45%). This edge is fueled by independents, among whom he leads by 7 points (47% to 40%), as well as women (52% to 40%). Importantly, Romney’s favorability level is low in Ohio – 37% have a favorable view, while a majority (50%) has an unfavorable view. President Obama’s job performance is also underwater there (46% positive/49% negative), but not to the same extent as Romney’s personal image.

#### Ohio leans Obama – poll

**Rasmussen 7/19** (Rasmussen Reports, 7.19.12, Rasmussen, “Election 2012: Ohio President,” http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/politics/elections/election\_2012/election\_2012\_presidential\_election/ohio/election\_2012\_ohio\_president)

The presidential race remains tight in the key battleground state of Ohio where President Obama has inched slightly ahead of Mitt Romney. A new Rasmussen Reports survey of Likely Voters in the Buckeye State shows Obama with 47% of the vote to Romney’s 45%. Five percent (5%) prefer some other candidate, and four percent (4%) are undecided. (To see survey question wording, click here.)

### Ohio – Swing State

#### Ohio is the largest tipping point state.

**Spinelli**, 7/8/**2012** (John Michael – communication professional and former credentialed Ohio statehouse journalist, Ohio, tops among key presidential swing states, favors Obama, Examiner, p. http://www.examiner.com/article/ohio-tops-among-key-presidential-swing-states-favors-obama)

From the reputable perspective of the FiveThirtyEight political calculus blog at the New York Times, topping the so-called "Tipping Point States" in this year's presidential election that will either return President Obama for a second term or install Mitt Romney in his first, is Ohio, a state the White House won in 2008 and **a state Romney cannot afford to lose** if he wants to add 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to his list already impressive list of second homes. Nate Silver, the odds-making baseball brain turned political predictor behind FiveThirtyEight, give the Buckeye State a 26 percent change of being the state that elects the next president in November. Silver ranks Virginia [14.2%], Pennsylvania [12.6%] and Florida [11.5%], in that order, as tipping point states.

### Ohio – Not Key

#### Ohio is not a must win --- other states can open up. National trends matter more than swing states.

**Bernstein**, 7/8/**2012** (Jonathan – political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post blogs Plum Line and PostPartisan, Five myths about swing states, Tampa Bay Times, p. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/five-myths-about-swing-states/1239046>)

You'll hear plenty of similar pronouncements every election season. The Republicans have never won without Ohio, therefore they can't win without Ohio. Or: There is a "blue wall" of states that the Democrats have captured consistently since 1992, so the party has a built-in minimum in the electoral college. That could mean that any poll showing a strong Republican tilt in one of those states indicates that Obama is doomed — or that Gov. Scott Walker's recall victory in "blue wall" Wisconsin shows that Democrats are in trouble. Forget all these "rules." When Republicans won three consecutive presidential elections in the 1980s, pundits became convinced that the GOP had an electoral college lock. That view lasted exactly as long as the party's national vote lead did; as soon as Bill Clinton took the national lead in 1992, it turned out that some of the Republican "lock" states were swingers after all. Sure, if Romney wins Democratic California, he's going to win the election, but that's because if Romney wins California, he's going to be in the process of a huge national landslide. The United States has national elections, and what matters almost every time is the national results. Yes, a candidate must find 270 electoral votes in order to win. But in most years, the electoral college margin will be much larger than the popular vote difference. And the rare times, such as in 2000, when the popular vote is very close, it's not possible to guess in advance which states will be the one or two that really make a difference. So the campaigns will put their resources into those states they expect to be close, because it certainly doesn't hurt, but our elections are much more national than our obsession with swing states implies.

### Pennsylvania Key

#### Pennsylvania key – Obama in the lead now but electoral votes are at stake

**Easley**, writer for The Hill, 7/11/**12** [Jonathon. “Poll: Obama leads in swing-state Pennsylvania.” The Hill. <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/237319-poll-obama-leads-in-swing-state-pennsylvania/accessed>: 7/20/12]

Obama took 47 percent support in the poll, while Romney took 40. That’s in line with the Real Clear Politics average of polls, which shows Obama with an eight-point lead in the Keystone State.¶ Pennsylvania is one of 12 key swing states that Obama won in 2008 that will be critical in determining the outcome of the 2012 election. Pennsylvania’s 20 electoral votes are the third most at stake among swing states, behind only Florida and Ohio.¶ Obama won Pennsylvania by 11 percent over Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) in 2008.¶ The poll of 1,227 likely voters was conducted between July 9 and July 10 and has a 2.8 percent margin of error.

### Virginia – Dead Heat

#### Virginia is a dead heat --- it will be a key battleground state.

**CNN**, **7/19**/2012 (Obama lead disappears in Virginia, p. <http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/19/obama-lead-disappears-in-virginia/>)

President Barack Obama's single digit lead over Mitt Romney in the crucial battleground state of Virginia has disappeared, according to a new poll. The Quinnipiac University survey indicated Virginians split 44%-44% for the two presidential candidates. The race has tightened since March, when Obama led Romney 50%-42%, and the beginning of June, when Obama was ahead 47%-42%. Independent voters in the state are similarly split, with 40% saying they'd vote for Obama and 38% backing Romney. "Virginia voters are sharply split along gender and political lines about the presidential race. The two candidates equally hold their own political bases and are splitting the key independent vote down the middle," Peter A. Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute, wrote in a statement accompanying the poll's release. Virginia is shaping up to be a key battleground in November. Obama won the state by roughly five points in 2008, becoming the first Democrat to take the state in a presidential election since 1964, but it's considered a toss up in 2012. The commonwealth carries 13 electoral votes.

#### Obama barely winning Virginia – poll

**Purple Poll 7/9** (Purple Poll, Doug Usher, PhD, editor, July 2012, Fielded 7/9-7/13, Purple Insights, http://www.purplestrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/7.2012-Purple-Poll.pdf)

Virginia – considered critical to both the Romney and Obama campaign – tilts slightly toward Obama at this stage (46% to 44%). Obama also has the slightest edge in Colorado (45% to 44%). Importantly, independent voters in both states lean toward Romney by 6 points. Clearly, these Purple Predictor States remain up for grabs.

### Virginia – Obama Winning

#### Virginia favors Obama

**Leighton 7/10** (Kyle Leighton is the Editor of TPM Media's PollTracker, 7.10.12, TPM, “Poll: Obama Up 8 Points In Virginia, 1 in North Carolina,” http://2012.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/07/poll-obama-up-8-points-in-virginia-on-high-support-from-democrats-leads-independent-voters.php)

President Obama has a big lead in Virginia, a once-solid Republican stronghold, according to a new survey. Obama’s performance is powered by near uniform support from his own party and strong numbers among independent voters. The president leads by a single point in North Carolina, a state that leads more strongly Republican.

#### Obama winning Virginia independents – poll

**Leighton 7/10** (Kyle Leighton is the Editor of TPM Media's PollTracker, 7.10.12, TPM, “Poll: Obama Up 8 Points In Virginia, 1 in North Carolina,” http://2012.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/07/poll-obama-up-8-points-in-virginia-on-high-support-from-democrats-leads-independent-voters.php)

Independent voters are leaning toward the president in Virginia — 47 percent are prepared to vote for Obama, while 36 percent say they want Romney. That’s built on a divergent perspective of the two candidates: Independents are evenly split on how the president is doing, 46 percent approve, and 46 percent disapprove. Romney is way down with independents — 33 percent view him favorably, and 51 percent have an unfavorable view.

### Virginia – Unemployment Key

#### Virginian votes key – need to keep the unemployment rate the way it is or make it better

**Horsley**, White House correspondent for NPR News, 7/13/**12** [Scott. White House correspondent for NPR News. Reports on the policy and politics of the Obama Administration, and economic issues. “Why New Swing State Of Virginia May Determine Presidency.” Kera. http://keranews.org/post/why-new-swing-state-virginia-may-determine-presidency/accessed:7/17/12]

State Of The Economy¶ Fueled by government (including military) spending, Virginia's unemployment rate never strayed above 7.3 percent during the economic downturn. It now sits at 5.6 percent. That's among the 10 lowest state rates in the nation.¶ The national unemployment rate hit 10 percent in 2010; it is now calculated at 8.2 percent.¶ Bankruptcy filings in Virginia are running below the national average, and housing prices are running above, according to a recent analysis of the state's economy by James Glassman of JPMorgan Chase. Employment is growing "at a respectable pace," Glassman wrote in his June 30 analysis, and "the state's job market is relatively rosy." The state, he said, "has made considerable progress recovering or restoring the jobs it lost in the recession."¶ That makes Romney's economic argument against Obama more difficult than in other important swing states, like Nevada, for example, which has the nation's highest unemployment rate of 11.6 percent, and the highest foreclosure rate.¶ "Federal spending, defense spending, the stimulus money — that's why Obama has a good case to make in Virginia," says Sabato, "and why I say if he can't carry Virginia, he's probably not going to win."¶ Romney's Virginia-tailored message? It was carried to the state by Giuliani: Obama, he told veterans gathered at an event in Virginia Beach, is targeting military cuts that would put "your region of your country right in his crosshairs."

### Virginia – Swing State

#### Virginia is a swing state --- it will decide the 2012 election.

**USA Today**, 6/11/**2012** (Virginia seen as a top prize by presidential campaigns, p. http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/story/2012-06-11/virginia-campaign-swing-state/55525938/1)

Virginia, until recently a reliable supporter of Republican presidential candidates, has become a vitally important swing state that may hold the key to this year's presidential elections. That's why President Obama, GOP challenger Mitt Romney and independent groups allied with both candidates have spent more on ads in Virginia than in any other state except Ohio, campaign figures show. "The fact that both camps are advertising for the general election in early June shows that both camps are taking this (state) seriously," said Roanoke College political scientist Harry Wilson. That's far different from a few election cycles ago, when Republicans could afford to take Virginia's support for granted and Democrats wrote off the state as unwinnable. Neither candidate will neglect Virginia this year, when its 13 electoral votes are up for grabs. Estimated ad expenditures by both sides in Virginia totaled $4.3 million between April 10 — when former senator Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania exited the race and Romney became the presumptive GOP nominee — and May 29, according to ad data analyzed by Elizabeth Wilner of Kantar Media's Campaign Media Analysis Group. By Election Day, Virginians will have seen and heard so many campaign ads, "everybody is going to be glad that it's over," Wilson said. "Everybody is going to be sick of the ads." Ohio, with 18 electoral votes, was the only other swing state that saw higher ad expenditures — $8.4 million, according to data compiled by Kantar Media and published by National Journal magazine. In Virginia, independent groups aligned with Romney are outspending those supporting Obama, Wilner said in an email. Obama is raising more money than Romney from Virginia donors, though that may change as the election nears. Federal records show Obama had raised nearly $4.2 million in Virginia as of April 30. Romney had raised nearly $3.4 million. In 2008, Obama became the first Democratic presidential candidate since 1964 to win Virginia. Last month, he kicked off his re-election campaign with appearances at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond and Ohio. Obama can expect to fare better in Virginia than in swing states such as Ohio and Pennsylvania, according to James Madison University political scientist Bob Roberts. That's because the state has fewer blue-collar white voters, a higher proportion of voters between 18 and 30, and many more upper-income suburban voters, he said. "The demographic profile fits him better in Virginia," he said. Virginia has permanently changed its political color from Republican "red" to swing-state "purple" because of demographic changes, analysts say. University of Virginia political scientist Larry Sabato ticked off the changes — rising numbers of minorities, the decline of the white population since the 1980s and the growth of affluent and politically moderate Northern Virginia. "These are permanent changes," Sabato said. "They aren't going to reverse. Therefore, demographically the state is still ripe for a Democratic candidate to win whenever Democrats are competitive nationally." Romney may have tougher going in Virginia this year than in other swing states because of those demographic changes, analysts said. Federal workers in Northern Virginia may be turned off by his plans to shrink government and independents may be put off by his association with state Republicans, who pushed abortion rights and other socially divisive issues in the last legislative session, Roberts said. Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania are among a handful of states expected to decide the 2012 election. Other swing states are Florida (29 electoral votes), New Mexico (five electoral votes), Nevada (six electoral votes), Colorado (nine electoral votes), North Carolina (15 electoral votes) and Wisconsin (10 electoral votes).

#### Virginia key – it has the strongest economy, lowest unemployment rate and most electoral votes

**Horsley**, White House correspondent for NPR News, 7/13/**12** [Scott. White House correspondent for NPR News. Reports on the policy and politics of the Obama Administration, and economic issues. “Why New Swing State Of Virginia May Determine Presidency.” Kera. http://keranews.org/post/why-new-swing-state-virginia-may-determine-presidency/accessed:7/17/12]

Yes, Virginia, you are this election year's Santa Claus.¶ And it could be your bag of 13 presidential electoral votes that will be the key to deciding who occupies the White House in January.¶ Proof of Virginia's gathering importance?¶ President Obama is in the midst of a two-day Virginia campaign swing. Republican candidate Mitt Romney dispatched former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani to counterattack Friday.¶ The airwaves are awash in campaign ads, and there's a veritable who-has-more-campaign-offices arms race well under way.¶ It's a situation that astounds lifelong Virginians like political analyst Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics.¶ "It's really quite amazing that Virginia has become ground zero in a presidential campaign," he told NPR. "It's almost the new Ohio." "Who," he asks, "could have imagined it?"¶ Polls show a tight race, with averages giving Obama a slight edge in the state.¶ When Obama, buoyed by a huge voter turnout in 2008, became the first Democratic presidential candidate to win the state in 44 years, it revealed how much the changing demographics of the Old Dominion were remaking its politics. His winning margin in Virginia, 53 percent to 46 percent, was identical to his national numbers.¶ Though some exuberant Democrats at the time predicted that the Obama win was proof that Virginia was moving more quickly than anyone anticipated from Republican red to Democratic blue, GOP candidates have won every statewide office since.¶ Analysts view Virginia as crucial to a Romney win; and though they see a path to victory for Obama even if he loses Virginia, it would not bode well for the president to lose a state where the economy ranks among the nation's most robust.¶ "If he loses Virginia, given its 5.6 percent unemployment rate, it suggests the president will have a tough time winning a second term," Sabato says.¶ But if Romney doesn't carry Virginia, he says, "it's hard to see him getting to 270."¶ That's the magic number — the Electoral College votes needed to capture the White House.¶ With the presidential campaigns' intense focus on Virginia, a concurrent dead-heat U.S. Senate battle there between two popular former governors, and an avalanche of money and political ads, we decided to take a look what the ground looks likes just south of the nation's capital.

### Washington – Dislike Transportation Spending

#### Washington voters dislike transportation spending

**Engineering News-Record**, 11/25/**2002** (Washington State Scrambles in Wake of Highway Bond Defeat, Vol. 249, Issue 22, p. EBSCO Host)

FOLLOWING VOTERS' DEFEAT OF A $7.8-billion transportation referendum, Washington state will fall to 49th among states in 2004 capital spending for highways, says state Transportation Secretary Douglas B. MacDonald. It also now appears that a $1.75-billion proposal for a 14-mile Seattle monorail could lose. On Nov. 19, the monorail project, which appeared to be winning on Election Day, was losing by three votes. But officials were still counting a few thousand absentee votes at ENR press time. MacDonald told the state transportation commission Nov. 14 that he would welcome audits by “outside professionals who know the transportation business” as a means of overcoming voters' skepticism of state DOT spending. He said outside audits would provide credible apples-to-apples comparisons of transportation benchmarks. “Citizens need to know they are getting their money's worth” MacDonald said. MacDonald, former executive director of the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority who took over as head of the state DOT in June 2001, says his foremost responsibility as transportation secretary is building credibility. “We must create a climate in which the public is **willing to spend money on transportation**,” he told ENR. But the cards were stacked against MacDonald in the Nov. 5 election. Environmentalists say the transportation referendum (R-51) was a roads measure that slighted public transit. Others say it would have little immediate impact on highway congestion that has become the second-worst in the nation. Voters outside the Seattle area said it would do nothing for them at all. The measure would have been funded by a 9 cents fuel-tax hike. Construction and business leaders spent about $4 million to support the measure. It failed by 20%.

### Wisconsin – Swing State

#### Wisconsin is a key state – it’s both liberal and conservative

**Politico** 7/12/**2012** [Patrick Gavin, William Bergstrom, Tim Mak, Mackenzie Weinger and MJ Lee contributed to this report. “50 politicos to watch: Swing-state media players.” Politico.com.http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0712/78294\_Page2.html#ixzz215035igt/accessed: 7/19/12]

Every four years, the nation’s eyes turn to Wisconsin — some presidential election cycles more than others, but the Badger State is usually up for grabs.¶ As the Washington bureau chief for the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, Craig Gilbert has a unique view on how the state fits into the nation’s political tapestry.¶ “Wisconsin is kind of a hard state to get a handle on,” Gilbert said. “It’s got a reputation for being more of a liberal state than it actually is, in some respects. So when Wisconsin votes in a conservative direction like it did in 2010, and arguably in this year’s recall election, that comes as a surprise to some people. But it truly is a swing state. It’s hard to stereotype because it has its liberal strains and its conservative strains.”¶ Thus, he says, what’s happening in Wisconsin is likely happening all over the United States.¶

# Obama Bad

## Links

### Transportation Infrastructure 1NC

#### Transportation spending will win Obama the election --- perceived as a job creator.

**Cooper**, 1/25/**2012** (Donna – Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to **help the middle class grow and prosper**. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens.

### Generic – AT: Other Issues

#### Transportation spending outweighs other issues --- massive support even from the Tea Party.

**Rockefeller Foundation Press Release**, 2/14/**2011** (Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform, p. http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure)

This Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey highlights 4 key findings:

American voters see improvement in transportation infrastructure as a way to improve the economy and their quality of life: With federal unemployment rates hovering at 9%, Americans feel that improvements to transportation and infrastructure will create millions of jobs – eight in ten voters think transportation and infrastructure will boost local economies and create jobs including 64% of Tea Party supporters and 66% of Republicans. American voters are looking for consensus and cooperation in Washington: Americans want their elected officials to work together, especially around the issue of transportation and infrastructure (66% of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground). More than any other issue tested, American voters would like to see compromise on legislation related to transportation and infrastructure (71%). American voters see room for improvement in how government spends money on infrastructure: With a high federal deficit, Americans overwhelmingly say that that current government spending on building and maintaining transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise – 64% overall and 72% of Republicans. Americans support a host of reforms aimed at making spending more efficient while still producing results. For instance, 90% support allowing local regions to have some input on how transportation dollars are used in their area. American voters are open to several funding streams for national transportation projects: With overwhelming support for transportation and infrastructure improvements, Americans are open to several funding streams. Seventy-eight percent encourage more private investment and 72% of voters support imposing penalties on projects that go over budget or exceed their deadline. Sixty percent of voters support establishing a National Infrastructure Bank, 59% support issuing new transportation bonds and 58% support eliminating subsidies for American oil companies that drill in other countries. Only 27 percent support increasing the gas tax, although almost half of all respondents believe it increases annually (it has not increased since 1993). “As the transportation debate in Washington begins to heat up, this new Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey shows that the American people, no matter their political party, support transportation and infrastructure reform, said Marcia L. Hale, President of Building America’s Future Education Fund. “As voters continue to demand that economic reforms come ahead of politics, I call on all our representatives in Washington to listen closely to what the public is saying.”

### Compromise Link

#### Voters want a consensus on transportation infrastructure --- outweighs other issues.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 1)

Voters—be they Democrats, Republicans, or independents—are looking for cooperation and consensus in Washington. • As has been the case for well over a year, a majority of the public believe that things in the country are off on the wrong track—55% say this is the case, while 33% say things are headed in the right direction. • One of the key things the public is looking for right now is for elected leaders to work together. Two-thirds (66%) of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground, compared with just 20% who say leaders should hold fast to their positions (another 10% say it depends on the issue). • Interestingly, this sentiment crosses party lines—74% of Democrats, 65% of independents, and 58% of Republicans say leaders should be seeking common ground. Even a plurality (46%) of voters who identify as Tea Party supporters want common ground, versus 34% who say leaders should hold fast to their positions. Voters want common ground on transportation legislation more than on any other issue. Americans want leaders to seek common ground across a host of issues, but they want it on transportation legislation more than any other area. • 71% of voters say there should be common ground on this issue—higher than other major issues—while 19% say leaders should hold fast to their positions, which is lower than other major issues. • By comparison, the next-highest issue is legislation dealing with the budget deficit, where 69% would like to see common ground and 25% want to see leaders holding fast to their positions. • This pattern holds across other issues as well, from energy development to health care reform to tax cuts to Social Security.

### Plan = Jobs Agenda

#### Transportation spending strengthens Obama’s jobs agenda strategy --- swings voters.

**USA Today**, 5/1/**2012** (Federal transportation bill enters legislative homestretch, p. http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2012-05-01/federal-transportation-highway-bill/54660278/1)

Defying expectations, Congress has reached the homestretch on a major overhaul of federal transportation programs that is critical if the nation is to avoid steep cutbacks in highway and transit aid. The bill is driven partly by election-year politics. Both Congress and President Obama have made transportation infrastructure investment the centerpiece of their jobs agendas. But the political imperative for passing a bill has been complicated by House Republicans' insistence on including a mandate for federal approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. The White House has threatened to veto the measure if it retains the Keystone provision. And there are other points of disagreement between the GOP-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate, including how to pay for transportation programs and how much leverage the federal government should have over how states spend their aid money. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has said it's unlikely Congress will pass a final bill until after the November elections. Despite LaHood's pessimism, lawmakers and transportation lobbyists said they believe prospects are improving for passage of a final bill by June 30, when the government's authority to spend highway trust fund money expires. The fund, which pays for roads and transit, is forecast to go broke sometime next year. A House-Senate conference committee is scheduled to begin formal negotiations May 8. It has taken Congress years to get this far. Work on a transportation overhaul began before the last long-term transportation bill expired in 2009. The Senate finally passed a $109 billion bill with broad bipartisan support in March. The bill would give states more flexibility in how they spend federal money, step up the pace of road construction by shortening environmental reviews, impose a wide array of new safety regulations and boost funding for a federal loan guarantee program to encourage private investment for major infrastructure projects. House Republicans, after failing to corral enough votes to pass their own plan, recently passed a placeholder bill that allows them to begin negotiations with the Senate. That bill included the Keystone provision, as well as provisions limiting the public's ability to challenge transportation projects on environmental grounds and taking away the Environmental Protection Agency's power to regulate toxic coal ash. "I feel like people are worn out on this issue and would like to get something done," said Jeff Shoaf, a lobbyist with the Associated General Contractors of America, a trade association for the construction industry. "I think the prospects are good." Winning approval of the Keystone provision, which would give federal regulators no choice but to approve a pipeline to transport oil from Canada's tar sands, appears to be House Speaker John Boehner's top priority, lawmakers and transportation lobbyists said. Republicans portray Obama's delay in the pipeline as a contributor to high gasoline prices. "Boehner wants to push Keystone as hard as he can because he sees it as a political winner," said Joshua Schank, president and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation, a nonprofit foundation dedicated to improving transportation. Senate Democratic conferees on the bill appear to have enough votes to block inclusion of the Keystone provision in the final product. Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., one of four Senate committee chairmen responsible for a portion of the bill, has announced he'll oppose Keystone and other House environmental provisions. An open question is whether House Republicans will balk on an overall transportation bill if they can't get Keystone. Similarly, despite their public statements, it's unclear whether Senate Democrats would be willing to sacrifice the bill in order to block a Keystone provision, and whether Obama would follow through on his veto threat, especially if the Keystone language were softened in negotiations. The president painted a bleak picture of America's infrastructure in a speech Monday to union workers in the construction industry, saying U.S. highways are clogged, railroads are no longer the fastest in the world and airports are congested. A transportation construction bill would boost employment and the economy, but "the House Republicans are refusing to pass a bipartisan bill that could guarantee work for millions of construction workers," Obama said, referring to the Senate bill. "Instead of making the investments we need to get ahead, they're willing to let us all fall further behind," he said. The transportation bill "is incredibly important to the president," said Ed Wytkind, president of the transportation trades department of the AFL-CIO. Both sides ultimately must decide whether they want an issue to be used as a campaign weapon or an accomplishment they can tout to voters.

### Job Creation Link

#### The public supports transportation infrastructure spending as a critical tool for economic growth.

Smart Growth America, March **2011** (Building for the 21st Century: American support for sustainable communities, p. <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/building-for-the-21st-century.pdf>)

The findings also reveal that spending on transportation infrastructure – like road repair, trains or buses – ranks higher than both investing in technology/innovation and investments in clean energy and green jobs as ways to rebuild the economy. The majority of Americans agree about problems that can be solved by smart growth solutions. Across all regions and all political parties, Americans agree that our country faces several problems that can be solved, in part, by smart growth solutions: • 84% of Americans believe that our country is too dependent on oil. 77% of Independent voters, 77% of Republicans, 95% of Democrats and 82% of those polled with no party affiliation agree with this statement. Smart growth strategies provide alternatives to driving that give families lower cost transportation choices, reduce how much they need to drive and decrease our dependence on oil. • 82% of Americans agree that spending 50% of a household budget on housing and transportation – which most Americans families do – is simply too much. 77% of Independent voters, 77% of Republicans, 87% of Democrats and 90% of those polled with no party affiliation agree that 50% of a household budget is too much to spend on transportation and housing. By providing low-cost transportation choices, reducing the distance between home and work and placing schools and shops close by smart growth strategies help reduce these combined costs. • 82% of Americans believe that rebuilding our economy and creating new jobs is the most important issue of our generation. 76% of Independent voters, 84% of Republicans, 84% of Democrats and 81% of those polled with no party affiliation agree that rebuilding our economy is more important than any other issue facing America today. Smart growth strategies help build the foundation for long-term economic growth by creating jobs today and reducing the fiscal burden on towns and states for the future. • 75% of Americans agree that infrastructure spending on roads, trains, and buses creates jobs and helps the economy get stronger. 68% of Independent voters, 67% of Republicans, 89% of Democrats and 70% of those polled with no party affiliation agree that investing in transportation infrastructure creates jobs and helps the economy get stronger. This isn’t just belief, it’s a fact: Repairing roads and bridges creates 16% more jobs per dollar than building new ones, and building public transportation creates 31% more jobs per dollar than building roads.

#### Transportation spending is a high-profile jobs issue for voters.

**Reuters**, 6/7/**2012** (Boehner floats 6-month US transport funding extension, p. http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/usa-infrastructure-boehner-idINL1E8H7AH320120607)

The fight in Congress over the transportation bill is one of several being waged between Democrats and Republicans on high-profile issues, with each side trying to gain the upper hand in their bids to win re-election on Nov. 6. The highway bill is particularly important as it would authorize major job-creating construction projects across the United States at a time when the economic recovery is losing momentum and jobs are the top issue for voters.

### Job Creation Link – Perception

#### The public perceives transportation infrastructure as job creators.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 2)

The public understands the economic benefits of infrastructure improvement. • Four in five (80%) voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation “will boost local economies and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering.” Just 19% disagree with this. • And 79% agree that “in order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.” Again, 19% disagree.

### Job Creation Link – Economy Key

#### Transportation infrastructure resonates with voters as economic development and job promotion.

State Smart Transportation Initiative, May **2012** (Building Support to Fund Preservation Work, Prepared by Spitfire Strategies, p. 5)

Repair and maintenance messages should also tap into the values of target audiences. Just because you may care about the environmental impact of repair and maintenance of existing infrastructure doesn’t mean that’s what your target audience cares about. Understand what moves voters or policymakers. Try to meet your voter or policymaker audiences where they are, instead of highlighting the arguments that might resonate well within your office or the broader transportation community. According to national polling, the most effective values to tap in your preservation messages are job growth, economic development and safety (particularly for policymakers). A 2010 survey by Smart Growth America (SGA) found that 68 percent of voters believe now is the time for state governments to invest in transportation, because if done right, these investments will create jobs and attract new business. The poll found that 91 percent of U.S. voters believe that maintaining and repairing our existing roads and bridges should be the top or a high transportation priority for state governments. Also according to the survey, voters responded best to messages that linked transportation spending to jobs and economic development. Saving money by using tax dollars efficiently is also a compelling message. For voters, the cost-savings message also resonates. They respond well to the fact that spending $1 to keep a road in good condition now prevents spending $7 to reconstruct it once it has fallen into poor condition. Another message that moves this audience is that repair and maintenance projects provide at least a 400 percent return on investment, on average, by preventing the need for future reconstruction, spurring economic development and reducing damage from potholes. 1

### Job Creation – Key to Election

#### Obama will use transportation spending to campaign on jobs --- key to his reelection.

**Johnson**, 2/17/**2012** (Fawn – correspondent for the National Journal, Infrastructure Becomes Campaign Fodder, Transportation Experts Blog at the National Journal, p. http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/infrastructure-becomes-campaig.php)

If you want proof that President Obama is distancing himself as far from Congress as he can, look no further than his proposed infrastructure budget. The White House proposed $476 billion over six years for surface transportation in the fiscal 2013 budget, which is at least $200 billion more than House Republicans are proposing. It's also at least $150 billion more than current infrastructure spending levels. Obama is aiming high, even though he knows he'll probably get much less. Infrastructure means jobs, and "jobs" are the name of the game for his reelection. It's an added bonus that infrastructure has been in the news, which gives politicians of all stripes the opportunity to exploit it for reelection purposes. Both the House and the Senate are attempting (and so far not succeeding) to pass surface transportation bills. Obama ideally wants to increase federal infrastructure investment, but he has also praised the Senate for its more modest bill that simply maintains the current spending levels over two years. Leaders say it could take a few weeks to get that measure completed.

### Generic – Investment Support

#### The public supports transportation investment --- includes independents.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 3)

In fact, voters are in strong agreement with President Obama’s ideas on investment in transportation. Survey respondents were read excerpts from the president’s State of the Union address related to transportation and asked their reaction. “The American Dream has required each generation to sacrifice and meet the demands of a new age. We know what it takes to compete for the jobs and industries of our time. We need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information—from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet. So over the last two years, we've begun rebuilding for the 21st century, a project that has meant thousands of good jobs for the hard-hit construction industry. We should redouble those efforts. We'll put more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges. We'll make sure this is fully paid for, attract private investment, and pick projects based on what's best for the economy, not what's best for politicians.” • Fully 80% of voters agree with this statement, including 46% who strongly agree, while 19% say they disagree. • Agreement is nearly unanimous among Democrats (95%) and is exceptionally high among independents (75%) and Republicans (66%). • Indeed, 91% agree with the specific idea that “our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure--just as our parents and grandparents did”; only 8% disagree with this.

#### The public wants transportation spending even if it results in more taxes.

**Madland and Bunker**. 3/22/**2012** (David – Director of the American Worker Project at American Progress, and Nick – Research Assistant with the Economic Policy team at the Center for American Progress, Ties that Bind: How a Strong Middle Class Supports Strong Public Infrastructure, p. <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/03/middle_class_infrastructure.html/print.html>)

And make no mistake, the broader American public supports increased investments in infrastructure. Ninety-three percent feel making improvements to infrastructure is important; 72 percent support “increasing federal spending to build and repair roads, bridges, and schools”; and 81 percent are prepared to pay more in taxes to do so.

Generic – Investment Support

#### Polls show overwhelming public support for infrastructure investment across all party lines.

Building America’s Future, 1/8/**2009** (Poll: Majority of Americans Ready to Pay for Better Infrastructure but Demand Accountability, p. http://www.bafuture.org/news/press-release/poll-majority-americans-ready-pay-better-infrastructure-demand-accountability)

Today the co‐chairs of Building America’s Future announced the results of a national poll that examines American views on infrastructure, priorities and willingness to pay for it. Conducted by Luntz, Maslansky Strategic Research, the poll shows widespread and bipartisan support for smartinfrastructure investment with accountability measures. Key findings included: • A near unanimous 94% of Americans are concerned about our nation’s infrastructure. • 81% of Americans are prepared to pay 1% more in taxes to rebuild America’s infrastructure. • Accountability is their single highest priority (61%) in rebuilding America’s infrastructure. o Regarding infrastructure spending, Americans care most that projects are on time andon budget (31%), and that they can see exactly where the money is being spent (24%). • Americans understand that infrastructure isn’t just roads and highways. Indeed, energyfacilities are their highest priority. Roads and highways score second, clean water is third. “Americans don’t want their children educated in portable classrooms, and they don’t want to waste millions of gallons of water from leaky old pipes,” said California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. “They want the federal government to smartly invest in our nation’s infrastructure. Now is the perfecttime to put money into public‐works projects because it will help create jobs while pumping up our economy. It's like hitting two homeruns with one swing. This poll confirms that infrastructure is a priority to all Americans, and that they are willing to invest in their own quality of life.” “This poll confirms what many of us believe – the American public understands the importance of investing in a broad range of infrastructure, from the energy grid to roads and transit to clean water. And they understand why infrastructure is so important to them in their daily lives,” said PennsylvaniaGovernor Ed Rendell. “But the public is demanding strong accountability, transparency and oversight of any new investments in infrastructure,” Rendell said. “They want us to set national priorities in infrastructure investment that improve people’s lives, their communities and our economy. They would rather see us take the time to pick the right investments, rather than rush ahead with the same old projects.” "The numbers don't lie: a majority of Americans want to invest in building up our nation's infrastructure, but they want to know that their money is being spent wisely,” said New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg. “They want the government to clean up its act and take responsibility for both success and failure. Any investment made must have benchmarks attached so that we can evaluate what is getting done and what opportunities are being squandered.” “There simply isn't another issue with such widespread support across partisan lines and geographic boundaries,” said Frank Luntz of Luntz, Maslansky Strategic Research. “The public already sees the need and is ready to lend a hand financially to make sure it gets done – but they want it done correctly. This is a major test for government. Accountability is absolutely essential."

#### The public supports transportation spending.

**Pew Research Center**, 3/2/**2010** (Support for Alternative Energy and Offshore Drilling, p. http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1509/alternative-energy-offshore-oil-drilling-nuclear-cap-and-trade)

The public continues to favor a wide range of government policies to address the nation's energy supply. More than three-quarters of the public (78%) favors increasing federal funding for research on wind, solar and hydrogen technology. A large majority (70%) also favors spending more on subway, rail and bus systems. Both measures are little changed from recent years.

Generic – Investment Support

#### Public supports transportation infrastructure.

PRWeb’ 12 (May 18, 2012, “Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure” <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2012/5/prweb9521021.htm>)

A new survey from HNTB Corporation finds two-thirds (66 percent) of Americans who intend to vote during this year's presidential election feel that a candidate's standing on American transportation infrastructure will influence their decision; more than one in five (22 percent) say this will be extremely influential on who they vote for.¶ "Our highways, bridges and other transportation infrastructure are essential assets that support growth and investment in the U.S. economy," said Pete Rahn, HNTB leader national transportation practice. "People expect them to be resilient, reliable and safe."¶ Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways.¶ Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The Highway Trust Fund – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds.¶ More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded.¶ The uncertainty over a long-term bill also is a challenge for state departments of transportation, which rely heavily on federal funding to support major highway and bridge programs, and creates ambiguity for planners and contractors who need the certainty of a long-term bill to commit to large, complex multiyear projects.¶ "The absence of a long-term bill is hurting our economic competitiveness," said Rahn. "Recent efforts by the House and Senate to move discussions into a conference committee and hammer out potential details of a bill are a step in the right direction, but what’s really needed is a stable, long-term authorization that can adequately pay for our transportation system."¶ Overall, 4 in 5 (80 percent) Americans would rather increase funding and improve roads and bridges than continue current funding levels and risk allowing our roads and bridges deteriorate.¶ The challenge is finding sustainable and sufficient revenue sources. More than 3 in 5 (61 percent) Americans would prefer to allocate funds for these projects through tolls.

### Generic – HNTB Survey Prodict

#### HNTB survey has a low margin of error and is reliable

PRWeb’ 12 (May 18, 2012, “Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure” <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2012/5/prweb9521021.htm>)

About the survey

HNTB’s America THINKS national highway survey polled a random nationwide sample of 1,024 Americans April 2-10, 2012. It was conducted by Kelton Research, which used an e-mail invitation and online survey. Quotas were set to ensure reliable and accurate representation of the total U.S. population ages 18 and over. The margin of error is +/- 3.1 percent.

### Generic – Swings Voters

#### Transportation spending will swing voters in the election --- they want more funding.

**ADS Logistics**, 5/29/**2012** (Transportation Infrastructure Weights Heavy on the Minds of Voters, ADS Logistics Supply Chain Management Blog, p. <http://www.adslogistics.com/blog/bid/78595/Transportation-Infrastructure-Weighs-Heavy-on-the-Minds-of-Voters>)

With all the political issues you will be hearing about as the election nears, one important topic that will be on many Americans’ minds may surprise you. The transportation infrastructure concerns many in this country, and it will be heavily considered before voters decide who they want for the next president. In fact, according to Truckinginfo, about two thirds of American voters claim that each candidate’s stance on transportation infrastructure will help them vote. This is not exactly a hot button issue that you may see discussed on the news frequently, but it is clearly important to the average voter. The survey, which was conducted by HNTB Corp., also discovered the following results: 89% of citizens surveyed feel that federal funding is crucial to improve interstate highways. More than 80% wish to increase current funding for highways. 57% claimed that this country’s infrastructure is underfunded.

#### Transportation spending is an issue that will heavily influence likely voters.

**Houston Chronicle**, 5/18/**2012** (Americans Value Highways and Bridges as a National Treasure, p. <http://www.chron.com/business/press-releases/article/Americans-Value-Highways-and-Bridges-as-a-3568488.php%20accessed%20tm%205/19>)

A new survey from HNTB Corporation finds two-thirds (66 percent) of Americans who intend to vote during this year's presidential election feel that a candidate's standing on American transportation infrastructure will influence their decision; more than one in five (22 percent) say this will be extremely influential on who they vote for. "Our highways, bridges and other transportation infrastructure are essential assets that support growth and investment in the U.S. economy," said Pete Rahn, HNTB leader national transportation practice. "People expect them to be resilient, reliable and safe." Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways. Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The Highway Trust Fund – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds. More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded. The uncertainty over a long-term bill also is a challenge for state departments of transportation, which rely heavily on federal funding to support major highway and bridge programs, and creates ambiguity for planners and contractors who need the certainty of a long-term bill to commit to large, complex multiyear projects. "The absence of a long-term bill is hurting our economic competitiveness," said Rahn. "Recent efforts by the House and Senate to move discussions into a conference committee and hammer out potential details of a bill are a step in the right direction, but what’s really needed is a stable, long-term authorization that can adequately pay for our transportation system." Overall, 4 in 5 (80 percent) Americans would rather increase funding and improve roads and bridges than continue current funding levels and risk allowing our roads and bridges deteriorate.

### Generic – AT: But They Don’t Want to Pay

#### Public supports paying for transportation infrastructure.

**Slone**, September **2009** (Sean – Transportation Policy Analyst at the Council of State Governments, Increasing Public Awareness of Infrastructure Costs & Finance, p. http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/TIA\_infrastructure\_cost.pdf)

In a study earlier this year commissioned by the HNTB Corporation, a firm that provides architecture, engineering, planning and construction services, 81 percent of Americans surveyed said they agreed that **making sacrifices to pay for infrastructure improvements** now will make the difference between “a more prosperous or a more difficult future for the next generation.” Sixty-eight percent of respondents said they were willing to pay more in taxes to support highway and bridge maintenance and new construction to reduce traffic congestion. But how much more will Americans pay? The survey said the average American is willing to pay $22 a month to reduce the time spent in traffic by 20 percent. The survey further indicated more Americans trust state government above the federal or city governments and private sector companies to manage and maintain infrastructure projects. Yet 61 percent of respondents said they were not confident taxes they pay to build roads in their area are used well and actually make a difference. 4

### Generic – Public Transportation

#### Voters want safer public transportation options.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 3)

Voters’ top priorities for additional infrastructure investments are safer streets and having more transportation options. • Voters’ top goal by far is “safer streets for our communities and children”—57% say this should be one of the top-two priorities if more money is invested in infrastructure. This is the top choice for most major subgroups of the electorate. • The second-highest priority for voters overall at 32% is “**more transportation options**.” But there is a socioeconomic difference here—for voters in lowerincome households the second-highest priority (at 37%) is “less money spent out-of-pocket on transportation.” • In addition, 85% agree that “spending less time in traffic would improve quality of life, make communities safer, and reduce stress in people’s daily lives.” • Moreover, the vast majority also believe the country (80%) and their own community (66%) would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

### Latinos 2NC

#### Transportation spending generates Latino support.

**Politics 365**, 3/19/**2012** (Don’t Leave Latinos on a Frozen Planet, p. <http://politic365.com/2012/03/19/an-economic-recovery-that-doesnt-leave-hispanics-behind/>)

The GOP austerity plan misses some serious facts regarding the plight of low income communities and belies a serious flaw in message for what their vision of economic recovery for our country should entail. Here are the facts: our economy is slowly recovering, yet for Hispanics and other low income groups including working class Americans, unemployment levels are still high. Getting this segment of our labor force back to work is vital to U.S. economic recovery. Hispanics comprise a large part of the low skilled labor market, making up over 20% of workers in the construction, food industry and farming sectors. Infrastructure investment is an investment in low income communities who have been hit hardest by the recession including Hispanics. The GOP austerity plan, in the long run, would disproportionately affect low income communities who have already been hurt by downturns in the economy. Earlier this year President Obama announced an ambitious $476 billion plan to invest in transportation and infrastructure projects in states over six years. This plan was dead on arrival, mostly due to Republican concerns over cost and calls for austerity. Congress is currently moving a $109 billion transportation bill which would increase infrastructure spending at a less ambitious rate but still with the goal of creating 2 million more jobs in infrastructure spending. While the Senate GOP have been welcome to working on this, the Tea Party wing of the House caucus has roundly derided the approach, calling it egregious overspending. Yet they have not proposed any less costly or more effective alternatives. Their plan does include a new FDA approval process, patent reform, and tax code reform. These are slim pickings for the American worker. While the concept of austerity may provide a romantic notion that if Americans tighten their belts all our troubles would go away, the reality is that Americans have tightened their belts to the point of choking and actions which include job creation and economic growth are still desperately needed. Investment in infrastructure development could be a mechanism to alleviate the unemployment of the hardest hit populations including Hispanics. A recent Senate Hispanic Task Force meeting led by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and Senator Robert Menendez sought to highlight the importance of legislation that invests in working class Americans as a means to help struggling Hispanics. An investment by the federal government in infrastructure is an investment in the Hispanic community. Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ) chairman of the Hispanic Task Force articulated this point: “While we have focused on proposals to help create jobs that would help unemployed Hispanic workers, Republicans have focused only on obstructing our efforts — and Latinos have taken notice. This will have negative impact for them not only in the upcoming elections, but also on their efforts as a whole to reach out to and attract this growing constituency.” The evidence shows recent investments in infrastructure spending spurred job growth for sectors of the labor market which employ Hispanics and others in low income communities. The GOP, in objecting to infrastructure spending to contain costs, is ignoring some key facts. First, low income communities and states desperately need these funds to create jobs and remain solvent. Second, the size of this infrastructure package has already been reduced considerably from what the President asked for. Recent jobs data shows that there have been gains in the economy over the last three months, yet, the reality is that this economy is still fragile. Construction jobs continue to climb, up 2.5% over just three months ago, in a market where Hispanics represent 20% of the labor force.

### Latinos – Key to Election

#### Latino voters will swing over ten states in the election.

**Barreto**, 3/31/**2011** (Matt – associate professor of political science at the University of Washington, director of the Washington Institute for the Study of Ethnicity and Race, Where Latino Votes Will Matter in 2012, Latinovations, p. http://blog.latinovations.com/2011/03/31/guest-blogger-series-matt-barreto-where-latino-votes-will-matter-in-2012/)

In 2012, Latino voters have the best chance to influence outcomes in 10 states for either Senate, President, or both. Four of the top five states will be “Latino influence states” on everyone’s map – New Mexico, Florida, Nevada, Colorado all have large and growing Latino electorates in otherwise politically competitive states. In addition to close presidential contests, New Mexico, Florida and Nevada will likely see very competitive Senate elections. Another state we include, Arizona, has a large Latino population, and depending on who the nominees are for U.S. Senate, could have a fairly competitive election with Latino voters proving decisive. In 2010, Latinos registered voters in Arizona demonstrated the highest turnout rate of Latinos in any state. The next batch of states that Latinos may influence are ones that historically are not obvious Latino states, but significant population growth over the last decade has left a substantial Latino eligible voter population. In Connecticut, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Massachusetts, Latinos account for over 5% of potential voters, and each state is expected have a competitive U.S. Senate or Presidential contest in 2012. For example, in Georgia, the Latino population grew by 96% since 2000 while the White population grew by 6%; a state McCain won by just 5% (52-47) in 2008. In Wisconsin Latinos grew by 74% compared to 1% growth for Whites, and could be one of the most fiercely contested states in 2012. Beyond these 10 states, there are others where Latinos will matter if elections are close, as expected in Nebraska, Virginia, Indiana, Missouri and Ohio. While the Latino population is a smaller percentage, the number of Latino citizen adults is growing rapidly, and with voter registration drives targeting potential Latino voters, we could very well be talking about the next “Latino upset” ala Reid vs. Angle in one of these five states. In Missouri the Latino population grew by 79% – 20 times faster than the White population (which grew by 4%), in a state that McCain won by just 4,000 total votes in 2008. One of the biggest keys to Latino influence in 2012 will not just be the population growth which has already occurred, but rather, voter registration drives that still need to occur.

#### Hispanic voters are growing in toss up states --- this will decide the election.

**Bolton 2012** Alexander Bolton The Hill. “Hispanic population soars in presidential swing states” http://thehill.com/homenews/news/234231-hispanic-population-soars-in-presidential-swing-states

Hispanic populations are soaring in toss-up states that will decide the presidential election. Shifting demographics in states not usually associated with Hispanic voters have changed the traditional political calculus heading into Election Day. President Obama and Mitt Romney, the presumed GOP nominee, are aware of the burgeoning Hispanic numbers and have ramped up their outreach in recent days. Immigration, an emotionally charged issue for many Hispanics, is likely to stay on the front burner in the weeks ahead as the Supreme Court is expected to rule soon on the controversial Arizona law requiring law enforcement officers to check the immigration status of people they stop. Hispanic populations have grown by an average of 77 percent in nine presidential battlegrounds since 2000, according to census data. States traditionally seen as dominated by white working-class voters have seen Hispanic populations explode in recent years. Pennsylvania’s Hispanic population grew 83 percent between 2000 and 2010; Iowa’s increased by 83.7 percent; Virginia’s increased 92 percent; North Carolina’s increased by 111 percent; Ohio’s increased by 63 percent; New Hampshire’s increased by 79 percent; and Iowa’s grew by 84 percent, according to U.S. Census data. As a percentage of the total population, these Hispanic voting blocs are not proportionally equal to Nevada or Florida, but they are fast becoming more significant. Clarissa Martinez-De-Castro, director of civic engagement and immigration at the National Council of La Raza, noted that Hispanic voter participation exceeded the margin of Obama’s victory in Indiana and North Carolina, two traditional Republican strongholds, in 2008. In Pennsylvania, Hispanics make up nearly 6 percent of the total population, while in Virginia they account for nearly 8 percent; in North Carolina it’s 8.4 percent; in Iowa, 5 percent; in Ohio, 3.1 percent; and in New Hampshire, nearly 3 percent. “It will have a significant impact in a very close election,” said Manuel Pastor, professor of American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California. Sen. Marco Rubio (Fla.), the Senate Republican’s leading liaison to the Hispanic community, told reporters Thursday that Hispanics in these states would be crucial to Republicans’ fortunes. “What I think we should focus on is the growing number of Hispanic voters in key states like Florida, Virginia, Iowa, North Carolina and others that are much more open-minded, that do not have a longstanding — via geographic — allegiance to one political party or ideology,” he said at a breakfast sponsored by The Christian Science Monitor. Some analysts think Rubio is a strong contender to become Romney’s running mate because he could attract Hispanic voters, though experts on Hispanic political activity are skeptical. They say many Hispanic voters have been turned off by the harsh anti-immigration rhetoric of the Republican Party and note that Hispanic candidates in Nevada and New Mexico failed to win a majority of Latino voters in 2010. “Nothing is a slam-dunk,” Martinez-De-Castro said of Rubio’s ability to move Hispanic voters if he appears on the GOP ticket. Rubio acknowledged on Thursday that Democrats would win a significant majority of Hispanic voters this fall, regardless of new immigration proposals pushed by Romney or himself. “There is a historical reality that Democrats are in the short term going to do much better among Hispanics,” he said. A June Latino Decisions/Univision poll gave Obama a 43-point lead over Romney among Hispanic voters. Other polls have shown similarly wide margins. Swing states with large Hispanic populations have also seen swift growth between 2000 and 2010, according to the U.S. Census. Nevada’s Hispanic community grew 82 percent, to 26 percent of the state’s population. Its support was a big factor in Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid’s (D-Nev.) gritty 2010 reelection. In Colorado, the Hispanic population grew by 41.2 percent to make up 20.7 percent of the total population. Florida’s expanded by 57.4 percent to make up 22.5 percent of the entire state. A survey of U.S. Census data by National Council of La Raza found that the number of registered Hispanic voters in swing states skyrocketed as well. The number of registered Hispanic voters in Pennsylvania swelled from 95,000 in 2004 to 189,000 in 2008. In North Carolina, it rose from 44,000 in 2004 to 83,000 in 2008. In Florida, it grew from 924,000 in 2004 to 1.38 million in 2008. The larger Hispanic populations in Florida, Colorado, Nevada and even Virginia could factor in Romney’s decision to focus on Midwestern states such Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan, which have proportionally smaller Hispanic blocs. Pastor said increases in Hispanic populations do not always correlate with a proportional rise in the number of registered voters. Population increases include illegal immigrants, who are not allowed to vote, and younger people, who have less consistent voting records. The changing demographics could influence control of the Senate in 2013. Four of the presidential swing states — Nevada, Ohio, Virginia and Florida — are Senate battlegrounds. Romney made a pitch to Hispanic voters Thursday with an address to the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials. Romney told the audience that Obama has been taking their support for granted. He softened his stance on immigration by pledging to give green cards to immigrants who earn advanced degrees at U.S. universities and a path to legal status for those who serve in the military. But he declined to say whether he would uphold the executive order President Obama announced last week halting the deportation of immigrants who came to the country at a young age if they met certain conditions. Obama is scheduled to speak to the Hispanic leadership group Friday.

#### Galvanizing Latino voters will win the election.

**Huffington Post**, 6/12/**2012** (Latino 2012: More Potential Latino Voters in 8 States Than Margin of Victory in 2008, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/12/latino-2012_n_1591622.html>)

The Latino vote has been referred to as the "sleeping giant." That's because millions of Latinos are eligible to vote but have not yet registered. If they register and show up to the polls, that awoken giant could determine the 2012 presidential election. In fact, in eight states, the number of potential Latino voters is greater than the margin of victory in the 2008 presidential election, according to an infographic released by the Center for American Progress Tuesday.

#### Latino swing voters will swing six states.

**Garcia**, 2/12/**2012**(Charles – CEO of Garcia Trujillo, Will Hispanic voters swing the 2012 race?, CNN Opinion, p. http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/10/opinion/garcia-hispanic-voters/index.html)

In the 2008 election there was a 30% swing of Hispanic votes away from the Republican Party's share of the vote in 2004. This swing vote was enough to elect Barack Obama to the White House and turn six states — Colorado, Florida, Indiana, New Mexico, Nevada and Virginia — from red to blue. Any candidate or campaign that ignores Hispanic swing voters does it at their peril.

### Latinos – AT: Immigration Key

#### Latinos will vote on jobs and economic concerns not immigration.

**Huffington Post**, 7/1/**2012** (Latino Vote Coveted in 2012 Election, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/01/latino-vote-2012-election\_n\_1641001.html)

Immigration policy would seem to be the natural top issue for these voters, except that nearly two-thirds of Hispanics are born in the U.S. Their priorities are the same as the general population - jobs, the economy, education and health care. "We need to see more jobs here, that's my No. 1 priority and what I want to hear about," says Stefan Gonzalez, an almost 18-year-old from Denver, whose heritage includes Spanish, Mexican and Native American roots. Gonzalez, who works in a suburban Denver pawn shop, says he plans to vote for Obama this fall. In Albuquerque, Ernest Gurule, an 84-year-old whose ancestors settled New Mexico in 1580, says his main issue is the federal health care plan upheld by the Supreme Court last week, and that he'll back Obama in part because of it. Also, the Democrat, adds: "It's too expensive to change horses midstream." Democrats and Republicans are in a fierce race to figure out how to best reach Hispanics. In the short term, these voters could decide the outcome in Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico, Florida and elsewhere. The long-term stakes are even bigger because Hispanics are projected to account for roughly 30 percent of the population by 2050, doubling in size and, potentially changing the national political landscape.

### Latinos – AT: Latinos Key

#### Latinos voters can only swing a minimal amount of votes.

**Trende**, 6/19/**2012** (Sean – Senior Elections Analyst for Real Clear Politics, Obama’s Puzzling Immigration Decision, Real Clear Politics, p. http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/06/19/obamas\_puzzling\_immigration\_decision\_114531.html)

1) Latinos are underrepresented in swing states. While the Latino vote is frequently portrayed as a critical voting bloc, in truth it is concentrated in only a few swing states with just a handful of electoral votes. The only states where Latinos make up more than 10 percent of the electorate are: Arizona (16 percent of the electorate in 2008), California (18 percent), Colorado (13 percent), Florida (14 percent), Nevada (15 percent), New Mexico (41 percent), and Texas (20 percent). Of these, only Colorado, Florida, and Nevada are swing states; New Mexico and Arizona are at best borderline swing states. In Florida, the Latino vote largely (though decreasingly) comprises voters of Cuban descent and is therefore atypical of other Latino electorates. So in the end, we’re talking about Colorado and Nevada as the states where this is likely to produce dividends of any size, for a total of 15 electoral votes.

#### Hispanics will not affect the election --- the best forecasting models prove.

**Silver 2012** Nate Silver June 19, 2012. Five Thirty Eight Blog. “Hispanic Voters Less Plentiful in Swing States“ http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/19/hispanic-voters-less-plentiful-in-swing-states/

As I wrote on Tuesday morning, President Obama’s decision to suspend deportations of some young illegal immigrants should entail mostly upside for him from a political standpoint. Based on polls about his decision and the way that Republicans are reacting to it, the evidence that public opinion is on Mr. Obama’s side is reasonably clear. So I don’t agree with other analysts who have termed the decision risky or puzzling. Mr. Obama has learned this year that being the incumbent at a time when most voters think the country is on the wrong track is not necessarily an advantageous position. But an incumbent president can still help himself at the margin with his policy and agenda-setting powers. I do agree with Sean Trende of Real Clear Politics about one key point, however. It is one reason why the caveat “at the margin” very much applies to Mr. Obama’s decision, and may somewhat diminish its electoral importance. As Mr. Trende writes, “Latinos are underrepresented in swing states”. Below is a table showing an estimate of Hispanic turnout in 2008. These figures were determined by multiplying a state’s overall turnout by the share of voters who described themselves as Hispanic or Latino in exit polls. In total, about 11 million Hispanics turned out to vote in 2008, according to these estimates. However, almost 40 percent of the Hispanic vote was in one of just two states – California and Texas – that don’t look to be at all competitive this year. The fact that Democrats are winning clear majorities among Hispanics is one reason that California is no longer competitive, of course. And perhaps Texas will become more competitive in another 8 or 12 or 16 years. (Although note that many Hispanics in Texas have been there for generations and might not be thought of as immigrant communities.) But voters in these states just aren’t likely to sway the Electoral College outcome in 2012. New York and Illinois, which also aren’t at all competitive, and New Jersey, which is only very marginally so, also have a decent number of Hispanic voters. You do see Florida up near the top of the list, however, and Arizona and Colorado not far down, so I will need to be a bit more precise about my analysis to defend my claim. The way that the FiveThirtyEight presidential forecasting model measures the competitiveness of a state is through what it calls the tipping point index. This is a measure of the likelihood that a state will make the marginal difference in the election, giving a candidate the decisive 270th electoral vote. The list of tipping point states is narrower than you might expect. The relative order of the states just doesn’t change very much from election to election, especially when an incumbent is running again and we know what voters thought about him four years earlier. Many states might be competitive, meaning that they might plausibly be won by either candidate, but most of their electoral votes would be superfluous in an election that truly came down to the last vote. The tipping point index accounts both for how close a state is relative to the national trend, and how many electoral votes it has. Right now, the model thinks that the odds are about 50/50 that one of just two states, Virginia and Ohio, will play the tipping point role. Each of these has a below-average number of Hispanic voters. Colorado is third on the tipping point list, and it has an above-average number of Hispanic voters. But Pennsylvania is fourth, and it has a below-average number again. Nevada, with an above-average number of Hispanics, is fifth on the list, but it is followed by three very white-dominated states (Iowa, New Hampshire and Wisconsin). Then comes Florida, which is lower on the list than you might expect, especially since it has 29 electoral votes. The model “thinks” about the different electoral combinations very carefully when it runs its simulations, and considers how the states might move in relationship to one another based on their demographics, as well as in comparison to the national trend. Mr. Obama could certainly win Florida – we give him about a 35 percent chance of doing so — but these simulations find that he usually has easier paths to the victorious 270 electoral votes. The president’s polling and the “fundamentals” factors that the model considers are more favorable to Mr. Obama’s in each of the eight states that appear above Florida on the tipping point list. Most of the time that he wins states like Virginia, Ohio and Colorado, for instance, Mr. Obama will already have a winning map unless he takes some unexpected losses elsewhere. Moreover, many of the Hispanics in Florida are Cuban-Americans, and they do not always behave like the predominantly Mexican-American population of the Southwest, or the Hispanic populations of the Northeast, which include many Puerto Ricans and Dominicans. The model also doesn’t think much of New Mexico as a tipping point state. It really wasn’t close at all in 2008, and polls there have shown Mr. Obama with a double-digit lead at a time when he is barely ahead of Mitt Romney nationally. Mr. Obama could lose New Mexico in a landslide, but it just doesn’t meet the definition of a tipping point state. Even the broader term “swing state” probably mischaracterizes it somewhat. Nor does the model think that Arizona is a tipping point state. If has a fairly large Hispanic population, but the white population there is old and quite conservative. Arizona is something of the opposite of New Mexico – a state Mr. Obama could win this year, but probably only in a landslide where it does not provide the decisive electoral votes. On the whole, if you take a weighted average of the Hispanic turnout in each state based on its tipping point index, it comes out to about 6 percent, less than the 9 percent Hispanic turnout throughout the country as a whole. That means a Hispanic voter is somewhat less likely to swing the Electoral College outcome than if they were evenly distributed (as a share of the population) throughout all 50 states.

### Latinos – Low Turnout

#### Latino voter registration is declining rapidly --- high turnout will swing the election.

**Jaffe 3-29** Michael Jaffe. ABC News and Univision Election Correspndent ABC News“Latinos Could Swing Election, But Turnout Might Disappoint”. http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/03/latinos-could-swing-election-but-turnout-might-disappoint/

Latinos, the nation’s fastest-growing voting bloc, are poised to play a potentially decisive role in this fall’s presidential election, but new data suggests that turnout might fall short of lofty projections, which could change the fate of the race for the White House. The number of registered Latino voters has dropped significantly in recent years, from 11.6 million in 2008 to 10.9 million in 2010, according to new data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey. While 2008 was a presidential election year and 2010 was only a midterm congressional election, that is still a sizable decline, especially given the increase in the Latino population nationwide. In the past decade alone, the Latino population has increased by 43 percent. There are more than 50 million Latinos in this country, nearly one in six Americans. A record 12.2 million Latinos are set to vote in November, a 26 percent increase from 2008, according to projections released in the fall by the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO). But that was before the new Census numbers revealed the surprisingly steep decline in registered Hispanic voters. The William C. Velasquez Institute (WCVI), a non-partisan organization focused on Latinos’ political and economic participation, crunched the Census numbers earlier this month and found that “a significant decline in national Latino voter registration in 2010 may diminish the size of Latino voter turnout in November 2012 by more than a million votes,” according to the organization’s president, Antonio Gonzalez. The off-year decline in Latino voter registration is not unexpected: Registration fell by 4,000 voters after the 2004 presidential election. What is unexpected is that the drop in registration after the 2008 election was far bigger, a fall-off of 626,000 voters, down 5 percent. Nine states “experienced significant declines” in Latino voter registration in 2009-2010, WCVI found: California, Texas, Nevada, Florida, Washington, New Mexico, Michigan, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Some possible reasons for this decline, the group stated, are “a spike in residential mobility” coupled with “intensive downward economic mobility due to the combined effect of significant (and disproportionate) unemployment and mortgage foreclosures” in these nine states in the past two years. In January, for instance, a survey by the Pew Hispanic Center found that a majority of Latinos believed that the country’s economic downturn had hit their ethnic group harder than other Americans. The Velasquez Institute predicts now that national Latino turnout this fall will be “no higher than 10.5 million votes cast.” While Latino voter turnout might not appear crucial at first glance, it could potentially determine the fate of November’s election, and who occupies the Oval Office for the next four years. Latinos cast 6.6 million votes in 2008 and, with more than two-thirds for President Obama, paving the way for the Illinois Democrat’s resounding win. Generally speaking, Latinos are liberals, tending to disagree with Republicans on key issues such as immigration reform and the government’s role in improving the economy. For Obama, Latino turnout could be the difference between winning and losing the White House. The Obama campaign has made a concerted effort this year to replicate its success among Latinos four years ago. Campaign strategists frequently cite the growing Latino electorate as an advantage and they have taken aim at states with booming Latino populations such as Arizona and Colorado. To that end, the Obama campaign has pounced on some of the inflammatory rhetoric that Republican presidential hopefuls such as Mitt Romney and Rick Santorum have used toward Latinos in the past year’s GOP primary. For instance, after Romney vowed to veto the DREAM Act – the Democrats’ measure to provide a path to citizenship for some children of undocumented immigrants who attend college or serve in the military – praised Arizona’s strict immigration law that ordered immigrants to carry their registration documents at all times and mandated that police question them if there was reason to suspect that they were in the country illegally, and touted the endorsement of the controversial law’s author Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach, Obama campaign surrogates dubbed Romney “the most extreme presidential candidate” ever on Latino issues. Thus far, it appears, Chicago’s strategy of ripping Romney’s record with Latinos has worked. A late January poll conducted by Latino Decisions for ABC News and Univision found that 67 percent of Latinos would back Obama in a matchup against Romney, who only earned 25 percent of their support. Forty-one percent of Latinos nationwide said they had a somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable view of Romney, while a whopping 72 percent of Latinos said the Republican candidates in the primary either didn’t care too much about Latinos or were being outright hostile toward them. But in what might be an alarming sign of lower-than-expected turnout this year, four in 10 Latinos nationwide said they were either not following the GOP primary too closely or not following it at all. In addition, a Pew Hispanic Center study released in December showed that a majority of Latino voters – 56 percent – have not yet engaged in the presidential campaign, saying they have given little or no thought to the candidates in the race. Perhaps wary of that fact, Hispanic groups have kicked off efforts to increase the number of Latino voters come November. The National Council of La Raza has launched a national “Mobilize to Vote” campaign focused on registering and mobilizing thousands of Latinos, especially in critical swing states such as Florida, Nevada and Colorado. The race is a close one in Florida, with Obama leading Romney 49 percent to 42 percent, according to a new Quinnipiac University poll released Wednesday. The Latino Decisions poll in January found a similar edge for Obama: 50 percent to 40 percent. But on the economy – the top issue for voters – Romney, who won the state’s January primary, holds the edge on who would do a better job improving the country’s fortunes: 48 percent for the former Massachusetts governor compared with 45 percent for the president, according to the Quinnipiac survey. In battleground states such as Florida, both parties are well aware, Latino voters could swing the election one way or another, but only if they show up to vote. And that, it seems, is a real question at this point.

### Airports Links

#### Public supports airports --- they see it as a job creator.

**Dye**, 3/26/**2012** (Morgan – Senior Management of Communications & Marketing at Airports Council International – North America, Poll Finds Americans See Airports’ Value, Centerline, p. http://www.aci-na.org/blog/2012/03/26/poll-finds-americans-see-airports-value/)

Americans love their local airports, but they’re still not sure how they work, according to a new national survey commissioned by Airports Council International-North America. A majority (61%) recognized the importance of airports to the economy, with 33% saying they are “extremely important” to their local economy, a finding that is consistent with a recent ACI-NA report that attributed 10.5 million jobs and $1.2 trillion in spending to the nation’s 490 commercial airports. “Americans know that airports are hubs of economic activity and job creation for the communities they support,” Greg Principato, president of ACI-NA, said.

### Bicycles Links

#### Bicycles are massively popular

Federal Highway Administration, 5/7/**2012** (Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach, p. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\_pedestrian/guidance/design\_guidance/design.cfm)

Bicycling and walking issues have grown in significance throughout the 1990s. As the new millennium dawns public agencies and public interest groups alike are striving to define the most appropriate way in which to accommodate the two modes within the overall transportation system so that those who walk or ride bicycles can safely, conveniently, and comfortably access every destination within a community. Public support and advocacy for improved conditions for bicycling and walking has created a widespread acceptance that more should be done to enhance the safety, comfort, and convenience of the nonmotorized traveler. Public opinion surveys throughout the 1990s have demonstrated strong support for increased planning, funding and implementation of shared use paths, sidewalks and on-street facilities.

#### Voters will support bicycles --- it’s distinct from other transportation spending.

**Clark**, 4/8/**2010** (Andy – President of the League of American Bicyclists, What Role for Polls in Policy Debate?, Transportation Experts Blog at National Journal, p. http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/04/what-role-for-polls-in-funding.php)

As others have said quite effectively, people want choice. They don't equate roads and bridges as being exclusively for cars and trucks, especially in metro areas - they want the public right of way and the public realm to build community, to generate activity and jobs, and to facilitate commerce, and they understand that there's a balance to achieving all these goals that isn't always easy. My interpretation of what people will actually vote for - as opposed to what they will say in response to a poll - in recent years is that they will vote to tax themselves for smart transportation investments in building sustainable, livable communites that offer transit, bicycling, walking and driving as options; they will vote for park and recreation bond issues and sales tax initiatives that build critical infrastructure such as parks, trails and open space. The public is much more suspicious of, and less likely to fund, "more of the same" monocultural highway expansion projects that are rooted in a 1950's planning ideology and placed in the hands of heavy-handed state highway agencies with a "trust me we know what's best for you" approach to project selection.

### High Speed Rail Links

#### Massive public support for HSR

**Butman**, 12/1/**2010** (Jim, Survey shows public support for high-speed rail, Biz Times, p. http://www.biztimes.com/article/20101201/ENEWSLETTERS02/312019989/)

Nearly two-thirds of American adults (62 percent) said they would definitely or probably use high-speed rail service for leisure or business travel if it were an option, according to a survey from the Washington-based American Public Transportation Association (APTA). The survey, taken among 24,711 adults, also asked how important various factors would be in choosing high-speed rail service. Ninety-one percent of respondents said high-speed rail should offer shorter travel times compared to driving to their destinations; 91 percent said the rail service should be less expensive than flying; 89 percent said it should be less expensive than driving; and 85 percent said the rail service should integrate with local public transit so they could avoid using rental cars and cabs, and paying parking fees. The APTA wants Congress to invest $50 billion over the next six years to build a high-speed rail network. "In most political circles, garnering nearly two-thirds support for a forward-thinking vision like high-speed rail would be considered a landslide," said APTA president William Millar said.. "We strongly support the government's commitment to implementing high-speed rail. It will provide more options for travelers, as well as create jobs and be a strong boost for the local economy."

### Highways Links

#### Highways have public support including doubling spending.

**Dutton**, 4/7/**2010** (Audrey, Americans Back Expanding Rail, Buses Over Highways, Poll Shows, Bond Buyer, Vol. 372, Issue. 33295, p. Business Source Complete)

Americans, even in rural areas, overwhelmingly favor expanding public transportation such as rail or bus transit rather than highway construction, which traditionally has received much more funding, according to a recent national poll. The results should be instructive to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee as it drafts its version of a multi-year bill, argued Transportation for America, a coalition of transportation, housing, environmental, and other groups that commissioned the poll and released its results last week. Transportation for America is pushing for multi-year legislation that would: increase options; create a unified trust fund for rail, freight, highway, transit, and other investments; and give states, regions and cities more direct funding and greater control over project selection, while holding them to a set of measurable goals. The poll of 800 registered voters, conducted in late February and early March, found that most voters supported twice the current levels of federal funding to be spent on public transportation, which can include rail or bus transit partly financed through issuance of municipal bonds. "When thinking about federal funding for public transportation, solid majorities clearly indicate they do not feel that current allocations are appropriate." the polling firms wrote in a memo summarizing the data. Almost 70% of those polled said their community would benefit from expanded public transportation. More than 80% said the whole nation would benefit from it. But only 19% .said they had actually used a bus. ferry, or train during the preceding month, and almost half of those voters who had not used such modes of transportation said they simply have no access to them.

### Mass Transit Links

#### Mass transit spending has growing public support

**Wall Street Journal**, 11/12/**2008** (Mass-Transit Projects Fared Well at Polls, p. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122645311762919469.html>)

U.S. voters approved billions of dollars for mass-transit projects, highlighting a growing desire to overhaul the nation's aging transportation systems. The increasing political support for transportation investment comes as Democratic leaders in Congress are pushing for a second economic-stimulus bill that could include tens of billions of dollars in additional spending on infrastructure projects. It also signals a potential boon for companies that provide everything from locomotives to collision-avoidance technology. Some 23 initiatives were approved nationwide last week that will inject $75 billion into transportation systems, according to the Center for Transportation Excellence, a nonpartisan research group that promotes mass-transit service. Among the winners: Nearly $10 billion in bonds to start building a high-speed rail network in California, and $18 billion to expand mass-transit service in the Seattle area. The vote on another measure, which would raise the sales tax in Santa Clara County, Calif., to fund an extension of Bay Area Rapid Transit service, remains too close to call. Overall, more than 70% of the major transportation-funding measures on ballots this year were approved, about double the rate at which initiatives are usually passed, the CFTE said. This rate of success came as a surprise to many transportation advocates, who were expecting a less enthusiastic response to tax increases and public debt at a time of economic and fiscal turmoil. Of the measures approved, the CFTE noted, 14 will increase sales taxes, four siphon funds from property taxes and three authorize bonds. "Before the election, we wondered what was going to weigh most on voters...the recent memory of $4 per gallon gas or concerns about the economy," said William Millar, president of the American Public Transportation Association. "It was pretty clear people voted for the future. The page has turned on transportation in America."

### National Infrastructure Banks Links

#### NIB has substantial public support.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 4)

Voters are open to several suggested funding streams for national transportation projects, though there is considerable hesitancy among voters to backing higher taxes to pay for them. • Proposals that the majority of voters find acceptable are encouraging more private investment (78% acceptable) and imposing penalties on projects that go over budget or exceed their deadline (72% acceptable). • There also is significant support for establishing a National Infrastructure Bank (60%), issuing new transportation bonds (59%), and eliminating subsidies for American oil companies that drill in other countries (58%).

### Sustainable Communities Links

#### Support for sustainable communities massive outweighs the opposition.

Smart Growth America, March **2011** (Building for the 21st Century: American support for sustainable communities, p. <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/building-for-the-21st-century.pdf>)

The majority of Americans – regardless of political affiliation – support sustainable communities. The survey found that 79% of Americans overall support the idea of an “urban, suburban, or rural community that has more housing and transportation choices, is closer to jobs, shops or schools, is more energy independent, and helps protect clean air and water.” 76% of Independent voters, 72% of Republicans, 89% of Democrats and 65% of those polled with no party affiliation support this idea. Only 5% of respondents said they opposed this idea.

### AT: Gas Tax Link

#### Obama will not raise the gas tax for funding.

**Goozner**, 3/21/**2012** (Merrill, Paltry Gas Tax drives U.S. Roads into the Ground, The Fiscal Times, p. http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2012/03/21/Paltry-Gas-Tax-Drives-US-Roads-into-the-Ground.aspx)

Politics at the Pump The Obama administration has ruled out any increase in the gasoline tax, especially with prices soaring at the pump. “There’s no way before the election that they were going to discuss putting a new revenue source on the table,” said Donna Cooper, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, who previously ran Pennsylvania Gov. Edward Rendell’s policy shop. She recently wrote a report analyzing the nation’s roads and mass transit needs that concluded transportation infrastructure spending needed to double if the U.S. was going to remain competitive. There’s no way that level of funding – or even the current level – is going to come from the gasoline tax. The recovery from the Great Recession has broken a long-term trend that saw gasoline usage rise with economic growth. The sharp downturn of 2008-09 sent daily gasoline consumption plummeting from 9.3 million barrels per day to 9 million barrels a day. That is expected during recessions. People without jobs don’t drive to work, and those with reduced incomes drive less.

#### Congress will not support a gas tax and the plan will just trade off.

**Klein**, 4/13/**2012** (Ezra – editor of Wonkblog and a columnist at the Washington Post, The dumb tax pledges that dominate Washington, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/the-dumb-tax-pledges-that-dominate-washington/2012/04/13/gIQAP7s1ET_blog.html>)

The consequences of this unhealthy consensus stretch far beyond the budget deficit. Consider, for instance, our roads. We used to have a straightforward way to fund infrastructure in this country: the federal gas tax. In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower raised the tax from 1.5 cents a gallon to 3 cents to help pay for the creation of the interstate highway system. In 1959, he increased it from 3 cents to 4 cents. In 1982, President Ronald Reagan raised the gas tax to 9 cents. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush raised it to 14 cents, with half of the increase going to reduce the deficit. In 1993, President Bill Clinton raised it to 18.4 cents. In other words, from 1956 to 1993, there was a bipartisan consensus on the federal gasoline tax: Both parties agreed that it occasionally needed to be raised in order to help pay for the nation’s infrastructure. But since 2000, there has been a bipartisan consensus against raising the federal gasoline tax. In 2005, the Bush administration joined with congressional Republicans to support a big transportation bill. But rather than raise the gas tax, the law just exhausted the Highway Trust Fund. In 2009, that law expired. Since then, Republicans and Democrats have failed to pass nine — nine! — short-term extensions, in large part because they can’t agree on how to fund infrastructure. But they do agree on one thing: Neither party intends to raise the gas tax.

## Obama Bad Impacts (Foreign Policy)

### Deterrence 2NC

#### Obama reelection results in unilateral disarm --- kills deterrence and results in nuclear war.

**Ferrara**, 4/4/**2012** (Peter – Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute and General Counsel of the American Civil Rights Union, served in the White House Office of Policy development under President Reagan, Obama’s Unilateral Nuclear Disarmament, American Spectator, p. <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/04/04/obamas-unilateral-nuclear-disa>)

America's Nuclear Suicide Obama's literally crazy idea is that if we just lead by example and phase out our nuclear weapons, everyone else will realize we mean them no harm, and do the same. As a result, because of the messiah, the lion will lie down with the lamb, and the world will live as one. As Gaffney further explained, "He evidently is prepared to take such a step unilaterally in order to encourage by our example other nations to join his long-standing ambition to 'rid the world of nuclear weapons.'" The problem is if President Obama is reelected, he as the commander-in-chief would be free to carry out this flower child policy on his own authority, without Congressional approval. As Gaffney further explained in the March 27 Washington Times, "Mr. Obama's subordinates are signaling, however, that he is prepared to disarm us unilaterally through what one of them, Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller, recently called 'executive action.'" Gaffney rightly concluded in his February 22 column, "It is an astonishing insight into the President's commitment to 'fundamentally transforming the United States of America' -- in the worst sense of the phrase -- that he is willing to take such steps in the midst of his reelection campaign. Imagine what he would do if the last vestiges of restraining accountability are removed in a second term." In these modern times, a full blown nuclear war would be over in a matter of days. America will not have four years to build up the arsenal of democracy if caught by surprise. A dew-eyed miscalculation on these matters literally threatens your very life, and the lives of your family and children. That is why not only President Obama must be held accountable for this national defense foolishness, but the entire Democrat party that supports and enables him. That includes his contributors, whose names are publicly available, and his voters. This is a Paul Revere moment. The survival of you, your family and your nation is at stake, far more so than even on that April night in 1775. Exercise your rights of freedom of speech and democratic participation while you still have them, indeed, while you are still alive.

### Ext – Obama Kills Deterrence

#### Obama will unilaterally disarm the U.S. --- undermines nuclear deterrence.

**Gaffney**, 3/26/**2012** (Frank – president of the Center for Security Policy, Leading no followers to ‘Global Zero’, The Washington Times, p. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/mar/26/leading-no-followers-to-global-zero/>)

In Seoul, South Korea, on Monday, President Obama enthused once again about his vision of a world without nuclear weapons. It’s a dream he has had since he was a radical leftist studying at Columbia University in the early 1980s. In the hope of advancing it now as commander in chief of the United States of America, he declared that - since he is convinced we have more of these weapons than we need - he is going to reduce our arsenal. According to some accounts, he has in mind cutting it to one roughly the size of Pakistan‘s. In his address at Hankuk University, Mr. Obama suggested that he would get the Russians to do the same. That surely will come as a surprise to their once-and-future president, Vladimir Putin, since he has been quite aggressively beefing up the Kremlin’s nuclear forces. In fact, Mr. Putin recently unveiled a $770 billion defense modernization plan which would, among other things, buy 400 new long-range ballistic missiles. It is a safe bet that they will be outfitted with modern nuclear weapons, probably multiple, independently targetable ones at that. It seems no more likely that the Russians will agree to reduce their vast monopoly on tactical nuclear weapons or their undisclosed and “nondeployed” stocks of strategic nuclear weapons - two other initiatives Mr. Obama declared he wanted to take. Even if they would, any such agreement would be wholly unverifiable. If the Russians won’t play ball, it’s a safe bet no one else will, either. Mr. Obama’s subordinates are signaling, however, that he is prepared to disarm us unilaterally through what one of them, Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller, recently called “executive action.” In short, the president seems to be replacing his notorious “lead from behind” strategy in Libya with a “lead with no one behind” approach. Mr. Obama has sparked disbelief and outrage on Capitol Hill with the revelation that he has tasked the Pentagon with developing options that would eliminate as much as 80 percent of the deployed weapon levels set just two years ago by his seriously defective “New Start” Treaty. On March 7, Rep. Michael R. Turner, who chairs the House Armed Services Committee’s Strategic Forces Subcommittee, wrote in Politico: “Traditionally, a president has directed his military advisers to determine, chiefly, what level of our nuclear force is needed to deter a potential adversary from attacking us or our allies. The answer to that question should be what drives the strategy - not a president’s political ideology.” In addition, on Feb. 17, Mr. Turner and 33 other members of Congress threw down the gauntlet in a letter to Mr. Obama. It said, in part: “We seek your assurance that in view of the ambitious nuclear weapons modernization programs of Russia, communist China, Pakistan and others, the deep cuts to U.S. conventional capabilities per the Budget Control Act, and your failure to follow through on your pledged [modernization of the deterrent], that you will cease to pursue such unprecedented reductions in the U.S. deterrent and extended deterrent.” The legislators’ point about the president’s failure to honor the commitment made to secure Senate approval of New Start in a cynical and heavy-handed power play during the 2010 lame-duck session is particularly apt. Even if Mr. Obama can’t get away with the sweeping reductions he has in mind, all he has to do to accomplish America’s unilateral disarmament is perpetuate the atrophying of our increasingly obsolescent nuclear forces - most of which are more than 25 years old and have not been realistically tested through underground detonations for two decades. Later this week, a new push will be made for a treaty that would lock our deterrent permanently into just such a death spiral. The National Academy of Sciences will release a study that is expected to deem the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty verifiable and further underground testing unnecessary. Much evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, proponents of the treaty and advocates of “Global Zero” - the multimillion-dollar campaign to eliminate all nuclear weapons that would, at most, rid the world of ours (and perhaps those of other, Free World nations that honor their international commitments) - hope to use the academy’s analysis to prevail upon the U.S. Senate to reverse its previous rejection of this accord. At the same time as the Obama administration is wreaking havoc on our nuclear deterrent, it is undermining the other insurance policy we need against catastrophic, potentially country-cratering attacks such as those involving ballistic-missile-delivered electromagnetic pulse strikes: effective national, or better yet global, missile defenses. Policy decisions and budget cuts are taking their toll on our anti-missile programs. So is the president’s willingness to cede technology or vetoes to the Russians. In the latter connection, Mr. Obama was overheard telling outgoing Russian President Dmitri Medvedev in Seoul on Monday: “On all these issues, but particularly missile defense, this, this can be solved but it’s important for [Putin] to give me space. … This is my last election. After my election, I have more flexibility.” Translation: If President Obama is re-elected, we should expect even more U.S. disarmament - whether or not anybody is following our lead. Shouldn’t that grim prospect be a centerpiece of the campaign this year and the American people offered a robust alternative come November?

Ext – Obama Kills Deterrence

#### Obama reelection undermines nuclear deterrence --- sparks arms races and conflict.

**Washington Times**, 2/16/**2012** (Editorial: Obama’s unilateral disarmament, p. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/feb/16/obamas-unilateral-disarmament/>)

President Obama is working to realize the leftist dream of unilateral nuclear disarmament. This will leave the United States pitifully weak and create conditions for catastrophic deterrence failure.¶ The White House has told the Pentagon to study options for reducing the number of U.S. nuclear warheads by as much as 80 percent. The future nuclear force could have as few as 300 weapons, far below the cuts to 1,550 required by the START 2 nuclear treaty with Russia. It would give America an arsenal about the size of France's Force de Frappe and raise serious questions on whether it would have sufficient strength for even minimal deterrence.¶ Supporters of radical weapons reduction contend that Mr. Obama’s “nuclear zero” is not a unilateralist strategy and that deep cuts would only come as part of a framework of global arms reduction. This is mere rhetoric. No such framework has been established or is being negotiated, and no other country in the world is contemplating such extreme cuts. START 2, which the Obama administration claims is a model for the global framework, committed the United States to nuclear cuts while giving Russia the green light for nuclear-force modernization and expansion. The weak verification regime in the treaty puts America in the position of having to take Moscow’s word for it that Russia is complying with the agreed-upon terms. Ronald Reagan counseled “Trust but verify,” but Mr. Obama signed off on “Let’s just hope they aren’t lying.”¶ Communist China has never agreed to be part of any strategic nuclear framework. There are no reliable official numbers on the size of Beijing’s nuclear forces, though a 2011 Georgetown University study concluded the Chinese already may have the world’s largest nuclear arsenal. The White House hasn’t pursued any nuclear negotiations with Beijing and seems to think if the People’s Republic doesn’t mention its strategic forces, they don’t exist.¶ Rising regional powers aren’t buying into Mr. Obama’s anti-nuke line. Pakistan, India, North Korea and Iran have or are pursuing nuclear weapons. As the U.S. arsenal shrinks, the relative value of their weapons increases, so they have every **incentive to continue to move down this path**. This illustrates a dangerous flaw in Mr. Obama’s thinking. At the same time he is pushing America toward “nuclear zero,” the White House is promising to extend the U.S. nuclear-deterrence umbrella to countries such as Israel and Saudi Arabia to assuage fears of the nuclear threat from Tehran. Given this credibility gap, it’s no wonder many Middle Eastern states are planning to initiate their own nuclear programs if Iran gets the bomb. In this respect, “nuclear zero” is weakening deterrence, spurring an arms race and making conflict more likely.¶ It will be left to Mr. Obama’s successor to dump “nuclear zero” and reverse the dangerous erosion of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. If America rejects the security responsibilities of a superpower, it has no business calling itself one.

#### Obama reelection undermines nuclear deterrence --- lack of funding.

**Guarino**, 4/18/**2012** (Douglas – staff writer for the Global Security Newswire, Obama Reelection Could Threaten U.S. Nuclear Deterrent, GOP Suggests, National Journal, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/obama-reelection-could-threaten-u-s-nuclear-deterrent-gop-suggests-20120418)

Key congressional Republicans on Tuesday suggested that President Obama’s potential reelection could undermine the United States’ ability to deter enemy attacks, even as a GOP-controlled House Appropriations panel approved legislation on Wednesday that largely endorses the president’s plan for nuclear weapons spending (see GSN, Feb. 28). Under the Obama administration’s fiscal 2013 proposal, the National Nuclear Security Administration is requesting $7.6 billion for programs “to maintain a safe, secure and effective nuclear deterrent.” The figure is a 5 percent increase from funding Congress provided for the current fiscal year, but $372 million less than what the administration projected in 2010. The 2010 projections were aimed at supporting Obama’s pledge to provide $85 billion over a decade for modernizing the U.S. nuclear arsenal and associated infrastructure. Obama made the pledge during the successful push for ratification of the New START nuclear arms control treaty with Russia. Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., who was a key player in the 2010 New START negotiations but ultimately voted against the accord, said on Tuesday the fiscal 2013 budget requests demonstrates that the “gap between what was promised and what was delivered continues to grow.” Kyl said he was skeptical of assurances from administration and military officials that the proposed cuts to projected spending would create a “manageable risk” so long as they do not continue beyond fiscal 2013. Spending shortfalls have been defended similarly in past years, he argued during a breakfast talk at the Capitol Hill Club. “When do you cross the line between manageable risk and peril when each year we’re told we’re at the end of the line?” Kyl asked. “What happens if President Obama is reelected and is no longer answerable for another election to the American people—what’s likely to happen to these programs at that time?”

### Ext – Nuclear Cuts Kill Deterrence

#### Nuclear weapons are key to deterrence --- six reasons.

**Thayer**, **2012** (Bradley A. Thayer, a consultant to the Department of Defense and professor of political science at Baylor University, 2/20/12, “Preserving our nuclear deterrence: Obama proposal for force reduction is foolhardy,” Washington Times, http://search.proquest.com/docview/922263797)

For deterrence purposes, nuclear weapons matter for six reasons. First, they help keep the peace and prevent crises from escalating, as the world witnessed with the Cuban missile crisis. Second, they deter an attack on the U.S. homeland. Third, nuclear weapons - both strategic and tactical - allow the United States to extend deterrence credibly, effectively and cheaply to its allies, such as Germany, Japan and Saudi Arabia. This provides them with security and removes their incentive to acquire their own nuclear weapons. Fourth, we have nuclear weapons to deter attacks against the U.S. military. Fifth, nuclear weapons play a role in deterring escalation of conflict. For example, were China to attack Taiwan, U.S. nuclear weapons would deter escalation to a strategic exchange between the United States and China. Finally, nuclear weapons deter the use of other weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons or chemical weapons, against the U.S. homeland, allies or U.S. military. Nuclear weapons aid Uncle Sam's ability to coerce opponents as well for three reasons. First, in a crisis situation, nuclear weapons help persuade a challenger not to escalate to a higher level of violence or move up a rung on the escalation ladder. Second, although laden with risks, they also provide the possibility of attacking first to limit the damage the United States or its allies would receive. Whether the U.S. would do so is another matter. But possessing the capability provides the nation with coercive capabilities in crisis situations or war. Third, nuclear weapons give the United States the ability to threaten nuclear first-use to stop a conventional attack or limited nuclear attack and to signal the risk of escalating violence to a higher level. Regrettably, the cold fact is that the clock cannot be turned back. Nuclear weapons cannot be un-invented, and they remain key tools to advance the interests of the United States and international stability. The global deterrent and coercive commitments of the United States do not permit additional cuts. They cannot be eliminated or dramatically reduced without a cost and penalty for the interests of the United States. The Cold War changed much, but it did not alter the need to be able to deter and coerce foes, a need as identifiable to the ancient Greeks as it is to us today. No state has given up key tools, certainly not China, Russia, India, Pakistan, Israel, North Korea, France or the United Kingdom, and the United States should not be first. No superpower has contemplated such drastic reductions in essential weapons it and its allies need now and will need in the future.

#### Obama’s nuke cuts kills deterrence abilities

**Gertz**, **2012** (Bill Gertz, senior editor of the Washington Free Beacon, former national security reporter, editor, and columnist for 27 years at the Washington Times, author of six books, four of which were national bestsellers. His most recent book was The Failure Factory, a look at an out-of-control government bureaucracy that could have been a primer for the Tea Party, June 19, 2012, “A CUT TOO FAR

OBAMA SET TO SEEK DEEPER CUTS IN NUCLEAR ARSENAL,” The Washington Free Beacon, http://freebeacon.com/a-cut-too-far/)

President Obama has decided to seek deeper cuts in deployed strategic nuclear weapons to as few as 1,000 warheads, sharply below the target of 1,550 warheads required under a 2010 U.S.-Russia arms treaty, U.S. officials said Monday. Critics say the steep cuts, which the administration will seek in new talks with a growing anti-U.S. government in Moscow, would undermine U.S. strategic deterrence for the United States and its allies in Asia and Europe. The lower warhead levels also would be contrary to recent congressional testimony from a strategic forces commander who said further cuts would weaken the ability to deter nuclear states like Russia and China. A U.S. strategic nuclear force posture of 1,000 strategic warheads has not been seen since the early 1950s. At the height of the Cold War, both the United States and the Soviet Union had as many as 30,000 nuclear weapons. The deeper nuclear cuts are outlined in a forthcoming report the Pentagon calls the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) implementation study, dubbed the mini-NPR, and reflect President Obama’s announced 2009 effort to completely eliminate all nuclear weapons. The announcement comes despite reports that Russia and China are engaged in a major buildup of their nuclear forces, and North Korea and Iran are developing nuclear arsenals.

Ext – Nuclear Cuts Kill Deterrence

#### Cuts in funding for nuke modernization kills deterrence

**Gertz**, **2012** (Bill Gertz, senior editor of the Washington Free Beacon, former national security reporter, editor, and columnist for 27 years at the Washington Times, author of six books, four of which were national bestsellers. His most recent book was The Failure Factory, a look at an out-of-control government bureaucracy that could have been a primer for the Tea Party, June 19, 2012, “A CUT TOO FAR

OBAMA SET TO SEEK DEEPER CUTS IN NUCLEAR ARSENAL,” The Washington Free Beacon, http://freebeacon.com/a-cut-too-far/)

Gen. Robert Kehler, the current Strategic Command leader, said last month that he is worried about cuts in both warheads and funding needed for modernizing aging nuclear weapons and infrastructure. Under difficult fiscal constraints, nuclear forces that need modernizing include delivery systems, weapons life extension programs, stockpile monitoring, naval reactor design work, and upgrades for nuclear command and control, Kehler said during a talk at the Council on Foreign Relations. If further cuts are made, “we will have to go back and do what we did with this round of reductions: completely review what those impacts could be and make the appropriate recommendations,” the four-star general said. “Of all the elements of the nuclear enterprise, I’m most concerned with the potential for declining or inadequate investment in the nuclear weapons enterprise itself, some declining investment that would result in our inability to sustain the deterrent force,” he said. “Our weapons are aging, and we face the continued erosion of the nuclear enterprise’s physical and intellectual capital.” Without investments for modernizing nuclear arms and infrastructure, “maintaining the long-term credibility and viability of the nation’s nuclear deterrent will not be possible,” Kehler said. Former United Nations Ambassador John Bolton, a former State Department arms control undersecretary, said he is very worried that deeper cuts will harm U.S. security.

#### Reducing nuclear arsenal weakens deterrence

**Thayer**, **2012** (Bradley A. Thayer, a consultant to the Department of Defense and professor of political science at Baylor University, 2/20/12, “Preserving our nuclear deterrence: Obama proposal for force reduction is foolhardy,” Washington Times, http://search.proquest.com/docview/922263797)

Last week's leak from the Pentagon that the United States is considering reducing its nuclear arsenal from the 1,550 re- quired by the New START to as few as 300 provokes a critical question: Is the United States tempting fate with such drastic cuts? Because President Obama frequently states that one of his major objectives is to eliminate nuclear weapons, these cuts make very little difference. Unfortunately, the answer is yes, because nuclear weapons serve fundamentally important foreign- and defense-policy objectives. For the United States, nuclear weapons matter for purposes of deterrence and coercion - two of the major tools in the toolbox of the United States to advance and protect its interests. To serve these important and complicated ends, the United States must not cut its nuclear arsenal.

### Ext – Modernization Now

#### U.S. adversaries are modernizing their arsenals and other nations are proliferating.

**Ferrara**, 4/4/**2012** (Peter – Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute and General Counsel of the American Civil Rights Union, served in the White House Office of Policy development under President Reagan, Obama’s Unilateral Nuclear Disarmament, American Spectator, p. <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/04/04/obamas-unilateral-nuclear-disa>)

Perhaps you do not know that President Obama has asked the Pentagon to develop plans to reduce America's nuclear arsenal by up to 80 percent. That would ultimately leave America with just about 300 nuclear weapons, down from a high of over 31,000 at the height of the Cold War. In 2010, President Obama completed negotiations with Russia for a New Start Treaty, which reduces America's nuclear warheads to 1,550. There were effectively no reductions in Russian weapons in return, because the collapsed Soviet empire was functionally unable to maintain the threatening nuclear arsenal it maintained during the Cold War. President Obama exhibits a very strange lack of recognition of anything that happened during the Reagan years and the 1990s when Republicans gained control of Congress. You can see that in his failure to recognize any of the Reagan economic policies and their astounding success. He acts and talks as if none of that ever happened, perversely returning to the disastrously failed Keynesian economic policies of the 1970s. Similarly, in foreign policy, President Obama acts and talks as if he doesn't know that America under Reagan/Bush won the Cold War without firing a shot, in Margaret Thatcher's celebrated phrase, and the old Soviet power is no more. When he entered office, there were no arms control treaties in effect because the old Soviet Union that was party to START I no longer existed. In this context, reopening and completing New START Treaty negotiations with the surviving Russian Federation raises troubling concerns about President Obama's seemingly eerie state of mind. It is as if, so doggedly pursuing the opposite of everything that Reagan did, he is trying to reopen the Cold War, but this time with the opposite result: America loses. The old Soviet Union cannot easily be put back together. But more troubling for America is that this is no longer a bipolar world. China is a rapidly emerging military power building new, highly advanced nuclear and space weaponry, and a navy that is on course to push American naval forces out of the Western Pacific in a couple of decades, if not sooner. While Newt Gingrich's political opponents ridiculed his proposal for an American moon base by the end of this decade, the Chinese will have one looking down on our food stamp nation within a couple of decades. As Frank Gaffney wrote in the February 22 Washington Times: The Obama Administration continues to assume that the People's Liberation Army has only a few hundred nuclear weapons -- approximately the number to which our commander in chief would like to reduce the American arsenal. A radically different estimate was recently provided, however, in a Georgetown University study led by a former Pentagon strategic forces analyst, Professor Phillip Karber….Mr. Karber's team concluded that, based on the vast infrastructure China has created to conceal its missiles [3,000 miles of hardened tunnels], it may have as many as 3,000 nuclear weapons. Nuclear weaponry is also proliferating to Iran and North Korea, and soon to their rivals as America's nuclear umbrella becomes less and less reliable. That can mean Japan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt, besides Pakistan, which already has nukes that can fall into terrorist hands. And even shrunken Russia recently announced, under its about to be reinstalled President Vladimir Putin, a new $770 billion defense modernization plan with 400 new long range nuclear missiles, quite possibly each one with multiple, independently targeted warheads. This includes modernized ICBMs and submarine launched ballistic missiles. It is all in compliance with President Obama's New Start Treaty

### Unilateral Disarm Bad – Nuclear War

#### Unilateral disarm will result in use-it-or-lose-it pressure that escalates to nuclear war.

**Moran**, 2/16/**2012** (Rick – host of RINO Hour of Power, Obama mulls unilateral disarmament of strategic nukes, American Thinker, p. <http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/02/obama_mulls_unilateral_disarmament_of_strategic_nukes.html>)

So, Obama wants a world free of nuclear weapons. So did Reagan. The difference is, Reagan wanted to make nukes obsolete by building the Strategic Defense Initiative. Obama simply wants to disarm unilaterally - with no planned corresponding reduction from Russia, China, or any other nuclear power. Russia would never agree to such steep cuts anyway And one of his options is to reduce our stockpile of nukes to 300 - a number not seen since 1950. BusinessWeek: Even the most modest option now under consideration would be an historic and politically bold disarmament step in a presidential election year, although the plan is in line with President Barack Obama's 2009 pledge to pursue the elimination of nuclear weapons. No final decision has been made, but the administration is considering at least three options for lower total numbers of deployed strategic nuclear weapons cutting to around 1,000 to 1,100, 700 to 800, or 300 to 400, according to a former government official and a congressional staffer. Both spoke on condition of anonymity in order to reveal internal administration deliberations. The potential cuts would be from a current treaty limit of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads. A level of 300 deployed strategic nuclear weapons would take the U.S. back to levels not seen since 1950 when the nation was ramping up production in an arms race with the Soviet Union. The U.S. numbers peaked at above 12,000 in the late 1980s and first dropped below 5,000 in 2003. Obama has often cited his desire to seek lower levels of nuclear weapons, but specific options for a further round of cuts had been kept under wraps until the AP learned of the three options now on the table. A spokesman for the White House's National Security Council, Tommy Vietor, said Tuesday that the options developed by the Pentagon have not yet been presented to Obama. The Pentagon's press secretary, George Little, declined to comment on specific force level options because they are classified. He said Obama had asked the Pentagon to develop several "alternative approaches" to nuclear deterrence. An "alternative approach" to nuclear deterrence is surrender. If Russia has 3, 4, or 5 times the number of warheads as we do, then the only rational alternative if they threaten us is to give up. That small number of warheads makes nuclear war far more likely. It will be a "use them or lose them" strategy since a surprise attack on our missile force would likely reduce our retaliatory response to the point where Russia might actually think they could survive relatively intact.

#### Obama will push unilateral disarm --- nuclear deterrence reduces the chance of nuclear war.

Investor Business Daily, 2/15/**2012** (Obama’s Irrational Warhead Cuts: Nuclear Gun Control, p. <http://news.investors.com/article/601292/201202151830/obama-nuclear-warhead-cuts-are-irrational-.htm?p=full>)

The commander in chief who once pined for a world without nuclear weapons has decided a world without an American deterrent is a good start, seeking to cut the U.S. arsenal by 80%. In a world where rogue states with unstable leadership are either in possession of or pursuing nuclear weapons, and with Russia rearming and China emerging as a world military and nuclear superpower, President Obama has ordered the Pentagon to consider cutting U.S. strategic nuclear forces to as few as 300 deployed warheads — below the number believed to be in China's arsenal and far fewer than current Russian strategic weapon stocks. This latest example of presidential naivete, which makes even Jimmy Carter look like a warmongering hawk, seems based not on geostrategic reality but rather on the wishful thinking that the threat posed is nuclear weapons, not the enemies that possess them. Pentagon planners have been asked to consider three force levels as part of a Nuclear Posture Review ordered by President Obama last August: a force of 1,100 to 1,000 warheads, a second scenario of between 700 and 800 warheads, and the lowest level of between 300 and 400 warheads. Retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Thomas McInerney believes that even considering such deep strategic cuts is irrational. "No sane military leader," he says, "would condone 300 to 400 warheads for an effective nuclear deterrent strategy," he told Bill Gertz of the Washington Free Beacon. Gertz also quotes John Bolton, former U.N. ambassador and undersecretary of state for international security in the Bush administration, as saying the administration's plan to cut the nuclear force as low as 300 is by itself "sufficient to vote against Obama in November." The current U.S. arsenal has about 5,000 warheads. A cut to 300 would put us at a level not seen since 1950. Just as liberals think that guns, not criminals, cause crime, foes of American exceptionalism such as President Obama believe it is nuclear weapons that threaten the world, not the tyrants who possess them. They believe the once-unrivaled arsenal of democracy is really just the instigator of arms races. In the past, we would decide what we need to meet obvious threats. Obama seems to be saying let's disarm and the threats will just go away. As the world's only effective defender of freedom and democracy, the U.S. has a slightly different mission statement and military needs than Russia, China or the rogue states such as North Korea and Iran. To morally equate us with them is like saying there's no difference between cops and criminals because they both carry guns, so let's put restrictions on the guns. In a 2009 speech in Prague, Obama spoke of "America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons," ignoring the fact that before 1945 we lived in such a world and it was neither peaceful nor secure. While Obama envisions a world without nuclear weapons, and moves steadily toward unilateral disarmament of our arsenal, we envision a world without tyrants and thugs willing to use them against us. We do not fear nuclear weapons in the hands of Britain or France, countries that share our love of freedom and democracy. Nuclear weapons in the right hands ended the violence of World War II. In the right hands, they kept Western Europe free and helped win the Cold War. And the fact that they were used made it less likely they would ever be used again.

### Deterrence Good – Nuclear War

#### Nuclear deterrence prevents the escalation of conflict --- collapse results in WMD war.

**Robinson**, 3/22/**2001** (C. Paul – president and director of the Department of Energy Sandia National Laboratories, A White Paper: Pursuing a New Nuclear Weapons Policy for the 21st Century, p. <http://www.nukewatch.org/importantdocs/resources/pursuing_a_new_nuclear_weapons_p.html>)

I served as an arms negotiator on the last two agreements before the dissolution of the Soviet Union and have spent most of my career enmeshed in the complexity of nuclear weapons issues on the government side of the table. It is abundantly clear (to me) that formulating a new nuclear weapons policy for the start of the 21st Century will be a most difficult undertaking. While the often over-simplified picture of deterrence during the Cold War—two behemoths armed to the teeth, staring each other down—has thankfully retreated into history, there are nevertheless huge arsenals of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, all in quite usable states, that could be brought back quickly to their Cold War postures. Additionally, throughout the Cold War and ever since, there has been a steady proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by other nations around the globe. The vast majority of these newly armed states are not U.S. allies, and some already are exhibiting hostile behaviors, while others have the potential to become aggressors toward the U.S., our allies, and our international interests. Russia has already begun to emphasize the importance of its arsenal of nuclear weapons to compensate for its limited conventional capabilities to deal with hostilities that appear to be increasing along its borders. It seems inescapable that the U.S. must carefully think through how we should be preparing to deal with new threats from other corners of the world, including the role that nuclear weapons might serve in deterring these threats from ever reaching actual aggressions. I personally see the abolition of nuclear weapons as an impractical dream in any foreseeable future. I came to this view from several directions. The first is the impossibility of ever “uninventing” or erasing from the human mind the knowledge of how to build such weapons. While the sudden appearance of a few tens of nuclear weapons causes only a small stir in a world where several thousands of such weapons already exist, their appearance in a world without nuclear weapons would produce huge effects. (The impact of the first two weapons in ending World War II should be a sufficient example.) I believe that the words of Winston Churchill, as quoted by Margaret Thatcher to a special joint session of the U.S. Congress on February 20, 1985, remain convincing on this point: “Be careful above all things not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure, and more sure than sure, that other means of preserving the peace are in your hands.” Similarly, it is my sincere view that the majority of the nations who have now acquired arsenals of nuclear weapons believe them to be such potent tools for deterring conflicts that they would never surrender them. Against this backdrop, I recently began to worry that because there were few public statements by U.S. officials in reaffirming the unique role which nuclear weapons play in ensuring U.S. and world security, far too many people (including many in our own armed forces) were beginning to believe that perhaps nuclear weapons no longer had value. It seemed to me that it was time for someone to step forward and articulate the other side of these issues for the public: first, that nuclear weapons remain of vital importance to the security of the U.S. and to our allies and friends (today and for the near future); and second, that nuclear weapons will likely have an enduring role in preserving the peace and preventing world wars for the foreseeable future. These are my purposes in writing this paper. For the past eight years, I have served several Commanders-in-Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command by chairing the Policy Subcommittee of the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG). This group was asked to help develop a new terms of reference for nuclear strategy in the post-Cold War world. This paper draws on many of the discussions with my SAG colleagues (although one must not assume their endorsement of all of the ideas presented here). We addressed how nuclear deterrence might be extended—not just to deter Russia—but how it might serve a continuing role in deterring wider acts of aggression from any corner of the world, including deterring the use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons. [Taken together, these are normally referred to as Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD).] My approach here will be to: (1) examine what might be the appropriate roles for nuclear weapons for the future, (2) propose some new approaches to developing nuclear strategies and policies that are more appropriate for the post-Cold War world, and (3) consider the kinds of military systems and nuclear weapons that would be needed to match those policies. The Role(s) of Nuclear Weapons The Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Command, Admiral Rich Mies, succinctly reflected the current U.S. deterrent policy last year in testimony to the U.S. Senate: “Deterrence of aggression is a cornerstone of our national security strategy, and strategic nuclear forces serve as the most visible and most important element of our commitment Š (further) deterrence of major military attack on the United States and its allies, particularly attacks involving weapons of mass destruction, remains our highest defense priority.” While the application of this policy seemed clear, perhaps we could have said even “straightforward,” during the Cold War; application of that policy becomes even more complicated if we consider applying it to any nation other than Russia. Let me first stress that nuclear arms must never be thought of as a single “cure-all” for security concerns. For the past 20 years, only 10 percent of the U.S. defense budget has been spent on nuclear forces. The other 90 percent is for “war fighting” capabilities. Indeed, conflicts have continued to break out every few years in various regions of the globe, and these nonnuclear capabilities have been regularly employed. By contrast, we have not used nuclear weapons in conflict since World War II. This is an important distinction for us to emphasize as an element of U.S. defense policy, and one not well understood by the public at large. Nuclear weapons must never be considered as war fighting tools. Rather we should rely on the catastrophic nature of nuclear weapons to achieve war prevention, to prevent a conflict from escalating (e.g., to the use of weapons of mass destruction), or to help achieve war termination when it cannot be achieved by other means, e.g., if the enemy has already escalated the conflict through the use of weapons of mass destruction. Conventional armaments and forces will remain the backbone of U.S. defense forces, but the inherent threat to escalate to nuclear use can help to prevent conflicts from ever starting, can prevent their escalation, as well as bring these conflicts to a swift and certain end. In contrast to the situation facing Russia, I believe we cannot place an over-reliance on nuclear weapons, but that we must maintain adequate conventional capabilities to manage regional conflicts in any part of the world. Noting that the U.S. has always considered nuclear weapons as “weapons of last resort,” we need to give constant attention to improving conventional munitions in order to raise the threshold for which we would ever consider nuclear use. It is just as important for our policy makers to understand these interfaces as it is for our commanders.

### Deterrence Good – Probability

#### Even a low probability of deterrence failure should be avoided, the costs are too high.

**Payne**, May 18-19, **2009** (Keith – president of the National Institute for Public Policy, Department Head at the Graduate Department of Defense and Strategic Studies at Missouri State University, On Nuclear Deterrence and Assurances, Strategic Studies Quarterly in Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century Proceedings, AU Press, p. 89)

The material question is not whether commentators believe nuclear weapons “ought” to have value for deterrence in a normative sense; they have demonstrated that value. The question is whether we are willing to accept the risk of deterrence failure on those occasions in which the United States could not threaten nuclear escalation, possibly including threats to some adversaries’ highly valued/protected targets. The added risk of deterrence failure flowing from such an inability surely cannot be calculated a priori with precision. It may be nonexistent or high, depending on the specific circumstances of the contingency. Even if the risk of deterrence failure for this reason is low, however, the possibility would still deserve serious consideration because the consequences of a single failure to deter WMD attack could be measured in thousands to millions of US and allied casualties. And, of course, that risk may not be low.

### Deterrence Good – AT: Conventional Solves

#### Conventional capabilities cannot be a substitute --- only nuclear deterrence prevents the escalation to nuclear war.

**Lowther**, 3/18/**2009** (Adam – faculty researcher and defense analyst at the Air Force Research Institute, Learning to Love the Bomb, Boston Globe, p. Lexis)

Third, conventional capabilities will never effectively substitute for nuclear weapons. Yes, they can destroy the same target. But, they lack the same capacity to generate fear in the heart of an adversary. Fear acts to deter, which is why we possess nuclear weapons. Fourth, if the United States moves toward disarmament, it will be the only nuclear power to do so. Every other nuclear power is **modernizing its nuclear arsenal**. Thus, the United States may soon reach a point where it can be held hostage by other states. Fifth, in the 65-year history of the bomb there has never been an accidental detonation, miscalculation leading to nuclear war, or large-scale nuclear proliferation. History suggests the opposite. Nuclear weapons make those that possess them risk averse, not risk acceptant. The truth is nuclear weapons remain a fundamental aspect of our national security. Without them, the American people will face greater, not less, danger and adversaries willing to exploit our perceived weakness. Arbitrarily shrinking the nuclear arsenal by an additional 50 percent may not be a wise idea. It certainly deserves careful thought.

### Nuclear Cuts Bad – AT: Modeling

#### Other countries won’t copy nuclear cuts—empirics

**Turner**, **’10** (Michael R. Turner, senior Republican on the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, Apr 13, 2010, “Muddled Nuclear Posture,” USA Today, http://www.usatoday.com/NEWS/usaedition/2010-04-13-editorial13\_ST1\_U.htm)

Underpinning the president's drive for U.S. nuclear reductions appears to be an expectation that others will follow. There is no historical basis for this assumption. Since the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has reduced its nuclear arsenal by nearly 80%, but such cuts have not curbed Iran or North Korea's nuclear ambitions. Nor have they led to reductions in Pakistan, India, or China's nuclear arms.

### US/Israel Relations 2NC

#### Obama reelection makes current rocky US-Israel relations worse

**Miller**, **’11** (Aaron David Miller, a public policy scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and a Middle East negotiator in Democratic and Republican administrations, November 11, 2011, “What Obama really thinks of Netanyahu,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/10/opinion/miller-obama-netanyahu-open-mike/?hpt=wo\_t2)

"I can't stand him. He's a liar," Sarkozy said. Obama was heard to say, "You're tired of him -- what about me? I have to deal with him every day," according to a French website. I'm sure many people would have loved to have heard more of what Obama thinks. There's no doubt that Obama is frustrated and angry in the extreme with what he perceives to be Netanyahu's recalcitrance when it comes to Arab-Israeli peacemaking. Indeed if there was a cartoon bubble over the president's head, I guarantee you his sentiments would have matched or even exceeded, Sarkozy's. When it comes to "Bibi" Netanyahu, our somewhat detached and cool president is hot and very combustible. When Netanyahu was dismissively lecturing the president during their press conference last June in Washington, the look on Obama's face was somewhere between mortification and raw anger. If looks could kill, we would have had a new Israeli Prime Minister by now. U.S.-Israeli relations on any number of issues are extremely close, even intimate; and the Iran nuclear challenge will almost certainly make them even closer. But the Arab-Israeli peace issue seems to bring out the worst in both sides, and it has for years now. Kissinger and Rabin went at it in 1975 over a second Sinai disengagement agreement (Kissinger recalles d our Middle Eastern ambassadors as part of his so-called reassessment of the U.S.-Israeli relationship). President Jimmy Carter and Prime Minister Menachem Begin had a huge flap over settlements during the Camp David summit. President George H.W. Bush believed then-Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir misled him on settlements during their first meeting in 1989; and the relationship really never recovered. And Secretary of State James Baker wrestled with Shamir as well during the run-up to the Madrid peace conference in 1991. So Barack Obama is only the latest in a line of frustrated American presidents and secretaries of state. They have had to deal with a close ally who can also be withholding and maddening when it comes to protecting Israel's political and security interests in a conflict in which they have much more to lose than the American mediator if things don't turn out right. But President Obama's Bibi problem is different in several respects from his predecessors -- a fact that all but guarantees that tensions with the Israelis on this issue are not going to subside anytime soon. The 2012 election has kept them in a box. Indeed, the president's speech at the U.N. General Assembly last month notwithstanding -- more a campaign speech than one that addressed the Israeli-Palestinian issue -- if Obama is re-elected, buckle your seat belts. It's going to be a wild ride with the Israelis. First, the others -- Kissinger, Carter, Bush 41, and Baker, unlike Obama (so far) -- all succeeded. Their fights with their Israeli counterparts were productive; indeed they all had a strategy -- and sufficient will and commitment on the part of Israelis and Arabs to do serious diplomacy. At the end of the day, despite the tensions, everybody went home a winner. Even Bill Clinton managed to hammer out two agreements with Netanyahu, though neither was completely implemented. Second, part of the reason these three succeeded was that despite the toughness and the tension, there was a third "T" -- a modicum of trust that allowed each side to work with the other in something other than a zero-sum game environment. They built a mutual stake in the other's success. Former Secretary of State Baker will tell you that he had plenty of struggles with Shamir, but the two worked out a good personal relationship -- no leaks, respecting mutual red lines and so on. President Obama has yet to do that, and neither has Netanyahu. On the Arab-Israel issue, the president believes Bibi is a con man, and Netanyahu thinks the president wants somebody else as prime minister. The president is almost certainly persuaded that Netanyahu is buying time, playing American politics and hoping that the next president is a Republican who won't be so focused on pressing Israel on the peace process. If the administration could find a way to engineer regime change in Israel, it would. Indeed, the key folks that deal with the peace process at State and at the White House are veterans of dealing with Netanyahu (Hillary Clinton and Dennis Ross). They have seen the movie before, and they had hoped not to be in the sequel. Finally, there's the president himself, who clearly believes he knows best how to run the peace process. Obama doesn't just have a Bibi problem, he's got an Israel problem. Obama is not anti-Israel, but unlike his two predecessors -- Bill Clinton and George W. Bush -- he's not in love with the idea of Israel. He falls somewhere north of Jimmy Carter on the pro-Israel spectrum and south of George H.W. Bush. Here the president's coolness and detachment works against him. His early tough rhetoric against settlements and his commitment to fix the peace process whether or not Israel agreed created a pretty rocky foundation for gaining the trust and confidence so critical on the Israeli side, if a president wants them to do politically tough things later.

US/Israel Relations 2NC

#### Relations prevents WMD war in the Middle East and terrorism.

**Kohr**, 3/4/**1999** (Howard A. – Executive Director of American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Before the House Appropriations Committee: Foreign Operations, export Financing and Related Programs Subcommittee, Federal News Service, p. Lexis)

In an increasingly dangerous yet important part of the world, the United States and Israel have forged a unique and remarkable partnership. This relationship is based on a common set of values, a shared commitment to democracy and freedom, and comparable histories of providing safe haven to oppressed peoples. The U.S.-Israel partnership is also based on a staunch commitment to defend the mutual interests of both countries against ever-more ominous threats. Together, our two countries pursue a process of resolving conflicts within the Middle East through negotiations while at the same time maintaining the strongest military forces in the region to prevent aggression and instability. Today, after a half-century of cooperation, the mutual interests of our two countries are once again being challenged. Weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them are becoming both more sophisticated and more widespread in the Middle East. To destroy the U.S.-sponsored peace process, terrorists are turning to increasingly brazen acts of violence against both American and Israeli targets. Religious extremists aim not only to eliminate Israel but to purge the region of all non-Islamic influences and pro-Western governments. The prospect of these extremists obtaining and using nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons is one of the greatest threats faced by the United States, Israel, and the entire world. These shared threats have led the United States and Israel to unprecedented cooperation in deterring aggression, sharing intelligence and preparing joint defense systems and strategies: - Strategic cooperation--including frequent joint military exercises, ongoing military exchanges, the prepositioning of U.S. military equipment in Israel, and the joint development of some of the world's most advanced weapons systems--helps deter aggression in the Middle East. - In the fight against international terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), cooperation between the United States and Israel is perhaps without parallel. On a daily basis, the two allies exchange information on the whereabouts, organization, and plans of terrorist groups in the Middle East, as well as the political and military activities of the region's hostile states.- Israel serves as another set of"eyes and ears" for the United States. Israel provides vital intelligence on Iran's nuclear and missile programs, Iraq's concealment of vital documents, data, and facilities, and Iran's activities in support of Hezbollah in southern Lebanon, and other terrorist groups throughout the Middle East. - Israel is our most active partner in researching and developing missile defense systems to counter the ballistic missile threat from rogue countries such as Iran.

### Ext – Obama Hurts US/Israel Relations

#### Re-elected Obama more aggressive against Israel

**Senor**, **2012** (David Senor, coauthor with Saul Singer of "Start-up Nation: The Story of Israel's Economic Miracle" (Twelve, 2011), senior adviser to the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq in 2003-04, and an adviser to the presidential campaign of Mitt Romney, March 5, 2012, “Why Israel Has Doubts About Obama,” Wall Street Journal, http://www.cfr.org/israel/why-israel-has-doubts-obama/p27561)

The president's stern lectures to Israel's leaders were delivered repeatedly and very publicly at the United Nations, in Egypt and Turkey, all while he did not make a single visit to Israel to express solidarity. Thus, having helped foment an image of Israeli obstinacy, the Obama administration was now using this image of isolation against Israel's government. Mr. Panetta's criticism was promptly endorsed by Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, a harsh critic of Israel, who said Mr. Panetta was "correct in his assumptions." Indeed, almost every time the Obama administration has scolded Israel, the charges have been repeated by Turkish officials. November 2011: In advance of meeting with Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak, Mr. Panetta publicly previewed his message. He would warn Mr. Barak against a military strike on Iran's nuclear program: "There are going to be economic consequences . . . that could impact not just on our economy but the world economy." Even if the administration felt compelled to deliver this message privately, why undercut the perception of U.S.-Israel unity on the military option? That same month, an open microphone caught part of a private conversation between Mr. Obama and French President Nicolas Sarkozy. Mr. Sarkozy said of Israel's premier, "I can't stand Netanyahu. He's a liar." Rather than defend Israel's back, Mr. Obama piled on: "You're tired of him; what about me? I have to deal with him every day." December 2011: Again undercutting the credibility of the Israeli military option,v Mr. Panetta used a high-profile speech to challenge the idea that an Israeli strike could eliminate or substantially delay Iran's nuclear program, and he warned that "the United States would obviously be blamed." Mr. Panetta also addressed the Israeli-Palestinian peace process by lecturing Israel to "just get to the damn table." This, despite the fact that Israel had been actively pursuing direct negotiations with the Palestinians, only to watch the Palestinian president abandon talks and unilaterally pursue statehood at the U.N. The Obama team thought the problem was with Israel? January 2012: In an interview, Mr. Obama referred to Prime Minister Erdogan as one of the five world leaders with whom he has developed "bonds of trust." According to Mr. Obama, these bonds have "allowed us to execute effective diplomacy." The Turkish government had earlier sanctioned a six-ship flotilla to penetrate Israel's naval blockade of Hamas-controlled Gaza. Mr. Erdogan had said that Israel's defensive response was "cause for war." February 2012: At a conference in Tunis, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was asked about Mr. Obama pandering to "Zionist lobbies." She acknowledged that it was "a fair question" and went on to explain that during an election season "there are comments made that certainly don't reflect our foreign policy." In an interview last week with the Atlantic's Jeffrey Goldberg, Mr. Obama dismissed domestic critics of his Israel policy as "a set of political actors who want to see if they can drive a wedge . . . between Barack Obama and the Jewish American vote." But what's glaring is how many of these criticisms have been leveled by Democrats. Last December, New Jersey Sen. Robert Menendez lambasted administration officials at a Foreign Relations Committee hearing. He had proposed sanctions on Iran's central bank and the administration was hurling a range of objections. "Published reports say we have about a year," said Mr. Menendez. "So I find it pretty outrageous that when the clock is ticking . . . you come here and say what you say." Also last year, a number of leading Democrats, including Sen. Harry Reid and Rep. Steny Hoyer, felt compelled to speak out in response to Mr. Obama's proposal for Israel to return to its indefensible pre-1967 borders. Rep. Eliot Engel told CNN that "for the president to emphasize that . . . was a very big mistake." In April 2010, 38 Democratic senators signed a critical letter to Secretary Clinton following the administration's public (and private) dressing down of the Israeli government. Sen. Charles Schumer used even stronger language in 2010 when he responded to "something I have never heard before," from the Obama State Department, "which is, the relationship of Israel and the United States depends on the pace of the negotiations. That is terrible. That is a dagger." Sen. Joe Lieberman, a Democrat-turned-independent, said of Mr. Obama last year, "I think he's handled the relationship with Israel in a way that has encouraged Israel's enemies, and really unsettled the Israelis." Election-year politics may bring some short-term improvements in the U.S. relationship with Israel. But there's concern that a re-elected President Obama, with no more votes or donors to court, would be even more aggressive in his one-sided approach toward Israel.

#### Obama’s reelection worsens US-Israel relations—views Israel as obstacles, con man

**Miller**, **2012** (Aaron David Miller, a public policy scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and a Middle East negotiator in Democratic and Republican administrations, 1/2/12, “Bibi and Barack,” Los Angeles Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jan/02/opinion/la-oe-miller-bibi-barack-20120102)

Barack Obama has an Israel problem. Almost three years in, the president still can't decide whether he wants to pander to the Israeli prime minister or pressure him. The approach of the 2012 elections makes the former almost mandatory; the president's reelection may make the latter possible. Buckle your seat belts. Unless Obama and Benjamin Netanyahu find a way to cooperate on a big venture that makes both of them look good, and in a way that allows each to invest in the other, the U.S.-Israel relationship may be in for a bumpy ride. The president's view of Israel is situated in two fundamental realities. The first is structural and is linked to the way Obama sees the world; the second is more situational and is driven by his view of Netanyahu and Israeli policies. Together they have created and sustained a deep level of frustration bordering on anger. Unlike his two predecessors, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, Obama isn't in love with the idea of Israel. Intellectually he understands and supports the pro-Israeli trope — small democratic nation with dark past confronts huge existential threats — but it's really a head thing. Clinton and Bush were enamored emotionally with Israel's story and the prime ministers who narrated it. Clinton sat at the feet of Yitzhak Rabin — the authentic leader and hero in peace and war — as a student sits in thrall of a brilliant professor (some said like a son to a father). "I had come to love him," the former president wrote in his memoirs, "as I had rarely loved another man." And Bush 43, though often frustrated in the extreme with Ariel Sharon, loved his stories of biblical history and more contemporary war tales. Bush reacted — as he did on so many issues — from his gut, certainly when it came to Israel's security. While flying with Sharon over Israel's narrow waist, the then-governor said, "We have driveways in Texas longer than that." The main source of Obama's view of Israel lies in his broader assessment of conflict and how problems are resolved. Obama didn't get his vision of Israel from the movie "Exodus," in which the Israelis are cowboys and the Arabs are Indians. Nor does he have Clinton's Southern Baptist Bible sensibilities or Bush's evangelical ones relating to Israel as the Holy Land. Obama's views came from another place: his own logic, the university environment in which he developed intellectually and his own moral sensibilities. And according to this view, the Arab-Israeli dispute isn't some kind of morality play that pits the forces of good against the forces of darkness. Instead, it's a more complex tale, not of heroes and villains but of a conflict between two rights and two just causes. It's also a conflict that is vital to American interests. And those interests are being threatened by the divide between those who want a solution and are serious about moving toward one, and those who aren't serious about finding a solution and throw up obstacles. After three years, the president has clearly placed the Israelis in the latter category and the Palestinians in the former. The tendency to look at Israel analytically instead of emotionally, and to view the conflict through a national-interest prism rather than some sort of moral filter, dovetails with Obama's poisonous relationship with Netanyahu. Obama doesn't like him, doesn't trust him and views him as a con man. The Israeli prime minister has frustrated and embarrassed Obama and gotten in the way of the president's wildly exaggerated hopes for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which he's been pursuing with more enthusiasm than viable strategy since his inauguration. To make matters worse, when the president went after a settlements freeze, Netanyahu called his bluff and Obama backed down — a terrible humiliation.

#### Reelected Obama will be hostile toward Israel if they bomb Iran

**Glick**, **2012** (Caroline Glick, Senior Fellow for Middle East Affairs of the Washington, D.C.-based Center for Security Policy, journalist for Makor Rishon, and the deputy managing editor of The Jerusalem Post, March 7, 2012, “Obama Demanding Israel Place Its Survival In His Hands,” Real Clear Politics, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/03/07/obama_demanding_israel_place_its_survival>\_in\_his\_hands\_113398.html)

In his commentary in Maariv’s Friday news supplement, the paper’s senior diplomatic commentator Ben Caspit laid out a hypothetical lecture that Obama might give Netanyahu during the two leaders’ tete-a- tete in the Oval Office Monday afternoon. In Caspit’s scenario, Obama used the meeting to lay down the law to the Israeli premier. If you bomb Iran’s nuclear installations before the November elections, in my second term Israel will no longer be able to buy spare parts for its weapons systems from the US. So too, Caspit’s Obama said, the US will end its support for Israel at the UN Security Council if Israel dares to take it upon itself to prevent Iran from crossing the nuclear threshold before the US elections. Perhaps Caspit wrote his article after hearing about a meeting between American Jews and Vice President Joe Biden’s National Security Advisor Anthony Blinken. According to Commentary’s Omri Ceren, Blinken told the assembled Jews that if Israel’s supporters discuss Obama’s hostile treatment of Israel in the context of the election, they can expect to suffer consequences if Obama is reelected.

#### Obama’s reelection will escalate tensions with Israel --- no restraints in his second term.

**Glick**, **2012** (Caroline Glick, Senior Fellow for Middle East Affairs of the Washington, D.C.-based Center for Security Policy, journalist for Makor Rishon, and the deputy managing editor of The Jerusalem Post, March 7, 2012, “Obama Demanding Israel Place Its Survival In His Hands,” Real Clear Politics, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/03/07/obama_demanding_israel_place_its_survival>\_in\_his\_hands\_113398.html)

But what we do know is that under Obama’s leadership, senior US military and defense officials have made repeated statements that are openly hostile to Israel. Then-defense secretary Robert Gates called Israel “an ungrateful ally.” Current Defense Secretary Leon Panetta demanded that Israel “get back to the damned table” with the Palestinians. General Dempsey and his predecessor Michael Mullen have spoken disparagingly of Israel and its military capabilities and so at a minimum gave comfort to its enemies. Aside from these rather uncooperative comments, under Obama the US has adopted policies and taken actions that have endangered Israel militarily on all fronts and in fundamental ways. With Obama at the helm the US not only stood back and allowed Hezbollah and Iran to take over Lebanon. The US has continued to supply the Hezbollah- controlled Lebanese military with sophisticated US arms. Under Obama, the US intervened in Egypt’s internal politics to empower the Muslim Brotherhood and overthrow Hosni Mubarak. The transformation of Israel’s border with Egypt from a peaceful boundary to a hostile one is the direct consequence of the US-supported overthrow of Mubarak and the US-supported rise of the Muslim Brotherhood and the Salafists. These are indisputable facts. Their military repercussions are enormous and entirely negative. Then there is Syria. For more than six months, Obama effectively sided with Bashar Assad against his own people who rose up against him. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called Assad a reformer. Now, as Assad butchers his people by the thousands, the US has still failed to send even humanitarian aid to the Syrian people. Almost unbelievably, Clinton said that Assad would have to agree to any US assistance to the people who seek his overthrow. There have been reports that the US has warned Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq and Saudi Arabia about the possibility that Assad’s ballistic missiles and chemical and biological arsenals may be transferred to terrorists. Such a prospect constitutes a clear and present danger to US national security – as well as to Israel’s national security. Indeed, the threat of proliferation of WMD is so dangerous that the administration could be expected to take preemptive steps to destroy or commandeer those arsenals. Certainly it could be expected to support an Israeli operation to do so. But according to reports, Obama has sufficed with empty warnings to the Arabs – not Israel – that this could perhaps be a problem. By failing to act against Assad, the Obama administration is effectively acting as the guardian of Iran’s most important regional ally. That is, far from enhancing Israel’s military posture, Obama’s behavior toward Syria is enhancing Iran’s military posture. He is acting in a manner one would expect Iran’s ally to behave, not in the manner that one would expect Israel’s ally to behave. As to Iran, while Obama touts the new anti-Iran sanctions that have been imposed since he took office as proof that he can be trusted to take action against Iran, the fact is that Obama has been forced to implement sanctions against his will by the US Congress and Europe. So too, Obama still refuses to implement the sanctions against Iran’s Central Bank that Congress passed against his strong objections earlier in the year. As with the case of Syria – and Hezbollah in Lebanon – on the issue of sanctions, Obama’s behavior has served to help rather than hinder Iran’s pursuit of nuclear capabilities. Beyond Israel’s immediate borders, and beyond Iran, Obama’s behavior toward Turkey has had a destructive impact on Israel’s military position and strategic posture. Obama has said that Turkey’s Islamist, anti-Semitic Prime Minister Recip Erdogan is one of the five foreign leaders he is closest to. He reportedly speaks to Erdogan at least once a week. The Turkish leader prime minister is the Middle Eastern leader that Obama trusts the most. Erdogan gained Obama’s trust at the same time that he ended his country’s strategic alliance with Israel and began directly funding the Hamas terrorist organization and providing aid and comfort to Hamas by seeking to end Israel’s lawful maritime blockade of Gaza’s coastline. What is notable about Obama’s relationship with NATO member Turkey is that he has not used his relationship with Erdogan to influence Erdogan’s behavior. Instead he has rewarded Erdogan’s behavior. Obama’s self-congratulatory statements about US assistance to the development of Israel’s missile defense systems ring depressingly hollow for two main reasons. First, the military cooperation agreement between Israel and the US for the development of the Iron Dome antimortar and rocket shield was concluded and financed under President George W. Bush due to the peripatetic actions of Senator Mark Kirk. Obama inherited the program. And in his 2012 budget, Obama reduced US funding of the project. The second reason his statements ring hollow is because his actions as president have increased Israel’s need to defend itself from Palestinian mortars and rockets from Gaza. Obama has empowered the Palestinians to attack Israel at will and pressured Israel to take no offensive steps to reduce the Palestinians’ ability to attack it. This brings us to Obama’s statements about his support for Israel at the UN and toward the Palestinians. The fact is that it is Obama’s hostile position toward Israel that fuelled the Palestinians’ rejection of negotiations with Israel. As Mahmoud Abbas told The Washington Post’s Jackson Diehl, Obama’s demand for a Jewish building freeze convinced him that he has no reason to hold talks with Israel. Then there is his “support” for Israel at the UN. The fact is that the Palestinians only sought a UN Security Council resolution condemning Jewish construction in Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria because Obama made them think that he would support it. It was Obama after all who called Israeli settlements “illegitimate,” and demanded an abrogation of Jewish building rights outside the armistice lines. The same is the case with the Palestinian decision to have the UN accept “Palestine” as a member. In his September 2010 address to the UN General Assembly Obama called for the establishment of a Palestinian state within a year. It was his statement that made the Palestinians think the US would back their decision to abandon negotiations with Israel and turn their cause over to the UN. So in both cases where Obama was compelled to defend Israel at the UN, Obama created the crisis that Israel was then compelled to beg him to defuse. And in both cases, he made Israel pay dearly for his protection. The fact is that Obama’s actions and his words have made clear that Israel cannot trust him, not on Iran and not on anything. The only thing that has been consistent about his Israel policy has been its hostility. As a consequence, the only messages emanating from his administration we can trust are those telling us that if Obama is reelected, he will no longer feel constrained to hide his hatred for Israel.

### US/Israel Relations Good – War

#### US/Israel relations are key to prevent Israeli-Arab war

**Oren**, 7/1/**2002** (Michael – senior fellow at the Shalem Center in Jerusalem, Does the U.S. finally understand Israel?, Commentary, p. Highbeam Research)

For one thing, Arab leaders have drawn conclusions from U.S. policy that are seldom those intended by Washington. Friction between Israel and the U.S. is almost always perceived among Arabs as an opening to be exploited in their ongoing war against the Jewish state. Although U.S. policymakers believe that leaning on Israel is a means of maintaining tranquility, in the Arab world such pressure tends to foster the belief that the United States will at the very least keep Israel on a tight leash and perhaps coerce it into accepting terms more favorable to the Arab side. In this way, U.S. ambivalence reinforces Arab recalcitrance and sets in motion a vicious cycle: the harder the U.S. pushes Israel to make concessions in the name of "peace," the more elusive real peace becomes.

#### Israeli-Arab war escalates to global nuclear war.

**Piper**, staff writer for the American Free Press, April 12 **2004** (Michael Collins, “Israeli Nuclear Policies Threaten World Peace,” http://www.americanfreepress.net/03\_07\_04/Israeli\_Nuclear\_Policies/israeli\_nuclear\_policies.html)

Most Americans have no idea that the possibility of a full-fledged nuclear “suicide bombing” by the state of Israel itself is a cornerstone of Israel’s national security planning. However, there are some U.S. policymakers who have dared to express their concerns about this dangerous policy, which is known as what Pulitzer Prize-winning author Seymour Hersh referred to, in the book by the same name, “The Samson Option.” As Hersh has documented—and Israeli historian Avner Cohen has confirmed it in even more detail in his own book, Israel and the Bomb—Israel’s entire national defense policy (from its inception) was framed around the development of powerful nuclear bombs. As Hersh makes clear, the Israelis are willing, if necessary, to “blow up the world”—including themselves—if they have to do so in order to defeat their Arab foes. The so-called “Samson Option” for Israel is based on the well-known story of Samson in the Bible, who—after being captured by the Philistines—brought down Dagon’s temple in Gaza and killed himself along with a number of Philistines. As Hersh put it: “For Israel’s nuclear advocates, the Samson Option became another way of saying ‘Never Again’.”

### Obama Weakness 2NC

#### Reelecting Obama results in appeasement and signals American weakness.

**Wright**, 5/4/**2012** (Kevin – founder and director of the Old Dominion Research Group, Obama’s Foreign Policy: Continued Appeasement Will Bring the Ultimatum, Think FY, p. <http://www.thinkfy.com/content/obamas-foreign-policy-continued-appeasement-will-bring-ultimatum>)

This is the choice we face in the November election on foreign policy: stand strong and project our strength or accommodate and appease our adversaries. Both have consequences, but as Reagan said, “every lesson of history tells us that **the greater risk lies in appeasement**.” With President Obama’s record, the choice is crystal clear which side he stands on: a policy of accommodation and appeasement. Consider the events that have unfolded over the past three years with Russia and China: Only eight months into his first year as Commander-in-Chief, President Barack Obama waved a white flag to “our adversaries” by choosing Russia over “two key NATO allies” (Poland and the Czech Republic) in abandoning missile defense; a move that “will be hailed by the Kremlin as a big victory” and as a “sign of weakness.” Oh, and don’t forget that Obama announced the decision on the 70th Anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Poland and received no concessions from Russia in return. At the same time Obama was trying to appease Russia by abandoning missile defense plans, Obama was trying to appease the Communist Chinese by postponing a meeting with Tibetan spiritual leader Dalai Lama.

#### Obama’s submissive foreign policy results in global aggression --- multiple scenarios of conflict.

**Chapin and Hanson**, 12/7/**2009** (Bernard - interviewer and Victor Davis - Martin and Illie Anderson senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Change, weakness, disaster, p. http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/change-weakness-disaster-obama-answers-from-victor-davis-hanson/)

BC: Are we currently sending a message of weakness to our foes and allies? Can anything good result from President Obama’s marked submissiveness before the world? Dr. Hanson: Obama is one bow and one apology away from a circus. The world can understand a kowtow gaffe to some Saudi royals, but not as part of a deliberate pattern. Ditto the mea culpas. Much of diplomacy rests on public perceptions, however trivial. We are now in a great waiting game, as regional hegemons, wishing to redraw the existing landscape — whether China, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Syria, etc. — are just waiting to see who’s going to be the first to try Obama — and whether Obama really will be as tenuous as they expect. If he slips once, it will be 1979 redux, when we saw the rise of radical Islam, the Iranian hostage mess, the communist inroads in Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, etc. BC: With what country then — Venezuela, Russia, Iran, etc. — do you believe his global repositioning will cause the most damage? Dr. Hanson: I think all three. I would expect, in the next three years, Iran to get the bomb and begin to threaten ever so insidiously its Gulf neighborhood; Venezuela will probably cook up some scheme to do a punitive border raid into Colombia to apprise South America that U.S. friendship and values are liabilities; and Russia will continue its energy bullying of Eastern Europe, while insidiously pressuring autonomous former republics to get back in line with some sort of new Russian autocratic commonwealth. There’s an outside shot that North Korea might do something really stupid near the 38th parallel and China will ratchet up the pressure on Taiwan. India’s borders with both Pakistan and China will heat up. I think we got off the back of the tiger and now no one quite knows whom it will bite or when.

Obama Weakness 2NC

#### Iranian proliferation causes nuclear war.

Henry **Sokolsky**, executive director – nonproliferation policy education center, 10/1/**2003**, Policy Review, p. lexis

If nothing is done to shore up U.S. and allied security relations with the Gulf Coordination Council states and with Iraq, Turkey, and Egypt, Iran's acquisition of even a nuclear weapons breakout capability could prompt one or more of these states to try to acquire a nuclear weapons option of their own. Similarly, if the U.S. fails to hold Pyongyang accountable for its violation of the NPT or lets Pyongyang hold on to one or more nuclear weapons while appearing to reward its violation with a new deal--one that heeds North Korea's demand for a nonaggression pact and continued construction of the two light water reactors--South Korea and Japan (and later, perhaps, Taiwan) will have powerful cause to question Washington's security commitment to them and their own pledges to stay non-nuclear. In such a world, Washington's worries would not be limited to gauging the military capabilities of a growing number of hostile, nuclear, or near-nuclear-armed nations. In addition, it would have to gauge the reliability of a growing number of nuclear or near-nuclear friends. Washington might still be able to assemble coalitions, but with more nations like France, with nuclear options of their own, it would be much, much more iffy. The amount of international intrigue such a world would generate would also easily exceed what our diplomats and leaders could manage or track. Rather than worry about using force for fear of producing another Vietnam, Washington and its very closest allies are more likely to grow weary of working closely with others and view military options through the rosy lens of their relatively quick victories in Desert Storm, Kosovo, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Just Cause. This would be a world disturbingly similar to that of 1914 but with one big difference: It would be spring-loaded to go nuclear.

### Ext – Obama is Weak

#### Obama projects weakness in foreign policy.

**Smith**, 5/30/**2012** (Lee, What would Romney do about Syria, Reuters, p. http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2012/05/30/what-would-romney-do-about-syria/)

It would be understandable, given Romney’s desire to keep focused on jobs and the economy, if he were reluctant to get too far into the weeds on foreign policy. But come November, the American people will not be electing a financial adviser. They’ll be electing the leader of a world power. Romney should not actually have much trouble outflanking Obama on foreign policy. The White House prides itself, rightly, on killing Osama bin Laden, Anwar al-Awlaki, and other jihadists who threatened U.S. citizens, interests and allies. But the national security strategy of a superpower with interests across the world cannot be reduced to counterterrorism. Nor can our global responsibilities be fulfilled, in the immortal phrase, by “leading from behind.” The lie was given to this bizarre conceit as early as the Libya intervention. Where Obama’s advisers boasted that leading from behind represented a new kind of leadership, scaled to the modest expectations of a post-financial-crisis world, the reality was that while France and the United Kingdom were out front, it was American firepower that brought down Qaddafi. When Obama disdains to lead elsewhere, someone else fills the vacuum – often at the expense of American interests and values. Consider Syria, where the Obama administration has handed its policy off to the Russians, by way of former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan. It took Obama five months into the uprising and thousands of casualties before he called for Assad to step down. But because the administration does not believe that the Free Syrian Army is capable of toppling Assad – a prophecy that without American arms and training might be self-fulfilling – it has opted to work with the “international community” for what it calls a political solution, in the hope that Moscow will force Assad from power, leading to a democratic transition. The White House is not able to describe the mechanism by which such an outcome might be engineered, and that is because Moscow doesn’t particularly want to topple Assad. Some of the reasons Russian diplomats have put forth for preserving Assad are nearly comical – for instance, a Sunni Islamist regime in Damascus would embolden Chechen rebels. But what matters to Russia is that it has become the de facto power on the ground because the White House has let it. Any regional actor that wants some movement on Syria, whether it’s the Saudis, Qataris or Turks, has to go to the Russians. Moscow has no intention of abandoning the role that Obama handed it. Not since the Cold War have the Russians enjoyed such diplomatic prestige – and all thanks to Obama’s foreign policy weakness.

### Palestinian Peace Process 2NC

#### Obama’s election is key to progress on the Peace Process.

**CNN**, 7/18/**2012** (Second term Obama more likely to jump into peace process, Jordan’s king says, p. <http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/18/second-term-obama-more-likely-to-jump-into-peace-process-jordans-king-says/>)

The delicate process of negotiating peace between Israelis and Palestinians is more likely to be taken on by President Barack Obama in his second term than Mitt Romney in his first term, Jordan's King Abdullah II said Wednesday. Speaking to CNN's Wolf Blitzer, King Abdullah said the political reality was that a president without the worry of re-election was better poised to tackle the peace process. "Well obviously there's always going to be a difference between a first term president and a second term president in dealing with this core issue," King Abdullah said on CNN's "The Situation Room with Wolf Blitzer." "A second term president is going to be in a much more comfortable position in dealing with the Middle East peace process. Obviously a first term president will tend to be less willing to take on such a difficulty political issue, especially in the first term of his presidency."

#### Peace process results in a Palestinian state --- results in Israeli pre-emption and nuclear war.

**Bere**, 3/28/**2003** (Louis Rene – professor of political science t Purdue, A Palestinian State and Regional Nuclear War, p. http://www.science.co.il/Arab-Israeli-conflict/Articles/Beres-2003-03-28.asp)

Until now, fears of a nuclear war in the Middle East have generally focussed on Iraq. Yet, when the current war against Saddam Hussein is concluded, it is highly unlikely that Iraq will be in any position to acquire nuclear weapons. A new Arab state of "Palestine," on the other hand, would have decidedly serious implications for certain regional resorts to nuclear conflict. Newly endowed with a so-called "Prime Minister," this state, although itself non-nuclear, would greatly heighten the prospect of catastrophic nuclear war in the area. If all goes well for the United States in Operation Iraqi Freedom, President Bush will feel compelled to reward Arab state allies and supporters with a dedicated American effort to create a Palestinian state. This state, tied closely to a broad spectrum of terrorist groups and flanking 70 percent of Israel's population, would utterly eliminate Israel's remaining strategic depth. With limited capacity to defend an already fragile land and facing a new enemy country resolutely committed to Israel's annihilation, Jerusalem would have to undertake even more stringent methods of counter terrorism and self-defense against aggression. Various new forms of preemption, known under international law as anticipatory self-defense, would be unavoidable. Significantly, a strong emphasis on preemption has now become the recognizable core of President Bush's national security policy for the United States. Several ironies must also be noted. Above all, offering Palestine as a reward for collaborative opposition to Iraq would merely exchange one terror state for another. Additionally, the nuclear risks associated with a new state of Palestine would derive not from this state directly - which would assuredly be non-nuclear - but from (1) other Arab/Islamic states (including Iran) that could exploit Israel's new strategic vulnerabilities; and/or (2) Israel's own attempts to preempt such enemy exploitations. Because the creation of a state of Palestine alongside the state of Israel would raise the area risk of nuclear war considerably, this very politicized measure should now be viewed with real apprehension. Indeed, its creation could even bring an Islamic "Final Solution" to the region. After all, every Arab map of the Middle East already excludes Israel. Cartographically, Israel has already been destroyed. Architects of the Oslo Agreements had suggested all along that a "Two-State Solution" to the Palestinian problem would surely reduce the risk of another major war in the Middle East. After all, they had always maintained, the problem of stateless Palestinians is THE source of all problems between Israel and the Arabs. Once we have "justice" for Palestinians, the argument proceeded, Arab governments and Iran could begin to create area-wide stability and comprehensive peace settlements. Harmony would then reign, more or less triumphantly, from the Mediterranean and Red Seas to the Persian Gulf. But as we should have learned by now, especially from recurring Arab violations of the "peace process," the conventional Oslo wisdom was always unwise. For the most part, Iranian and Arab state inclinations to war against Israel have had absolutely nothing to do with the Palestinians. Even if Israel had continued to make all unilateral Oslo concessions, and had continued to adhere to unreciprocated agreements, these irremediably belligerent inclinations would have endured, especially from Syria, Iraq and Libya as well as from Iran, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. If Israel should soon face a new state of Palestine, the Jewish state's **vulnerability to armed attack by hostile neighbors will increase markedly**. If this diminished safety is accompanied by the spread of unconventional weapons to certain hostile states, which now seems certain, Israel could find itself confronting not only war, but genocide. It is also clear that Israel's own nuclear infrastructures will become increasingly vulnerable to surprise attack from Palestinian territories.

### AT: Palestinian Peace Process Good

#### Obama cannot jumpstart the peace process because of distrust and ineffective negotiations.

**Goldberg** 7-16-**2012** Jeffrey Goldberg- Columnist Washington Post, Jerusalem Post, New York Magazine and Bloomberg News. Bloomberg“Is Obama or Romney Better for Middle East Peace?” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-16/is-obama-or-romney-better-for-middle-east-peace-.html>

Which candidate for U.S. president is better positioned to jump-start Middle East peace negotiations? If you guessed the one who already has a Nobel Peace Prize on his shelf, you guessed wrong. Which candidate is better prepared to confront Iran militarily? If you guessed the Republican with an aviary of national-security hawks working on his campaign, well, wrong again. About Jeffrey Goldberg Jeffrey Goldberg, a national correspondent for the Atlantic, is the author of "Prisoners: A Story of Friendship and Terror." He was formerly a Washington correspondent and a Middle East correspondent for the New Yorker. More about Jeffrey Goldberg But let me explain. President Barack Obama came to office in 2009 with fixed ideas about how to revive peace negotiations. Despite the caricature drawn by his opponents, he was not unsympathetic to Israel and its security dilemmas -- particularly the challenge posed by Iran’s nuclear ambitions. But he also believed that his predecessor, George W. Bush, had spent too much time coddling the Israeli government, rather than challenging it to compromise with the Palestinians. Obama thought that an Israeli commitment to freezing the expansion of Jewish settlements on the West Bank would breathe new life into the peace process, and he said so publicly. Israel’s prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, whose governing coalition includes ideologues almost pathologically committed to the cause of settlement, didn’t much appreciate Obama’s demand, and he gave in only partially and temporarily. All this was happening against the backdrop of Obama’s famous visit to Cairo, where he delivered a message of reconciliation to the Arab world and then neglected to stop in next door to tell the Israelis that he hadn’t forgotten them. No Plan B Obama had no Plan B when Netanyahu didn’t do what he wanted. He didn’t punish Netanyahu, he didn’t cajole him, and he didn’t present alternative formulas for negotiations. His resentment of Netanyahu deepened, a feeling that was reciprocated in earnest. So the president, early in his term, was left with an Israeli leader who mistrusted him and a Palestinian leader, Mahmoud Abbas, who felt betrayed by the American inability to move the Israelis. Abbas, who had previously negotiated with the Israelis without benefit of a settlement freeze, thought he couldn’t move forward now that Obama had made a freeze a virtual precondition for talks. There are many critics of Israel -- including many Israelis -- who hope that Obama, if re-elected, will help Abbas by making a settlement freeze a precondition not only for renewed negotiations, but also for close relations between the U.S. and Israel. The theory is simple: Israel is a client state that depends on the U.S. for arms and for diplomatic protection in places like the United Nations, where it is regularly scapegoated. If Obama demands that Netanyahu bend to his will, and backs it up with specific threats, then the Israeli prime minister will bend. The theory is wrong, however. It is a political nonstarter -- Israel is still a popular cause among many Americans, Jewish and non-Jewish, and Congress is adamantly pro-Israel. More than that, it would cause the Israelis to harden their position, not soften it. Please don’t get me wrong: I would very much like to see the Israelis reverse their self-destructive settlement program. But even a cursory study of Israeli political behavior would tell you that a public demand from the U.S. president to evacuate territory or shutter settlements is going to paralyze Israeli leaders, and ultimately harden their stance, especially if voters believe they’re being forced to do something they don’t think they should do. Israeli leaders will only make dramatic concessions when they think the U.S. is standing with them shoulder-to-shoulder. Taking Risks Why? The Palestinians go into negotiations with the European Union, the Arab League, the UN and most of the world’s news media on their side. The Israelis have only the U.S. If Israeli leaders think the American president is a fair-weather friend, they won’t take risks for peace. They’ll hunker down and wait until he departs the scene. “The lesson for an American president is that if you really want to achieve progress you have to have a partner in the government of Israel,” said Robert Satloff, the executive director of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. “You can’t create a partner through threats. Remember that it is the government of Israel that is going to be the one giving up tangible assets.” I wish Netanyahu would take unilateral steps now to reverse some of the damaging aspects of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank. But he certainly won’t take these steps if he’s unsure of Obama’s support. If Netanyahu remains prime minister for an extended period, Romney has a better chance of resuscitating peace talks than Obama. The depth of the friendship between Netanyahu and Romney has been exaggerated, but it’s fair to say that Netanyahu thinks Romney won’t sell him out if negotiations fail, so Netanyahu is more likely to bargain with Romney at his side. And negotiations have a greater chance if the Palestinians think the U.S. president won’t axiomatically take their side when they make demands for Israeli concessions. Abbas offered nothing in the way of serious concessions in 2009 in part because he thought Obama would do the hard work of squeezing Israel. All this isn’t to say that negotiations would be fruitful if Romney wins the presidency. The Palestinians are weak and divided; the Arab world, increasingly Islamist in orientation, is going to be less interested in peace with Israel and more interested in confrontation; and the Israelis themselves seem less interested in compromise than ever. But there is almost no chance of progress if Obama wins re-election. On the other hand, Netanyahu’s primary concern today is the state of the Iranian nuclear program. And, as I’ll argue in my next column, Obama is more likely to take military action against Iran than Romney is. If Obama loses, Netanyahu might wind up missing him quite a bit.

### Taiwan F16s Good – Alliances

#### U.S. arms sale policies signal commitment to all U.S. alliances.

**Eikenberry**, 5/17/**2012** (Karl – retired U.S. Army Lieutenant General, former U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan, Frank E. and Arthur W. Payne Distinguished Lecturer at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International studies at Stanford University, Stop Ignoring Taiwan, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/17/stop\_ignoring\_taiwan)

The argument that the United States should abandon Taiwan altogether by gradually phasing out arms sales has been convincingly dismissed in these pages and is unlikely to become policy. But the current policy drift bears more subtle costs at precisely the time the United States should be strengthening its existing partnerships in the Asia-Pacific. There is already troubling evidence that U.S. allies in the region are hedging their bets, skeptical that the United States will meet its commitments, and wary of China's rising military power. American actions toward Taiwan matter to U.S. alliances elsewhere. This is true even beyond the Asia-Pacific as the United States withdraws from Afghanistan amid promises to remain engaged there.

#### Alliances prevent nuclear war

**Ross**, Winter 1998/**1999** (Douglas – professor of political science at Simon Fraser University, Canada’s functional isolationism and the future of weapons of mass destruction, International Journal, p. lexis)

Thus, an easily accessible tax base has long been available for spending much more on international security than recent governments have been willing to contemplate. Negotiating the landmines ban, discouraging trade in small arms, promoting the United Nations arms register are all worthwhile, popular activities that polish the national self-image. But they should all be supplements to, not substitutes for, a proportionately equitable commitment of resources to the management and prevention of international conflict – and thus the containment of the WMD threat. Future American governments will not ‘police the world’ alone. For almost fifty years the Soviet threat compelled disproportionate military expenditures and sacrifice by the United States. That world is gone. Only by enmeshing the capabilities of the United States and other leading powers in a co-operative security management regime where the burdens are widely shared does the world community have any plausible hope of avoiding warfare involving nuclear or other WMD.

### Ext – Taiwan F16s Key to Alliances

#### F16 C/Ds are key to building Taiwan’s capacity --- key to alliances and deters war.

**Goure**, 4/4/**2011** (Daniel – Vice President with the Lexington Institute, Building Partnership Capacity: Sell F-16s To Taiwan, Lexington Institute, p. <http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/building-partnership-capacity-sell-f-16s-to-taiwan?a=1&c=1171>)

A key aspect of U.S. foreign and security policy is to build the capacity of partner nations to undertake their own defense. The importance of pursuing this goal is clearly demonstrated by the air campaign in Libya. Of the 15 nations other than the United States participating in the Libyan operation, more than half of them are flying U.S.-made combat aircraft, a combination of F-16 C/Ds and F/A-18s. A number also have provided American C-130s and C-17s to support air operations. The NATO alliance is operating three U.S.-built AWACS command and control aircraft in order to direct air operations. Without the U.S. investment in allied air power, the Libyan operation would be reduced to a handful of countries, primarily the U.S., France and the U.K. It would have been impossible to turn enforcement of the Libyan no-fly zone over to NATO. Building partner capacity is the key to a more equitable division of responsibilities between the United States and its friends and allies in regions of interest, as well as a less-dominant role for the United States in ensuring regional security in Asia, the Middle East and Europe. Allies that can defend their own borders, coasts and air space are less likely to call on the U.S. in times of trouble. Moreover, more capable allies are better able to deter aggression, thereby reducing the likelihood that the United States will be called on to act on their behalf. When building capacity includes foreign sales of U.S. military hardware there are the additional advantages that ensue as the result of collaborative training and exercises, common maintenance practices and the creation of pools of spare parts. There also are the obvious industrial base and balance of payments benefits of selling U.S. military hardware to trusted friends and allies. Taiwan is a close and enduring ally seeking to enhance its self-defense capacity. Since its founding in 1949, Taiwan has relied on the United States to provide it with key military hardware necessary to its security. A guiding principle of U.S. policy towards Taiwan is that of ensuring a balance of military capabilities across the Taiwan Straits. To that end, over the past several decades, the United States has provided Taiwan with F-16 fighters, P-3 Orion antisubmarine warfare aircraft, CH-47 heavy lift helicopters, AH-64 Apache helicopters, Kidd-class destroyers and Patriot air/missile defense systems. Over the past decade, an imbalance of military power has developed across the Taiwan Straits. China has pursued a large-scale military buildup including the deployment of hundreds of ballistic missiles, attack submarines and advanced fighter and attack aircraft in the region opposite Taiwan. At the same time, Taiwan’s military capability has eroded. The most significant area of growing disadvantage for Taiwan is in combat aircraft. While China is deploying large numbers of fourth-generation combat aircraft, Taiwan’s fleet of F-16 A/Bs and, more significantly, F-5s is becoming obsolete. Taiwan has been pursuing development of an Indigenous Defensive Fighter (IDF) that has yet to produce a successful combat aircraft. As a consequence, Taiwan has come to the United States with a request that Washington reestablish a balance of airpower in the region by allowing Taiwan both to acquire additional F-16s and acquire the systems to modernize some 150 older-model F-16s. Taiwan’s request for the sale of some 150 additional F-16 C/Ds has been languishing unanswered somewhere in the halls of the State Department. Senator Richard Lugar, the ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, recently sent a letter to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stressing the importance of acting on Taiwan’s request to be provided the means to defend itself. In his letter, the Senator declared that “I am very concerned that if the Administration does not act favorably on Taiwan’s outstanding letter of request (LOR) for sales of F-16 C/D aircraft, Taiwan will be forced to retire all of its existing F-16 A/B aircraft in the next decade, leaving it with no credible air-to-air capability.” Senator Lugar went on to note that “replacement and augmentation of its existing fleet would not affect the qualitative and quantitative military balance in the region and would also, in turn, greatly assist the U.S. industrial base.” At a time when the United States is still engaged in two wars and finding it difficult not to become engaged in other regional conflicts and crises, it makes eminent sense to do whatever it can to build the ability of friends and allies, our partners in regional security, to defend themselves better. In the case of Taiwan, this means providing that country with the requested F-16 C/Ds.

### Taiwan F16s Good – Asian Credibility

#### Failure to sell advanced F16s undermines the signal of U.S. commitment in Asia.

**Rogin**, 4/27/**2012** (Josh – reports on national security and foreign policy from the Pentagon to Foggy Bottom for the Cable at Foreign Policy, White House: Taiwan needs new jets to counter China, The Cable at Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/27/white\_house\_taiwan\_needs\_new\_jets\_to\_counter\_china)

Last October, the Obama administration decided to sell Taiwan upgrade packages for its aging fleet of F-16 A/B model planes but the administration never said whether it would sell Taiwan the newer, more advanced planes, claiming it was still under consideration. At Lippert's November confirmation hearing, Cornyn pressed the nominee on the issue (watch the video here) and then introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill that sought to force the administration to sell Taiwan new F-16s. That amendment was voted down in the Senate. Cornyn then wrote a letter threatening to hold the Lippert nomination unless he gets some satisfaction on the issue. "I remain disappointed by your de facto denial of Taiwan's request to purchase 66 new F-16 C/D fighter aircraft, and I believe it sends a damaging message to nations in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond that the U.S. is willing to abandon our friends in the face of Communist China's intimidation tactics," Cornyn wrote.

### Taiwan F16s Good – Perception

#### F16s are key to reverse the perception of weakness and appeasement.

**Sorcher**, 5/7/**2012** (Sara – staff reporter for the National Journal, Insiders Support Selling U.S. Jets to Taiwan to Counter China, National Journal, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/insiders-support-selling-u-s-jets-to-taiwan-to-counter-china-20120507)

Two-thirds of National Journal's National Security Insiders support the sale of new U.S.-made fighter jets to Taiwan in light of Chinese military expansion. In a recent letter to Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, the White House said that it was committed to helping Taiwan address its gap in fighter aircraft as a result of Chinese military expansion, and promised to consider selling the island nation F-16 C/D jets. Cornyn was incensed over the Obama administration's September decision to upgrade Taiwan’s existing fleet of F-16 jets, rather than sell the nation the new package of late-model aircraft that Taipei, and many in Congress, had requested. In early October, 67 percent of polled Insiders said they supported the administration's initial decision to retrofit Taipei's aging fighter jet fleet. In contrast, an almost equal percentage (65 percent) now say the U.S. should sell Taipei the full package of F-16 C/Ds. "Obama needs to 'walk softly but carry a big stick,' " one Insider said. "China pays undue attention to perception, and there is little doubt they see us as 'appeasers' right now." The sale isn't just about providing a badly needed boost to Taiwan's capabilities, another Insider added, but demonstrating U.S. support for the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act, which requires Washington to sell Taiwan “defensive” weapons.

#### Perception of weakness undercuts deterrence --- results in US/China war.

**Christensen**, Spring **2001** (Thomas – professor of politics at Princeton, Posing problems without catching up, International Security, p. EBSCO Host)

On the active defense side, it appears that China is attempting to import and to build indigenously a fairly impressive layered air defense system to counter cruise missiles and advanced aircraft. In addition to reported clandestine acquisition of Patriot technology, China has purchased and is seeking to purchase from Russia an undisclosed number of SA-10 (S-300) and SA-15 (TOR-1) SAM systems. Some of this Russian technology might be successfully integrated into China's own domestically produced SAM systems, such as the HQ-9. [66] China is also working to develop antistealth and antisatellite capabilities. Even if the Chinese programs have only limited effect against more technologically advanced foes, they may still pose a future security challenge to Taiwan and the United States. If Beijing elites believe that they are in a protracted war of wills over an issue that they care about much more than do the Americans, such as Taiwan, those elites might still be emboldened by the perceived capability--however limited--to increase costs to American and Taiwanese forces and to reduce costs to mainland assets in such a struggle. This problem is only exacerbated by any perceptions that Chinese elites might have about America's supposed limited willingness to fight such protracted wars and to suffer casualties. Implications and Prescriptions for U.S. Strategy If the analysis above is correct, preventing war across the Taiwan Strait and between the United States and China is much more difficult than a straightforward net assessment of relative military power in the region might suggest. To deter China from launching attacks against Taiwan and escalating crises and conflicts by attacking American assets in the region, the United States must do more than demonstrate an ability to prevail militarily in a conflict; it must also demonstrate American resolve and, perhaps, the ability to protect its forces not only from defeat but also from significant harm.

Taiwan F16s Good – Perception

#### US/China war results in extinction

**The Straits Times**, 6/25/**2000** (Regional Fallout: No one gains in war over Taiwan, p. lexis)

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, **east Asia will be set on fire**. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe’s political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its “non first use” principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.

### Ext – Taiwan F16s Key to Resolve

#### Failure to sell F16 C/Ds undermines U.S. resolve.

**Blumental and Green**, 9/23/**2011** (Dan – Resident Fellow at American Enterprise Institute, and Mike – senior adviser and Japan Chair at the Pacific Partners Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Do we still care about the Taiwan Relations Act?, Foreign Policy, p. http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/09/23/do\_we\_still\_care\_about\_the\_taiwan\_relations\_act)

By any objective measure Taiwan needs the additional -- not just retrofitted -- F-16s. The Taiwan Relations Act requires the United States to provide Taiwan with arms and services of a defensive nature. Commitments such as the Six Assurances provide clear policy guidance: decisions about Taiwan's military requirements should be made on the basis of Taiwan's defensive needs and not U.S. diplomatic relations with Beijing. U.S.-China relations are obviously important, but U.S. resolve in standing by our friends and allies is a critical backstop to ensure that our policy towards Beijing works. The PLA Air Force is growing in leaps and bounds, including the fast-tracking of stealth aircraft. Taiwan needs to replace its aging fleet of F-5s to keep planes in the air, let alone counter the PLAAF's rapidly growing advantage. Taipei repeatedly requested F-16 C/Ds only to be told by the Pentagon not to ask again. Leading officials in Taipei are now being quite open in their disappointment and concern at the U.S. decision not to provide the F-16 C/Ds.

### Taiwan F16s Good – AT: US/China Relations

#### F16s won’t hurt relations --- Chinese power transition hurts the ability to backlash.

Christian Science Monitor, 5/1/**2012** (Why is the US considering F-16 sales to Taiwan?, p. http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-Pacific/2012/0501/Why-is-the-US-considering-F-16-sales-to-Taiwan/%28page%29/2)

China is now in the middle of a political transition. President Hu Jintao may cede some of his powers to senior Communist Party leader Xi Jinping as early as year’s end. The sudden fall of China’s best known corruption-buster, Bo Xilai, sheds further doubt about future leadership. Internal confusion may temper any response to Washington’s signal for a sale. “Because of some of the top power struggles taking place now in Beijing, that gives the US tremendous leverage and gives Taiwan a chance to upgrade,” says Liu Yi-jiun, public affairs professor at Fo Guang University in Taiwan. The US may use that leverage to pressure China on regional security issues, from Taiwan to Beijing’s growing clout in the disputed South China Sea, when top US Asian affairs diplomat Kurt Campbell holds talks in Beijing this week, says Raymond Wu, managing director of the political risk consultancy e-telligence in Taipei. “Washington understands there’s a lot on China’s plate,” he says. “There are a lot of domestic issues they need to address.”

### Taiwan F16s – F16 Upgrades Now

#### No impact – Lockheed and AIDC already agreed on the F-16 upgrade

**AFP**, News Agency, **7/12** [AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE. “Taiwanese Aviation Firm Says It Will Assist in F-16 Upgrades” Defense News. 2012. <http://www.defensenews.com/article/20120712/DEFREG03/307120002/Taiwanese-Aviation-Firm-Says-Will-Assist-F-16-Upgrades/accessed>: 7/19/12]

TAIPEI, Taiwan — Taiwanese aircraft maker Aerospace Industrial Development Corp. said July 12 that it had forged an agreement with U.S. aerospace firm Lockheed Martin to get a piece of the island’s $5.85 billion fighter upgrade deal.¶ AIDC and Lockheed Martin signed a memorandum of understanding on July 11 at Britain’s Farnborough International Airshow, according to a statement released by AIDC.¶ AIDC attaches great importance to the biggest F-16 upgrade project to be obtained by Lockheed Martin, it said.¶ Details of the proposed subcontracts from Lockheed Martin have not been finalized, an AIDC official said.¶ Taiwan’s defense ministry has said that the upgrade, which will take 12 years to complete, would give its 146 F-16 A/Bs a significant boost.¶ The jets will be equipped with radar capable of detecting Chinese stealth aircraft and may also be armed with precision munitions, according to the ministry.

#### No impact – Taiwan already signed the arm sales proposal

**Focus Taiwan**, News Channel, **7/16** [“Taiwan signs F-16 A/Bs upgrade deal with U.S” 2012. <http://focustaiwan.tw/ShowNews/WebNews_Detail.aspx?Type=aALL&ID=201207160032/accessed>: 7/19/12]

Taipei, July 16 (CNA) Taiwan has recently signed a proposal by the United States to retrofit the country's aging F-16 A/B jet fighters to seal the arms sales deal, Taiwan's Air Force said Monday. ¶ "It (the letter of acceptance) has been signed," Lt. Gen. Wu Wan-chiao, director of Air Force Command's Department of Political Warfare, told CNA in a telephone interview. ¶ "The United States will now begin selecting the contractor (of the upgrade program)," Wu said. ¶ The proposal, sent to Taipei by Washington in early May, contained listed prices totaling some US$3.8 billion that were in line with the budget approved by Taiwan's Cabinet, military officials have said. ¶ Included in the retrofit of Taiwan's A/B fighters is the installation of Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar. Equipping the fighters with AESA radar is a new initiative, officials said. ¶ Other items on the list include AIM-9X Sidewinder air-to-air missiles and Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) guidance kits, according to the officials.¶ The proposal came after the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama last September approved the sale of a retrofit and training package for the F-16 A/Bs instead of offering Taiwan the F-16 C/D fighters it had long wanted.

### Taiwan F16s – AT: Non-Unique – House Passed

#### Obama will not provide F16 C/Ds --- he will opt to sell upgrades not new planes.

**Munoz and Herb**, 5/1/**2012** (Carlo – Deputy Editor at AOL Defense, and Jeremy – award-winning journalist and Washington correspondent for the Star Tribune, Taiwan fighter deal could hamper key security talks with China, The Hill, p. <http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/224809-taiwan-fighter-deal-could-hamper-key-security-talks-with-china->)

But if a U.S-Taiwan deal does become reality, it likely will not happen until after the presidential election in November, says one former DOD senior official. Even if a deal is struck, the White House will probably forgo any new fighter sales in favor of a new round of upgrades for Taiwan's current F-16 fleet, Frank Cevasco, who spent a decade overseeing DOD's international programs, said Monday. The Obama administration "may decide to stall as it did before, offering to upgrade Taiwan’s existing F-16s ... and hope China’s new leaders decide against precipitating a new freeze on bilateral relations," Cevasco said.

#### Current F16 movement is election posturing --- there will be no progress.

**Mazza and Crouch**, 7/20/**2012** (Michael – research fellow at AEI, and Lara, Administration reversing course on fighter sales to Taiwan?, American Enterprise Institute, p. http://www.aei-ideas.org/2012/04/administration-reversing-course-on-fighter-sales-to-taiwan/)

While the language is intentionally vague at times, it does raise the specter of new jet sales to Taiwan in the “near-term.” Additionally, that the White House released this letter a week before the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue—when it would have been easier to wait until afterwards—suggests the administration may be adopting a more hard-headed approach to China. It may be election-year posturing, but that doesn’t mean it isn’t the correct course to adopt. All that said, Taiwan’s pilots shouldn’t hold their breath just yet. Arms sales are a long and complicated process: Much of the arms package promised in 2001, for example, has yet to be released. The letter is short on details, carefully worded—the White House understands Senator Cornyn’s desire for F-16 C/D sales to Taiwan—and does not specify the what’s or when’s of a potential new arms sale to the island. Presumably, there will be little movement until after Mark Lippert is confirmed as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs. Cautious optimism is in order here. The administration seems serious about providing Taiwan with new fighter aircraft, but this letter represents only one small step in the process. Taiwan is still a long way from having the fighters in hand. Meanwhile, the cross-Strait air balance continues to shift in China’s favor.

### Aggressive MD Good – Conflict

#### Weakness on missile defense threatens US-Russia war

**Whittington 12** (Mark Whittington, Yahoo! Contributor Network, 5.5.12, Yahoo! News, “Obama's Appeasement in Face of Russian Threats Not Working,” http://news.yahoo.com/obamas-appeasement-face-russian-threats-not-working-140700018.html)

COMMENTARY | Russia's threat to go to war over a missile defense shield being planned in Eastern Europe reveals the weakness of the Obama administration's policy of appeasement of enemies of the United States. According to CNS News, the threat was made by Russian Chief of General Staff Nikolai Makarov and will apparently be backed up by Iskander short-range missiles in Kaliningrad, which borders Poland. Thus far the Obama administration's response has been to coo about cooperation and achieving "common ground." The Russian threat of war comes after President Barack Obama was caught on a live mic, according to The Blaze, begging then-Russian President Dmitri Medvedev to give him "space" until after the election, whereupon he would be more "flexible" concerning the missile defense shield. The Russians, predictably, have concluded Obama is a pushover and have started employing Cold War-style military threats. The Russians have done this sort of thing before, back when the Soviet Union still existed. During the late 1970s and early 1980s the Soviets deployed hundreds of SS-20, a first strike intermediate range weapon designed to intimidate Western Europe. President Ronald Reagan despite intense pressure not to do so in the media and elsewhere, responded by deploying Pershing II ballistic missiles and Tomahawk cruise missiles, according to Newsmax. Once the Soviets realized Reagan was serious about finishing any war the Soviets started, they negotiated a treaty that banned the deployment of such weapons by both sides. The contrast between the two presidents, Obama and Reagan, cannot be starker. Obama has responded to Russian threats with appeasement and weakness. Reagan responded to Soviet threats with strength and resolution. As a result, while Obama is being run roughshod by the Russians, much to the detriment of American power and prestige. Reagan won the Cold War and put the Soviet Empire on the ash heap of history.

#### Obama’s weak missile defense threatens peace with Russia, China and Iran

**Lawrence 12** (Dana Lawrence, of Lawrence Politics Blog, 3.27.12, Lawrence Politics, “PRESIDENT OBAMA’S NEW ARM’S DOCTRINE: “PEACE, THROUGH WEAKNESS”.” http://lawrencepolitics.com/peace-through-weakness/)

What is so damaging about these secretive comments? We’re talking about the defense of the United States of America. The very way we defend America from regimes like Russia and Iran, is with missiles.We see the president showing his desire to move in even a more radical direction then he’s already done in the new START or strategic nuclear arms control treaty with Russia, where president Obama has agreed with the Russians that the United States missile defenses need to be reduced and our strategic nuclear weapons need to be reduced. In what kind of a world is president Obama choosing to become weaker? Why does president Obama have to indirectly whisper these concessions to the likes of Russian Pres. Putin and not even ask us, the American people what we think of it? Many of us don’t want anything to do with weakening our defenses in a dangerous world. Like President Reagan said, we believe in “peace through strength”. In a world in which Iran is seeking nuclear weapons, Russia is building its nuclear stockpiles, and helping regimes like Iran,China is building its nuclear stockpiles and is growing increasingly threatening in its presence around the world, using at least two generations of American nuclear technology, that it stole from our labs, on its most recent warships– and we haven’t even talked about the crazy North Koreans, who by the way, are propped up directly by China— why, in the war, would we be weakening ourselves like this? Just how bad are the Russians? After the president had weakened our stance with Russia by giving in to their demands to limit our missile defenses in the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which, by the way came into effect February 2011, the Russians simply took the very rules and limitations that we had agreed to in the treaty and repeatedly have threatened to deploy nuclear armaments close to NATO allies’ borders, beating us over the head with our own words, and have also threatened to withdraw from the new START if we don’t do what they, the Russians want us to do as far as missile defense. This is far from “peace through strength”. Apparently president Obama has a new slogan called “peace through weakness”, and I challenge you to find any country that had any longevity at all, that did well by laying down in front of their enemies, in the naïve hope that killers and thugs would stop being killers and thugs if we talked nicely to them. When the Russians say, ” Let’s be cooperative on missile defense,” what are they really saying? With-ruthless-killer-thug former-KGB-boss Putin-its-not-a-matter-of-if-but-when. First of all, we have foolishly had hours and hours of unilateral briefings so the Russians could get a real good view of our missile defense program. Being cooperative to the Russians means that they must have veto power over Washington, so that Washington cannot even shoot down a missile that’s coming toward its victims. Since when did the Russians get to tell us in Washington what to do? [I can imagine president Obama saying, “They don’t really mean that. It’s just bluster”.} Neville Chamberlain didn’t think Hitler really meant war and horror, either. Sometimes, Russia has demanded of us that we put limitations on the speed or geographical coverage of our own interceptors. I can’t believe that president Obama would be choosing to weaken ourselves and lay down before dangerous autocrats like Vladimir Putin. Just how “nice” is Vladimir Putin? This former head of the KGB, with all the murders and killings that that implies, this morally bankrupt leader, boasting his love child, this underhanded conniver, who just, supposedly “won” the Russian election, yes, under a pall of suspicious activities, this leader to whom free speech means,”Say what I tell you to say, or you’ll be dead”, {remember the famous Russian female commentator who was getting to close to the truth?}, this believer in the KGB type of free enterprise which says to the Russian Oil Industry, “Whether you like it or not, we are taking over”, this open disdainer of the United States of America and of our president, this hostile opponent of all American foreign-policy, including strongly opposing our call for the murderous Syrian dictator to step aside– Vladimir Putin, this is he– that “upstanding”, “loving”, “caring leader” and “family man” to whom Pres. Obama was indirectly whispering this week, in an unguarded moment, saying, in effect, “Vladimir, pretty please, just a little more time, love, and America will disarm for you, just like you want.” What should our response be to this dangerous stance of weakness before our enemies? We must see the world as it really is, with the threats from China, the threats from Russia, the threats from Iran, the threats from North Korea, the threats from terrorism, and build a military that is strong and capable on every front, both offensively and defensively. And that’s another thing that gets my goat. Obama and his minions are cutting our defense budget so dangerously thin that we cannot uphold the defense of this country, which is in the Constitution as one of the few things the government is supposed to do. We need to guarantee that we have enough money in our defense budget to be able to invent, to design, and build weapons that can stand against any threat out there. There really is peace through strength, and we’d better do all we can to vote out of office people who only cower before our enemies, and vote into office, people who understand real danger and real strength and real weakness. We conservatives need to do all we can to, vote President Obama out of office, in a landslide, this Fall.

### Aggressive MD Good – Laundry List

#### Concessions on missile defense threaten US security and economy

**Bolton 12** (John R. Bolton, a diplomat and a lawyer, has spent many years in public service, 6.25.12, American Enterprise Institute – Townhall Magazine “In foreign policy, American weakness is provocative,” http://www.aei.org/article/in-foreign-policy-american-weakness-is-provocative/)

Romney promptly and correctly labeled the Obama-Medvedev conversation “an alarming and troubling development.” One wonders what other foreign officials Obama is engaging in similar conversations—is it the rising generation of new Chinese leaders, perhaps those charged with expanding their conventional military forces as well as their nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles? The diplomats representing Iran, bargaining over the future of their illicit nuclear weapons program and expecting further U.S. concessions? Negotiators for the Taliban terrorists, haggling over the details of Obama’s potentially disastrous 2014 military withdrawal from Afghanistan, when they are not otherwise occupied assassinating Kabul government officials? Unfortunately, the list is long. Whether Obama or his advisers have actually had other conversations like the one with Medvedev, the whole world knows about that specific encounter, which is almost as bad. American Strength Protects Economic Interests Across the board, Obama’s vision of America’s proper place in the world is dramatically different from that held by most Americans. Perhaps most importantly for 2012’s key issue—America’s faltering, inadequate economic “recovery”—the administration completely misses the vital nexus between a strong America internationally and sustained domestic prosperity. The worldwide stability the U.S. and its alliances provide is important not only to advance U.S. political objectives but its economic interests as well. Global trade, investment and communications rest on the perception that these critical commercial flows will take place unimpeded by massive disruptions or uncertainties. While far from complete, America’s visibility, military predominance and global reach are all important to protecting economic recovery at home. Just as prolonged domestic expansion cannot last without a strong U.S. presence abroad, that presence cannot last without a vibrant U.S. economy. Obama repeatedly ignores this connection. It is as if he assumes global stability exists on its own, no matter what the United States does, just as he seems to assume there is an unlimited amount of wealth in America for him to redistribute without worrying about negative consequences. Internationally, however, if America does not provide stability, there are only two other possibilities. Either no one will provide it, and the ensuing vacuum will threaten international peace and prosperity, or others will step into the void. The United States can be certain they will not be looking out for America’s best interests, but for their own. Obama Turns Away Consider the wide range of issues where Obama has turned away from prudent foreign and defense policy, starting with national missile defense, ostensibly the subject of his conversation with Medvedev. Many Democrats, most notably Vice President Joseph Biden, have believed for decades, almost as a theology, that national missile defense in the Cold War was not only wrong but dangerous. Defense, in their view, is destabilizing. Only by remaining vulnerable to Soviet nuclear salvos could the U.S. convince Moscow it had no aggressive intent, at least in the bizarre world of “mutual assured destruction” (MAD) doctrine inhabited by Biden and his crowd. President Reagan, whose basic national security approach embodied “peace through strength,” had the courage to challenge the dominance of MAD thinking in U.S. strategic thinking by developing his “Strategic Defense Initiative.” Unfortunately, Reagan was unsuccessful in persuading the Soviets that the changing relationship between the two countries at the end of the Cold War justified new thinking on missile defense. And U.S. adherents to the MAD doctrine warned against doing anything to undercut the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty that prohibited national missile defense. Even more inexplicably, these opponents of national missile defense were willing to consider theater (or localized) missile defense to protect deployed American forces overseas and U.S. allies, but only because such activities were permitted under the ABM Treaty. In 2001, President Bush cut through the strategic confusion by announcing U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty so it could develop national missile defense “By any coherent metric, the nuclear threat America faces today is substantially greater than when he [Obama] took office.” 48 TOWNHALL July 2012 0H World Affairs capabilities against rogue states like North Korea and Iran. The Bush missile defense program, like Reagan’s, was designed to protect the entire U.S. homeland but was more limited in size. Bush wanted to protect against the relatively small number of missiles rogue states could launch against the U.S., rather than the massive Soviet attacks America feared in the Cold War. But even this modest approach, reflecting post-Cold War strategic realities, still worried Russia and the likes of Joe Biden. Accordingly, the Obama administration has gutted the U.S. national missile defense programs, both because most Biden-style Democrats never believed in them and because of Obama’s “reset” button policy toward Russia. How did Moscow react? Predictably, Russia still opposes even limited U.S. attempts to protect its civilian population. Moscow continues to insist, for example, that the missile defense assets the Bush administration hoped to base in Poland and the Czech Republic (to guard against strikes by a nuclear Iran) were actually directed against Russia’s ballistic missile forces. One only need look at a globe to see why this contention makes no sense. But incredibly, Obama has repeatedly acceded to Moscow’s views.

### Aggressive MD Good – AT: Relations

#### Obama’s Russian concessionary policy threatens security – worse than bad relations

**Bolton 12** (John R. Bolton, a diplomat and a lawyer, has spent many years in public service, 5.24.12, American Enterprise Institute, “The choice is clear: Romney will keep us safer,” http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/defense/intelligence/the-choice-is-clear-romney-will-keep-us-safer/)

Similarly, Russia and China continue to become more adversarial. Despite a three-year effort to press the “reset” button with Moscow, Russia has pocketed one Obama concession after another, on missile defense, arms control, and proliferation. Now, top Russian defense officials are threatening pre-emptive military strikes against U.S. missile-defense facilities in Europe. If this is what we get for bending the knee to Moscow, one can hardly conjure what “bad” relations with Russia would mean. Similarly, Beijing is building up its conventional and nuclear forces, conducting widespread cyber-warfare against both the U.S. government and our private sector, and making vast, and utterly unjustifiable, territorial claims in its region, with essentially no response from the White House. Elections, as political analysts say, are about choices. On national security, it is hard to imagine a starker choice than the one we will make this November. And the budget deficits created by Obama will make for extraordinarily hard choices as we try to restore America’s international presence. But as Ronald Reagan once said: “yes, the cost is high, but the price of neglect would be infinitely higher.”

#### Relations cannot check aggression --- MD is key to deter

**Huessy 12** (Peter Huessy is President of GeoStrategic Analysis of Potomac, Maryland , a defense and national security consulting firm, 6.21.12, Family Security Matters, “There Is No Good Reason Not to Build Missile Defenses,” http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/detail/there-is-no-good-reason-not-to-build-missile-defenses?f=politics#ixzz21Ax1o9nU)

Russia is demanding the US stop building missile defenses in Europe, just as it simultaneously helps Iran build the very rockets that hold NATO at risk. In language reminiscent of the Cold War, President Putin is once again urging Washington "better not to do this". Warns the Russian Chief of the General Staff Nikolai Makarov: "Taking into account a missile-defense system's destabilizing nature, that is, the creation of an illusion that a disarming strike can be launched with impunity, a decision on pre-emptive use of the attack weapons available will be made when the situation worsens." In short, if we build defenses, they threaten to attack. This despite serial attempts by Washington to "reset" relations between the two former Cold War adversaries. Central to the Russian confusion over NATO missile defense objectives is a long standing view by the Russians that sees missile defense as an arm of aggression, of providing a shield behind which an US attack will take place. During the Cold War, Gorbachev called missile defense "space strike weapons". What are we proposing to build? The US major missile defense initiative is the EPAA, the European Phased Adaptive Approach. Over time, the missile shield we defend against short, medium and eventually long range missiles. Current land and sea deployments protect against some threats. But for better protection, and after appropriate testing, the Block 1B version of the Navy Aegis based Standard Missile (SM-3) will be deployed, to expand the defended area against short- and medium-range missile threats. This will provide the near-term guts of the EPAA approach followed by the more capable 2A and the 2B missiles.

### AT: Bush Doctrine

#### Romney will not mirror the Bush Doctrine.

**Young Smith**, 11/23/**2011** (Barron – former online editor at the New Republic, Why the Romney Doctrine Won't Resemble the Bush Doctrine, The New Republic, p. http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/97735/response-gop-debate)

But maybe liberals shouldn’t fret so much. Yes, imagining any of the various Republican novelty candidates as the next commander-in-chief is a frightening prospect. But if we assume that the establishment candidate, Mitt Romney, wins the nomination, it seems unlikely that he’ll be inclined to reenact the presidency of George W. Bush. Indeed, if you take a close look at his foreign policy positions, you’ll find echoes of another Republican president, one who has lately become much more palatable to Democrats: Ronald Reagan. In recent years, something of a cottage industry has cropped up promoting President Reagan as a canny and relatively pragmatic practitioner of foreign policy. Among liberal historians like James Mann and Beth Fischer, it has become fashionable to cite different elements of Reagan’s national security platform as a positive example. In his book The Icarus Syndrome, for example, Peter Beinart identified Reagan’s mix of nationalistic swagger and military caution as the perfect antidote to the American tendency toward imperial overstretch, writing that Obama “should learn from Ronald Reagan, who scrupulously avoided Vietnam-type military interventions yet found symbolic ways … to make Americans feel proud and strong.” These revisionists often emphasize Reagan’s hesitance to employ American troops abroad: withdrawing the Marines from Lebanon in 1983, using limited airstrikes to retaliate against Qaddafi, and refusing conservative demands to intervene against the Sandinistas because “those sons of bitches won’t be happy until we have 25,000 troops in Managua, and I’m not going to do it.” (Grenada was the risk-free exception.) It’s clear that, governing in the shadow of the Vietnam era, Reagan was still haunted by our experiences there. Likewise, any desire Reagan may have had roll back the Soviet Union militarily was limited by his deeply felt fear of nuclear retaliation—a fear that ultimately led him to engage Gorbachev and end the Cold War. President Obama has assimilated many of these lessons. His desire to eliminate all nuclear weapons chimes with Reagan’s stated desire to do the same. His intervention in Libya displayed echoes Reagan’s hesitance to commit American troops to foreign conflict. And of late, Obama’s China policy has shown a Reaganesque willingness to assume a tough strategic posture while continuing to maintain cordial dialogue. During this campaign, Romney has been borrowing from Reagan in a different way, evincing a mix of over-the-top symbolic toughness, on one hand, and military caution on the other. Indeed, when it’s come to questions about the actual use of force, Romney has been quite circumspect, even dovish. Earlier this year, he suggested opposition to Obama’s military surge in Afghanistan, saying “one lesson we‘ve learned in Afghanistan is that Americans cannot fight another nation’s war of independence,” and he maintains that he would pull troops from the country by 2014. He has periodically retracted and modulated his most bellicose statements about attacking Iran, instead vowing to send more aircraft carriers to the region and increase sanctions. (Even at his most hawkish, it’s hard to see how Romney’s position on Iran differs in practice from Obama’s vow to keep all options on the table.) And he effectively adopted no position on the Libya intervention, criticizing Obama noncommittally. Romney has also placed great emphasis on those aspects of the Reagan playbook that Democrats might prefer to ignore—namely, Reagan’s vast binges on defense procurement spending and missile defense, the Manichaean approach to diplomacy that marked Reagan’s first term, and his gauzy emphasis on American greatness. While Obama may be about to oversee a massive reduction of defense triggered by the failure of the Super Committee for deficit reduction, Romney has proposed a “Peace through Strength” defense budget that would increase base defense spending to at least 4 percent of GDP. Romney has also echoed Reagan’s call for a “600-ship Navy” by proposing to “increase the shipbuilding rate from 9 per year to 15.” Like Reagan, he shored up his right-wing foreign policy bona fides by opposing a major treaty—in Romney’s case New START, in Reagan’s the Panama Canal Treaty. And he has doubled down on missile defense, blasting Obama for “convey[ing] an image of American weakness” and “surrender[ing] America’s role in the world.” Many of these steps could be deeply counterproductive in the current geopolitical context. To take one example, Reagan’s military ramp-up was pursued in the context of an arms race with a major strategic competitor, the Soviet Union. Today, while there might be a case for keeping the defense budget steady, there’s little justification for a build-up on the scale that Romney proposes, and an increase that large could jeopardize future economic growth. Of course, a lot of Romney’s campaign platform could be pure politics. It’s extremely hard to predict what a given presidential candidate will do on foreign policy based on statements from the campaign. (Just see what became of George W. Bush’s “humble” realism.) Romney may simply be trying to keep his options open, avoiding political pitfalls while substituting fiery rhetoric for any real commitment that might tie his hands in the future—but it’s difficult to shake the feeling that he’d rather be “offshore balancing” than storming the beaches of tyranny a la John McCain. But if liberals are worried that Romney will come into office and revive the tradition of never-back-down interventionism that defined the presidency of George W. Bush—and reminded them so much of Lyndon Johnson—then they’re almost certainly mistaken. Instead, Romney promises a huge defense build-up and a lot of loud talk about American greatness. He’s gambling that it’ll be enough to soothe a GOP bruised by a decade of war and anxious about the country’s decline. Why not? It worked for Ronald Reagan.

### AT: Climate Change

#### Romney will flip-flop on climate change issues after he is elected.

**Lacey 12** (Stephen Lacey, A writer for think progress, 03/06/12, Think Progress, Green Donors Bet Romney is faking his new climate change views and will flip flop back if elected, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/06/438479/green-donors-romney-climate-changeflip-flop-green-elected/)

According to his own standards on the campaign trail today, Mitt Romney was once a “radical” on energy issues. In 2003, as governor of Massachusetts, he supported “investing in cleaning technologies” for an old coal plant in the commonwealth responsible for dozens of deaths,[saying](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2011/05/20/208149/romney-coal-jobs-kill-people/) “I will not create jobs … that kill people.” Also that year, Romney [set up](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2011-09-07/Romneys-energy-rhetoric-differs-from-his-record-as-governor/50304822/1) a $15 million green energy trust fund for renewable energy in order to create a “major economic springboard for the commonwealth.” And in 2005, before deciding to pull out of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, Romney called cap and trade “good business.” That was back when the Economist magazine named him a[“climate friendly”](http://www.economist.com/node/3247187) Republican. Today, Romney says “we don’t know what’s causing climate change on this planet,” explaining that his new energy policy is to “aggressively develop our oil, our gas, our coal.” Romney’s changing positions on a broad range of issues have left supporters wondering where he’ll actually land on the issues if he becomes president. As Politico[reported yesterday](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/73642.htmlf), some donors in the environmental community are putting their bets on another flip flop on climate and energy issues: Julian Robertson, founder of the Tiger Management hedge fund, helped put cap-and-trade legislation on the map with $60 million in contributions over the past decade to the [Environmental Defense Fund](http://www.politico.com/tag/environmentaldefensefund). Now, Robertson has given $1.25 million to Romney’s Restore our Future super PAC, plus the maximum $2,500 to the Romney campaign. Other [green-minded](http://www.politico.com/tag/environment) financial backers may not be giving as much as Robertson, but they still share the view that climate-change science and a solid environmental agenda wouldn’t be a lost cause if Romney [won the White House](http://www.politico.com/2012-election/). “My feeling is that on these issues that people learn,” said former Gov. Thomas Kean (R-N.J.), who maxed out last fall to Romney with a $2,500 check. “And my hope is, as time goes on, he will understand that not everybody agrees on how you deal with these issues, but I hope he will agree with 99 percent of the scientists who believe this is an issue that we have to deal with.” This sentiment[echoes what other observers have predicted](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2011/11/03/359649/republican-president-climate-negotiations/). For example, Andrew Light, an international climate expert with the Center for American Progress, said he doesn’t think a Republican president would put an end to American involvement in climate negotiations. Because they are now a “central driver of broader foreign policy,” it would be tough for a candidate like Romney to pull out. “I am certain that there would be members of the administration who are not isolationists on foreign policy,” said Light. Although some experts believe Romney’s climate stance on the campaign trail might differ from his actual policies, signs don’t point to dramatic change. Last week, Romney chose oil billionaire Harold Hamm to chair his energy advisory panel — joining a group of [lobbyists](http://thinkprogress.org/green/2012/02/21/424116/mitts-canadian-tar-sands-lobbyist-guarantees-keystone-xl-construction-if-romney-elected/) who have worked for the coal and tar sands industries.

### AT: Law of the Sea

#### Law of the Sea won’t pass – no support in Senate

Alaska Dispatch 12 (Alaska Dispatch, 07/17/12, Alaska Dispatch, Law of the Sea treat ratification dead in US Senate, http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/law-sea-treaty-ratification-dead-us-senate)

It now appears that any chance this Congress would ratify the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea before adjournment has evaporated. Three Republican senators on Monday newly declared their opposition to the pact also known as The Law of the Sea Treaty. Republican Sens. Kelly Ayotte (New Hampshire), Rob Portman (Ohio) and Johnny Isakson (Georgia) joined other conservatives who oppose ratifying the treaty, Politico reports. The treaty, known colloquially by its acronym, LOST, lays out a legal framework to claim offshore Arctic resources, among many other things. With 34 senators in opposition, latest efforts by Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman John Kerry, D-Mass., to finally secure U.S. ratification of the treaty appear dead in the water, at least for now. That's because treaty ratification requires support of two-thirds of the U.S. Senate.

#### Law of the Sea Treaty won’t pass – 34 senators oppose it

Cardigan 12 (Cardigan, writer for Washington Times, 07/17/12, I Own the World, Law of the Sea Treaty now dead, DeMInt says, http://iowntheworld.com/blog/?p=141737)

The United Nations Law of the Sea Treaty now has 34 senators opposed to it and thus lacks the Senate votes needed for U.S. ratification, a key opponent of the treaty announced Monday. But the treaty’s main Senate proponent denies the treaty is sunk, saying plenty of time still exists to win support before a planned late-year vote. The Law of the Sea Treaty, which entered into force in 1994 and has been signed and ratified by 162 countries, establishes international laws governing the maritime rights of countries. The treaty has been signed but not ratified by the U.S., which would require two-thirds approval of theSenate. Critics of the treaty argue that it would subject U.S. sovereignty to an international body, require American businesses to pay royalties for resource exploitation and subject the U.S. to unwieldy environmental regulations as defined. The list of treaty opponents has been growing, and on Monday, Sen. Jim DeMint, South Carolina Republican and a leader of efforts to block it, announced that four more Republicans have said that they would vote against ratification: Sens. Mike Johanns of Nebraka, Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire, Rob Portman of Ohio and Johnny Isakson of Georgia.

#### Law of the Sea not passing --- GOP opposition

Rogin 12 (Josh Rogin, a reporter on national security and foreign policy from the Pentagon to Foggy Bottom, the White House to Embassy Row, for The Cable, 07/16/12, The Cable, Law of the Sea: Dead in Water?, http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/07/16/law\_of\_the\_sea\_treaty\_dead\_in\_the\_water)  
.As of today, 34 Republican senators have expressed opposition to Senate ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty, a number that would add up to rejection of the treaty if all those senators vote against it when it comes to the Senate floor. "This is Victory Day for U.S. sovereignty in the Senate," Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK), a passionate opponent of the treaty, proclaimed on the Senate floor late Monday. "With 34 opposed to LOST (the treaty), this debate is over." Inhofe's declaration of victory came after two Republican senators, Romney surrogates Rob Portman (R-OH) and Kelly Ayotte (R-NH), announced Monday they would vote against the treaty. "We simply are not persuaded that decisions by the International Seabed Authority and international tribunals empowered by this treaty will be more favorable to U.S. interests than bilateral negotiations, voluntary arbitration, and other traditional means of resolving maritime issues," the two senators said in a joint statement. "No international organization owns the seas, and we are confident that our country will continue to protect its navigational freedom, valid territorial claims, and other maritime rights." In effect, Portman and Ayotte added their names to the 31 GOP senators who expressed their opposition to the treaty in a July 16 letter to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV). That letter was signed by Sens. Inhofe, Jon Kyl, Roy Blunt, Pat Roberts, David Vitter, Ron Johnson, John Cornyn, Jim DeMint, Tom Coburn, Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Rand Paul, Jim Risch, Mike Lee, Jeff Sessions, Mike Crapo Orrin Hatch, John Barrasso, Richard Shelby, Dean Heller, John Thune, Richard Burr, Saxby Chambliss, Dan Coats, John Hoeven, Roger Wicker, Jerry Moran, Marco Rubio, Pat Toomey, and Mike Johanns. The 34th ‘no' is Georgia Sen. Johnny Isaakson, whose website displayed a message this week vowing that the senator would vote against the treaty. With 67 votes needed for ratification, the agreement does indeed look to be in trouble. But for proponents of the treaty, it's full steam ahead. The office of Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman John Kerry (D-MA), the lead sponsor and driving force behind Senate ratification of the treaty, told The Cable that he will not be deterred and intends to keep moving the ratification process forward. "Senator Kerry has been here long enough to know that vote counts and letters are just a snapshot of where our politics are in this instant, and it's not news to anyone that right now we're in the middle of a white hot political campaign season where ideology is running in overdrive," said Kerry spokeswoman Jodi Seth. "That's why Senator Kerry made it clear there wouldn't be a vote before election and until everyone's had the chance to evaluate the treaty on the facts and the merits away from the politics of the moment." "No letter or whip count changes the fact that rock-ribbed Republican businesses and the military and every living Republican secretary of state say that this needs to happen, and that's why it's a matter of ‘when' not ‘if' for the Law of the Sea," Seth continued. "The Chamber of Commerce, the oil and gas and telecommunications industries are some of the most effective in this town because they stick to their guns and they've been unequivocal about the need to get this done. They'll keep at it, and we will continue the work of answering questions and building the public record."

### AT: Trans-Pacific Partnership

#### Romney supports TPP.

Carter 6/14 (06/14/2012, Zach Carter, is The Huffington Post's Senior Political Economy Reporter, “Obama Trade Document Leaked, Revealing New Corporate Powers And Broken Campaign Promises” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/13/obama-trade-document-leak_n_1592593.html?utm_hp_ref=tw>)

Trans-Pacific negotiations have been taking place throughout the Obama presidency. The deal is strongly supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the top lobbying group for American corporations. Obama's Republican opponent in the 2012 presidential elections, Mitt Romney, has urged the U.S. to finalize the deal as soon as possible.

#### Romney supports it

Fox News’ 12, (no date on the site, 2012 is assumed) “Mitt Romney On the Issues”, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/elections/2012/mitt-romney/issues

If new markets are opened to what U.S. workers produce, Romney believes America can create an environment for rapid economic growth and job creation. He believes in open markets and global commerce if U.S. entrepreneurs selling high-quality products and services can be guaranteed access. He advocates agreements protecting intellectual property from those violating the rules of free enterprise. He wants to implement free trade agreements, pursue additional agreements, and conclude Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations. He also wants to confront China and increase the enforcement of existing law while imposing punitive measures if unfair trade practices continue.

## Obama Bad (Domestic)

### Cap and Trade Bad – Competitiveness

#### Cap and trade will kill competitiveness by pushing companies overseas and increases emissions because developing countries won’t have safety regulations.

Holecek’ 8 (11/7/08, Andrea, The Times, “New environmental policy could hurt steelmakers, manufacturing,” <http://nwi.com/articles/2008/11/07/business/business/docd02314e7dc222413862574f900781cbf.txt>)

President-Elect Barack Obama's reported plan to implement a cap-and-trade policy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions could make the integrated steel industry noncompetitive, according to a noted steel analyst. Charles Bradford, president of New York-based Bradford Research Inc./Soleil Securities, said a cap-and-trade policy could put Northwest Indiana's large steelmakers out of business because of its high cost. The Alliance to Save Energy and other environmental organization are urging the president-elect to make good on his campaign promises to focus on energy efficiency, including a economy-wide cap-and-trade program, as a key solution to the nation’s energy, economic, and environmental challenges. "He (Obama) wants cap and trade where people have to pay for their carbon emissions," Bradford said. "Integrated steelmakers put out three times more carbon emissions than the minimills." Integrated steelmakers, such as U.S. Steel Corp. and ArcelorMittal, produce steel using a two-step process, first by heating a combination of iron ore, coke and limestone in blast furnaces to produce pig iron, which is then made into steel in basic oxygen furnaces. Minimills melt steel scrap metal in electric furnaces to produce steel. Bradford said the integrated companies currently are losing their competitiveness. "In the summer they (integrateds) were the low cost producers because the price of prime scrap was $878 a ton, now its $133 a ton," he said. "At the same time (the integrateds) steelmaking costs are $600 or closer to $700 a ton. The minimills are under $300 (per ton) when you add conversion costs." However, because minimills use considerably more electricity than integrated steelmakers, their costs could rise if energy production would become more expensive under a cap and trade policy. U.S. Steel Corp. spokesman John Armstrong, wouldn't comment on competitiveness issues between U.S. steelmakers. U.S. Steel's concern is that any U.S. carbon reduction program could put U.S. manufacturing as a whole at a disadvantage in the global marketplace and force manufacturing offshore, he said. "Our biggest concern about (carbon dioxide) reduction schemes is that unless developing countries are held to the same standards, industry will go offshore," Armstrong said. "One of the ultimate paradoxes is that it would increase rather than decrease (carbon dioxide) emissions because developing countries don't have the same efficiencies in production of electricity, and don't would have stringent emission requirements and could generate more (carbon dioxide)." Nancy Gravatt, spokeswoman for the American Iron and Steel Institute, said the steel industry is "very energy intense and its processes involve carbon. "It's part of the process so its obviously a major concern as to what type of legislative approach will be taken for carbon reduction," she said Global manufacturing competitiveness is a big concern, Gravatt said. "Coming into office in an economy in financial crisis, President-elect Obama would have to take U.S. manufacturing competitiveness into consideration as he evaluates climate policy," she said. The steel industry has advanced a global steel sectorial approach to a policy on climate change, Gravatt said. "It would be approach that holds foreign manufacturers to comparable standards so U.S. jobs stay in America," she said. "It would be more be more harmful to the environment if U.S. manufacturers migrate to foreign lands where they won't have to deal with U.S. emissions standards."

Cap and Trade Bad – Competitiveness

#### Competitiveness preserves overall hegemony.

**Khalilzad 1995** (Zalmay – prominent scholar on Levinas and Foucault, Losing the Moment?, Washington Quarterly, Vol. 18, No. 2, p. Lexis)

The United States is unlikely to preserve its military and technological dominance if the U.S. economy declines seriously. In such an environment, the domestic economic and political base for global leadership would diminish and the United States would probably incrementally withdraw from the world, become inward-looking, and abandon more and more of its external interests. As the United States weakened, others would try to fill the Vacuum. To sustain and improve its economic strength, the United States must maintain its technological lead in the economic realm. Its success will depend on the choices it makes. In the past, developments such as the agricultural and industrial revolutions produced fundamental changes positively affecting the relative position of those who were able to take advantage of them and negatively affecting those who did not. Some argue that the world may be at the beginning of another such transformation, which will shift the sources of wealth and the relative position of classes and nations. If the United States fails to recognize the change and adapt its institutions, its relative position will necessarily worsen. To remain the preponderant world power, U.S. economic strength must be enhanced by further improvements in productivity, thus increasing real per capita income; by strengthening education and training; and by generating and using superior science and technology. In the long run the economic future of the United States will also be affected by two other factors. One is the imbalance between government revenues and government expenditure. As a society the United States has to decide what part of the GNP it wishes the government to control and adjust expenditures and taxation accordingly. The second, which is even more important to U.S. economic wall-being over the long run, may be the overall rate of investment. Although their government cannot endow Americans with a Japanese-style propensity to save, it can use tax policy to raise the savings rate.

#### Hegemony prevents nuclear war.

**Khalilzad 1995** (Zalmay – prominent scholar on Levinas and Foucault, Losing the Moment?, Washington Quarterly, Vol. 18, No. 2, p. Lexis)

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

### Cap and Trade Bad – Economy

#### Cap and trade collapses the economy --- creates negative shocks.

**Sergey 09** (Sergey V. Mityakov, assistant professor, department of economics, Clemson university, 03/19/09, CFR, Cap and Trade’s Economic Impact, http://www.cfr.org/united-states/cap-trades-economic-impact/p18738)

Restricting carbon emissions by cap and trade is probably not a good idea even in a booming economy. Many studies assessing the costs of mitigation of climate change (either through some cap-and-trade system or by means of a carbon tax) indicate that the losses in consumer welfare are likely to be enormous. At the same time the costs of climate change itself are not very well estimated to justify swift mitigation efforts; different studies produce different recommendations. Thus, there is no clear consensus among the scholars whether and when such a scheme should be implemented in the first place. In the case of a recession, additional negative shock to the economy in a form of cap-and-trade system seems like even a worse idea. If cap and trade were created now, it would lead to higher energy prices for American consumers and businesses, as energy producers would be forced to switch from cheaper and "dirty" fuels such as coal to "cleaner" and more expensive sources of energy. Thus, it is likely to hit American households through the following channels. On the one hand, consumers are going to suffer directly from the increased prices of the energy and energy-intensive goods they buy. On the other hand, higher energy prices will increase the production costs of American producers, making American-produced goods less competitive in the world market. This would tend to make the current recession even more severe, as businesses, which cannot compete against foreign producers, would close. Facing increased energy costs and competition from abroad, some American companies would have an incentive to shift their production overseas where no cap-and-trade system is operating. These adverse effects on producers are likely to lead to additional job losses in the United States, further increasing the costs of the recession for the American households. I think we should carefully analyze the costs of climate change to see whether they are indeed worth such sacrifices. Probably it is a better idea to postpone this decision until the current economic downturn is over.

#### Cap and trade hurts jobs- assumes creation of green jobs

Loris’ 9 (7/21/09, Nicolas Loris is a Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. Loris studies energy, environment and regulation issues such as the economic impacts of climate change legislation, a free market approach to nuclear energy and the effects of environmental policy on energy prices and the economy. “A Baker’s Dozen of Reasons to Oppose Cap and Trade”, The Foundry, July 21st 2009, [http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker’s-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/](http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker's-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/))

1.) It will destroy 1.15 million jobs. The Heritage Foundation’s Center for Data Analysis found that, for the average year over the 2012-2035 timeline, job loss will be 1.1 million greater than the baseline assumptions. By 2035, there is a projected 2.5 million fewer jobs than without a cap-and-trade bill. But Heritage isn’t alone in these estimates. The Brookings Institute, a supporter of a carbon tax, projects that cap-and-trade will increase unemployment by 0.5% in the first decade below the baseline. Using U.S. Census population projection estimates, that’s equivalent to about 1.7 million fewer jobs than without cap-and-trade. A study done by Charles River Associates prepared for the National Black Chamber of Congress projects increases in unemployment by 2.3-2.7 million jobs in each year of the policy through 2030–after accounting for “green job” creation.

Cap and Trade Bad – Economy

#### Cap and trade halts economic growth

Loris’ 9 (7/21/09, Nicolas Loris is a Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. Loris studies energy, environment and regulation issues such as the economic impacts of climate change legislation, a free market approach to nuclear energy and the effects of environmental policy on energy prices and the economy. “A Baker’s Dozen of Reasons to Oppose Cap and Trade”, The Foundry, July 21st 2009, [http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker’s-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/](http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker's-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/))

2.) It will reduce economic growth. All three aforementioned studies found significant losses in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), our primary measure of economic activity. Heritage found the average GDP loss is $393 billion, hitting a high of $662 billion in 2035. From 2012 to 2035, the accumulated GDP loss is $9.4 trillion (in 2009 dollars). Brookings predicts GDP in the United States would be lower by 2.5 percent in 2050 and the National Black Chamber estimates that in GDP will be 1.3 percent ($350 billon) below the baseline in 2030 and 1.5 percent ($730 billion) below the baseline in 2050.

#### Cap and trade hurts the poor and the workforce

Loris’ 9 (7/21/09, Nicolas Loris is a Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. Loris studies energy, environment and regulation issues such as the economic impacts of climate change legislation, a free market approach to nuclear energy and the effects of environmental policy on energy prices and the economy. “A Baker’s Dozen of Reasons to Oppose Cap and Trade”, The Foundry, July 21st 2009, [http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker’s-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/](http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker's-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/))

4.) It hits low-income households hardest. Cap-and-trade is an energy tax whose weight falls disproportionately on the poor. Although upper-income families tend to use more energy (and thus emit more carbon per household), since low-income households spend a larger percentage of their income on energy, the poor suffer most. Proponents of a carbon cap acknowledge this, saying, “Relative to total expenditure, however, the poor pay more […]. This means that carbon emission-reduction policies have a regressive impact on income distribution – unless coupled with revenue-recycling policies that protect the real incomes of the poor and middle classes.” Policymakers sought to protect consumers, especially the poor, from higher energy prices by handing out rebate checks or tax cuts. If only a small portion (15 percent) of the energy tax revenue is given back to the consumer, the burden on the poor obviously becomes heavier. Rebates or not, the higher energy prices would reduce economic activity by forcing businesses to cut costs elsewhere, by reducing their workforce, for example, and thus doing damage that no check would cover.

#### Cap and Trade hurts businesses

**Fehrenbacher 08** (Fehrenbacher, Katie, writer for Gigaom, 11/12/08, Gigaom, Former Energy secretaries: Cap and Trade is bad for business, http://gigaom.com/cleantech/former-energy-secretaries-cap-and-trade-is-bad-for-business/)

In the bubble of the Bay Area it’s easy to forget that there’s not a consensus on carbon regulation out there. At the opening dinner for the Forbes Energy conference on Tuesday night in New York, three former secretaries discussed their opinions about necessary energy and climate change policy, and at least two of them were in strong agreement that a cap-and-trade system in the U.S. would be bad for business. Both James Edwards, who was Secretary of Energy under President Reagan from 1981 to 1982 and John Herrington, Secretary of Energy under Reagan from 1985 to 1989, said a cap-and-trade system won’t work, will raise costs for consumers, and hurt business. Edwards and Herrington have long Republican political careers and oppose cap-and-trade systems, which set up a limit and market system to reduce companies’ green house gases, partly because they believe in lighter government interference. But both were very vocal about how they think a cap-and-trade system will hurt the U.S. economy in these difficult times. Cap and trade is “an industrial manager’s nightmare,” and will “destroy industry in America,” said Edwards, who was also the Governor of South Carolina from 1975 to 1979. Herrington said cap and trade is “the wrong direction to go,” for this country.

### Cap and Trade Bad – Farming

#### EPA regulations and cap and trade collapse US agriculture

Lieberman 10. (Ben, JD from George Washington Senior Policy Analyst in Energy and the Environment in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, EPA's Global Warming Regulations: A Threat to American Agriculture, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/04/EPAs-Global-Warming-Regulations-A-Threat-to-American-Agriculture>)

There is little doubt that legislative measures designed to address global warming would greatly burden the agricultural sector. Farming is energy intensive, and cap-and-trade bills--namely the House Waxman-Markey bill, which passed in June, and the Boxer-Kerry bill pending in the Senate--are essentially a massive tax on energy. Indeed, opposition from farm organizations and agricultural state legislators is one reason that the Senate bill has stalled. However, the Environmental Protection Agency ([EPA](file:///C:\Users\Dave\Documents\Macintosh%20HD%20250:\Organizations\Environmental-Protection-Agency)) is seeking to achieve similar goals through global warming regulations. Such regulations also pose a substantial threat to American [agriculture](file:///C:\Users\Dave\Documents\Macintosh%20HD%20250:\Issues\Agriculture), and bills to rein in the EPA deserve serious consideration. Cap and Trade: Bad for Farmers Cap-and-trade measures would drive up fossil energy prices, and the results for agriculture would be severe. An analysis conducted by The Heritage Foundation found that the Waxman-Markey bill would reduce farm profits by an estimated 28 percent starting in 2012, the first year the bill's provisions take effect, and average 57 percent lower through 2035.[[1]](#_ftn1) A study of a several Missouri farms ranging from 800 to 1,900 acres of corn, soybeans, and wheat estimated annual cost increases of $4,903 to $11,649 by 2020, mostly from higher costs of natural-gas-derived fertilizer as well as overall increased energy costs.[[2]](#_ftn2) Moreover, provisions in the Senate Boxer-Kerry bill purporting to provide agriculture with profit opportunities--such as earning valuable emissions credits by planting trees or engaging in emissions-reducing farming practices--are very limited and are unlikely to compensate for the higher costs imposed on farmers.[[3]](#_ftn3) EPA Regulations: Even More Problematic for Farmers Although global warming legislation looks less likely for the foreseeable future (though the President and some Senators are trying to revive it), there is an ongoing attempt to impose this agenda via regulations. The EPA regulations that would apply to stationary sources pose a threat to American agriculture.

#### Cap and trade hurts farmers by driving up energy prices.

Loris’ 9 (7/21/09, Nicolas Loris is a Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. Loris studies energy, environment and regulation issues such as the economic impacts of climate change legislation, a free market approach to nuclear energy and the effects of environmental policy on energy prices and the economy. “A Baker’s Dozen of Reasons to Oppose Cap and Trade”, The Foundry, July 21st 2009, http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker’s-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/)

7.) It would hurt America’s farmers. Farming is very energy-intensive, with fuel, chemical, electricity, and fertilizer costs; since cap-and-trade drives up the cost of energy prices, farmers’ losses will undoubtedly outweigh any money they collect from offsets (the money businesses would pay farmers to reduce carbon emissions by either not farming or using more efficient technologies). We estimate that farm income (or the amount left over after paying all expenses) will drop $8 billion in 2012, $25 billion in 2024, and over $50 billion in 2035. These are decreases of 28 percent, 60 percent, and 94 percent, respectively. The average net income lost over the 2010-2035 timeline is $23 billion—a 57 percent decrease from the baseline—and for consistency’s sake, that’s 52 billion postage stamps.

### Cap and Trade Bad – Free Trade

#### Cap and trade hurts free trade --- it is a protectionist measure.

Loris’ 9 (7/21/09, Nicolas Loris is a Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. Loris studies energy, environment and regulation issues such as the economic impacts of climate change legislation, a free market approach to nuclear energy and the effects of environmental policy on energy prices and the economy. “A Baker’s Dozen of Reasons to Oppose Cap and Trade”, The Foundry, July 21st 2009, http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker’s-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/)

9.) It would disrupt free trade. When businesses are faced with the higher costs from an energy tax through a carbon-capping policy, they can certainly make production cuts. Another logical solution is for these companies to move overseas, where they can make more efficient use of labor and capital. To counter this, the bill includes protectionist carbon tariffs to offset the competitive disadvantage U.S. firms would face. China has already threatened retaliatory protectionist policies. To mask the economic pain, the government awarded 15 percent of the allowance allocations to energy-intensive manufacturers. Free allowances do not lower the costs of Waxman-Markey; they just shift them around. Although the government awarded handouts to businesses, the carbon dioxide reduction targets are still there, and the way they will be met is by raising the price of energy, thereby inflicting more economic pain.

### Ext – Cap and Trade Hurts Free Trade

#### Cap and Trade bad- leads to global trade war.

**Yeatman 09** (Yeatman, William, Energy Policy Analyst, Competitive Enterpirise Institute, 03/19/09, CFR, Cap and Trade’s Economic Impact, http://www.cfr.org/united-states/cap-trades-economic-impact/p18738)

A cap-and-trade system necessarily harms the economy because it is designed to raise the cost of energy. Given the current economic crisis, an expensive energy policy is a bad idea. Almost all acts of economic production are powered by combusting fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas), a process that emits greenhouse gases thought to cause global warming. A cap-and-trade system is simply a mechanism to put a price on emissions in order to compel businesses and consumers to emit less. That is, it's essentially an emissions tax. But greenhouse gas emissions are virtually synonymous with energy use, so it's actually a roundabout energy tax. In fact, economists agree that the simplest, most efficient way to reduce emissions is a direct tax. Politicians, however, are terrified of the "t-word," which is why they have embraced a cap-and-trade system. The numbers are staggering. President Barack Obama's recently unveiled cap-and-trade plan would raise $645 billion in revenue from the government-run emissions auctions over eight years. Everyone would feel the pinch. Businesses would compensate for higher production costs and diminished markets by slashing jobs. Consumers would have to pay more for energy and energy intensive goods. Expensive energy is bad enough, but the real danger of a cap-and-trade policy is a global trade war. A cap-and-trade system would give a competitive advantage to industries in countries that aren't subject to a de facto energy tax. Jobs would flow overseas, but so would emissions, a dynamic known as "carbon leakage." To prevent this, a broad coalition of industry, labor, and environmental groups have expressed interest in a tariff that would tax the emissions content of imports from countries without stringent climate policies. Naturally, these countries would retaliate if such a tariff were enacted. Protectionism deepened the Great Depression, just as climate protectionism would worsen the current recession.

### Cap and Trade Bad – Warming Answers

#### Increases warming- companies would go overseas and release more emissions

Buckner’ 9 (6/29/09- Professor of Organizational Leadership at Columbia University (David, “Will Cap-and-Trade Cripple U.S. Production?”, Fox News, June 29th 2009, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,529487,00.html)

Cap-and-trade might not only hurt American competitiveness, but also, do the exact opposite of what it sets out to do. According to the EPA — EPA, the policy may, quote, "cause domestic production to shift abroad." Why would that happen? When those companies take their businesses overseas, they're going to will wind up in countries, most likely, without cap-and-trade rules because they can make their products cheaper there. That will actually increase greenhouse emissions. DAVID BUCKNER, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR: How are you doing? BECK: Well, I'm good. I don't think I could design a taking down of this country any better than the people — if I were an enemy of this country, I don't think I could design anything like this.BUCKNER: You slide it in on a Friday, would you? BECK: Yes, I am. BUCKNER: You slide in on a Friday night so it doesn't hit the news cycle until Monday. And the reality of it is... BECK: Not even that, you go on vacation — they go on vacation after this. So, they're gone for a week, so they won't feel the public wrath, and next week is a holiday. BUCKNER: Yes. What they don't recognize here is that we're not seeing the full picture. On the one side, they're saying that prices have to be inherently increased so that will be an incentive to not produce products. On the other side, they're saying it's not going to cost us anything. How can you have — the very thrust of this legislation is based upon the fact that you're going to raise prices so that people won't produce and create greenhouse emissions. On the flip side of it, they're saying, "But it won't cost you anything." It can't be, if it doesn't cost anything, it loses the thrust of the legislation.And so, the arguments on both sides are intellectually and economically dishonest. BECK: So, I have — I have to tell you, the — it's not an environmental plan. It can't be. BUCKNER: No. We don't know whether it can ever resolve that. And not only that, for America to say we can solve the global changes... BECK: Well, the president said that we have to act first, that we — that China and India — we can't go to, where is it, Copenhagen in December, and we can't convince them to do it. Why? BUCKNER: So, we're going to take the cost on us, is what he's saying. And everyone will follow. They won't. Here's what they'll do. You saw when our labor costs went up. We increased minimum wage. Labor unions exercise their right to petition for greater salaries and they got them. What happened? Labor left America; it went to India and China. India and China aren't raising their labor costs. They're not running around going, "You're right, we need to give more money to our people." They're going to take the markets. There is no way in which the increase in costs in America will ever remain — will keep us productive and keep us competitive. It will shift our production overseas. This is an exportation of labor. BECK: If I — if I look at this — I mean, this is from the governor of Virginia, talked about this and he said, "Well, we just — we have to get this passed as a nation, but we could never pass it just as a state, because that would hurt us competitively and we'd lose business here." I mean... BUCKNER: How does it work for the federal, too? But how does it work nationwide if it doesn't... (CROSSTALK) BUCKNER: Because it's going to be — well, it's actually saying for these states that it wouldn't work independently, we're going to shift — it's a redistribution. So, the ones that get hurt, oh, we're going to even it out across the country. BECK: David, how long does it take — I mean, you know — I mean, I don't know if you are as pessimistic as I am. I mean, I think we are witnessing the destruction of our country. I really do. I don't — I don't know if it's in two months, two years or 20 years, but we are seeing unsustainable ideas happening here. BUCKNER: We are seeing the cannibalization of capitalism. I agree with that. We are seeing policies in five months that have cannibalized five corporations and brought them underneath the umbrella of one government — which I never would have imagined in a capitalist environment in America we would see. We are seeing — even these environmental bills with no science and no way to pay for them — fully validated. There is not economic honesty in the dialogue. That's what concerns me. And it's not just about politics. It is the economics of it. Tell me how you're going to raise the cost of something such that people will be dissuaded from producing and not cost anything on the other side. The thrust of the argument is the increase in talks.

#### Cap and trade won’t solve warming- doesn’t low temperatures, and other countries are key

Loris’ 9 (7/21/09, Nicolas Loris is a Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. Loris studies energy, environment and regulation issues such as the economic impacts of climate change legislation, a free market approach to nuclear energy and the effects of environmental policy on energy prices and the economy. “A Baker’s Dozen of Reasons to Oppose Cap and Trade”, The Foundry, July 21st 2009, [http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker’s-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/](http://blog.heritage.org/2009/07/21/a-baker's-dozen-of-reasons-to-oppose-cap-and-trade/))

10.) There’s no environmental benefit. Even the flawed and significantly biased cost estimates of $140 per year or $170 per year aren’t worth the alleged benefits since the bill would lower temperatures by only hundredths of a degree in 2050 and no more than two-tenths of a degree at the end of the century. The fact that EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson confirmed the bill would do nothing for global temperatures without commitment from large emitters like India and China following suit, as well as Greenpeace’s adamant opposition due to all the corporate handouts in the bill should be telling signs that the environmental benefits are nonexistent.

#### Europe proves that Cap and Trade increases emissions.

**Pyle 09** (Thomas Pyle, president of the Institute for Energy Research, January/Feburary 09, Legal Eagle, Cap and Trade is Bad, http://energycentral.fileburst.com/EnergyBizOnline/2009-1-jan-feb/Legal\_Cap\_Trade.pdf)

Cap-and-trade sounds pleasant in theory, but in practice it has been a failure. Europe has the largest cap-and-trade system in the world, and instead of leading to a decrease in emissions, Phase I, between 2005 and 2007, led to a 1.9 percent increase in greenhouse-gas emissions. What’s worse, electricity bills in much of Europe have substantially increased because of cap-and-trade policies. The failure of the emission trading scheme to lower emissions is understandable when we consider the incentives facing politicians. Politicians want to talk a good game on climate, but they do not want to impose massive pain on citizens or businesses. As a result, politicians in Europe installed a lenient cap, which resulted in increasing emissions. After Phase I failed to even modestly reduce emissions in Europe, countries are not keen to impose the substantial costs that cap-and-trade would require. The German chancellor’s chief spokesman recently declared, “We’ve got to prevent companies from being threatened by climate protection requirements.”

### EPA Regulations Bad – Coal

#### EPA regulations crush the coal industry.

**Montopoli 2012** (July 16, 2012, Brian Montopoli, Brian Montopoli is senior political reporter for CBSNews.com, Montopoli graduated magna cum laude from Georgetown University in 1999, “Has Obama declared a ‘war on coal?’” <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-57472207-503544/has-obama-declared-a-war-on-coal/> )

Jennings pointed to the fact that six coal-burning power plants in Ohio - three in or around Cleveland and one each near Toledo, Dayton and Cincinnati - are slated to close or have closed, taking hundreds of jobs and much-needed tax revenue with them. Republicans and many in the coal industry attribute the closures in large part to Environmental Protection Agency regulations mandating reduced mercury and other emissions. Jennings said the losses will resonate across a state where the Ohio Coal Association, citing unnamed studies, says there are up to 11 "spin-off" jobs tied to each of the more than 3,000 jobs in the state in the coal industry. ¶ "The energy policies don't just affect a guy that's a coal miner," he said.¶ The notion that Mr. Obama has declared "war on coal," as his detractors put it, could have ramifications beyond Ohio. Anger toward the Obama administration is boiling over in coal mining areas of West Virginia like Mingo County, where some residents blame the president for mine and plant closures and lost jobs - an apparent factor in the strong showing by a convicted felon against the president in the Democratic primary early this year. (Democratic West Virginia Sen. Joe Manchin has aggressively distanced himself from the president and his policies on coal.) And while Mr. Obama has little chance of taking West Virginia regardless of his position on coal, the industry is also significant in nearby Pennsylvania, where the president holds a single-digit lead in recent polls, as well as the crucial swing state of Virginia.¶ Republicans are doing their best to raise the issue in the public consciousness: The GOP-led House Natural Resources Committee last week asked Obama administration officials, including Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, to testify over a proposal to protect streams from coal mining that the administration acknowledges would cost thousands of coal jobs. The Romney campaign, meanwhile, says Mr. Obama has shown "disdain" for the coal industry and the jobs it creates.¶ Democrats in Ohio, citing Mine Safety and Health Administration figures, counter that coal jobs in the state have actually increased 10 percent under Mr. Obama. "In Ohio today, there are more people working in coal than the day the president took office," said Chris Redfern, Chairman of the Ohio Democratic Party. Redfern added that the coal-burning power plants being closed would have been shut down soon without the EPA regulations because of their age.¶ Inside the Obama campaign office in Steubenville, Ed Good, an Obama supporter and utility worker who works at Sammis Coal Plant in Stratton, Ohio, complained of Republican "misrepresentations" on Mr. Obama's record on coal.¶ "We see these signs all the time without disclaimers, we see this perception that there's a war on coal, it's simply not true," he said. "There's more mining jobs right now than there has been in the last 14 years."¶ Yet the notion that Mr. Obama favors environmental concerns at the expense of much-needed jobs resonates in this southeast Ohio region, which has not found an economic lifeline in the wake of the collapse of the U.S. steel industry 30 years ago. The Rust Belt shift toward natural gas production, driven by new technology that allows for extraction through "fracking," has thus far generated few jobs in the region.¶ "If you're looking regionally, these folks understand how bad this administration has been to the American coal industry," said Mike Carey, chairman of the Ohio Coal Association. "But I also think that once people start having to spend more for electricity - which they will - there's nobody to blame except for the administration." He said that domestic coal production has fallen from 1.2 billion tons per year when Mr. Obama took office to 808 million tons per year today.¶ "If you look at the rhetoric and the policy from the president and his staff, clearly we see a direction," Carey said. "You don't look at those numbers and think that he's improved the lot of the coal miner's life."¶ He added: "From a regional perspective, it's an all-out war."¶ The United Mine Workers of America, which represents 600 active coal miners in Ohio and 90,000 active and retired coal industry workers nationwide, has thus far not endorsed Mr. Obama's reelection despite backing him in 2008.¶ The Obama administration has sought to reduce carbon emissions in an effort to combat climate change, in part through investment in clean energy alternatives like solar power. But the president has not issued rules limiting greenhouse gas emissions for power plants - a move that would likely cause him serious political headaches in Rust Belt states. His effort to pass so-called "cap-and-trade" legislation - which would reduce carbon pollution by imposing caps on emissions and allowing companies to buy and sell pollution permits - collapsed in 2010 and has been little-mentioned by the president since. ¶ Romney has opposed greater regulation on coal production during the campaign, saying the industry needs to be free to help "power America's economy." He has said that carbon emissions should not be subject to regulation under the Clean Air Act. Mr. Obama's EPA has been fending off lawsuits backed by coal and other energy interests challenging its authority to regulate carbon as a pollutant.¶ Romney's record as Massachusetts governor, however, suggests far more openness to regulation. In 2005, Romney lauded the state's establishment of carbon emission limits that he said "will provide real and immediate progress in the battle to improve our environment." Early in his term, Romney hired a prominent environmental activist who stood by his side as he stood outside a coal-fired plant and explained, "I will not create jobs or hold jobs that kill people, and that plant, that plant kills people." Romney also at one point backed a regional cap-and-trade system as governor, though he later backed off that position. ¶ The EPA regulations approved under Mr. Obama are designed to reduce emissions of mercury and other pollution by 90 percent by requiring plant owners to install mechanisms to control the pollution. While many newer plants were already largely in compliance with the requirements, many older plants were not, and owners were forced to either install the costly technology to reduce toxic emissions or move toward a shut down.

#### Coal is critical to the steel industry—coal scarcities tank production capacity

**WCI 2009** (World Coal Institute, organization promoting technological innovation and improved environmental outcomes within the context of a balanced and responsible energy mix. “Coal and Steel,” 3/6/2009)

Steel is a vital building block for development – it facilitates economic growth and poverty alleviation and is a major element in improving quality of life. Coal is an essential input in the production of steel. Steel is a man-made alloy of iron and carbon – and that carbon usually comes from coal. Almost 70% of the steel produced today relies directly on metallurgical coal, also referred to as coking coal. The remainder is produced by recycling scrap steel (itself originally produced directly using coal) using electricity – often generated using affordable and reliable steam coal. Increasing Demand for Steel Over the last 35 years steel production worldwide has almost doubled, from less than 600 million tonnes (Mt) in 1970 to around 1.2 billion tonnes in 2006. The period 2000-2006 has seen unprecedented growth, with global figures rising over 47%. Coal & Steel 3 Much of the demand for steel is being driven by the strong and rapid economic growth of China and India. In 2006, economic growth rates in those countries were 11% and 9% respectively. With a population of over 1 billion in India, and almost 1.3 billion in China, the demand for products and services has fuelled an almost insatiable demand for steel. China and India together consumed over 445Mt of steel in 2006, around 40% of total global crude steel consumption. This is set to continue as India is projected to eclipse China in population size by 2025 and the two countries will account for around 36% of the global population. Rapid urbanisation worldwide is driving demand still further – as cities grow, housing, water and electricity are urgently required. Transport links must be expanded to meet the geographical growth of urban and peri-urban areas. The availability and reliability of modern communication systems also becomes ever more important as urban economies become more sophisticated. Around 4.9 billion people are expected to be urban-dwellers by 2030 60% of the world’s population. This will place huge pressure on existing infrastructure and create significant demand for housing, better transport systems, communications networks, energy, sanitation and healthcare. Coal will continue to play a major part in the manufacture of the world’s steel for the foreseeable future. The well-supplied world market means that metallurgical coal can be delivered worldwide, facilitating the manufacture of steels which will ultimately deliver the goods and services that growing economies demand.

### EPA Regulations Bad – Economy

#### EPA hurts jobs by restricting businesses.

Benzinga’ 12 (3/28/12 Benzinga, news source, “New EPA Regulations: Bad for Jobs, Good for the Environment” <http://www.benzinga.com/general/politics/12/03/2451578/new-epa-regulations-bad-for-jobs-good-for-the-environment>)

While the EPA maintains that the U.S Clean Air Act saved more than 160,000 lives in 2010 alone, critics of the new regulations argue that putting stricter controls on coal plants will increase energy costs and kill hundreds of jobs. U.S. Rep Ed Whitefield had this to say, "Affordable, reliable electricity is critical to keeping and growing jobs in the United States and such a standard will likely drive up energy prices and threaten domestic jobs."¶ Representative Whitefield is not alone in his criticisms of the EPA, and is joined by the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity's CEO Steve Miller. In a press release today Miller announced the following: "Unfortunately, the EPA continues to ignore the real impact their rules will have on American families and businesses by driving up energy prices and destroying jobs.¶ “This is another, in a series of new regulations, written by EPA to prevent the U.S. from taking advantage of our vast coal resources that are responsible for providing affordable electricity for America’s families and businesses. This latest rule will make it impossible to build any new coal-fueled power plants, and could cause the premature closure of many more coal-fueled power plants operating today."

### EPA Regulations Bad – Steel

#### EPA regulations crush the steel industry --- emission controls are not cost competitive.

Mancini’ 12 (May 2, 2012, Jess Mancini, staff writer for Sentinel.com , The Marietta Times, “New EPA rules threaten Eramet” <http://www.mariettatimes.com/page/content.detail/id/543857.html> )

It's a national issue impacting the United States steel industry and will increase the trade deficit by more than $500 million. American producers of steel, of which ferromanganese is a component, will be reliant on foreign sources, Frank-Collins said.¶ The ferroalloys rule also requires the plants to install emissions controls to meet the stricter standards, Frank-Collins said. The cost at Eramet would be from $70 million to $80 million, dwarfing the $40 million spent there in the last four years to improve environmental performance, an investment that could not be recovered, she said.¶ "If the rule is finalized as it is proposed, it would be nearly impossible for these two companies to continue operating," Frank-Collins said.¶ The companies were aware new regulations were going to be promulgated, but not as restrictive as proposed, she said. Eramet and Felman are discussing options with EPA scientists and have commented on the new rules to the agency.¶ "Basically this rule has the potential to kill our industry," she said.¶ It is not the first time that has been said, said Eric Fitch, director of the Environmental Science Program at Marietta College. If regulation had such an impact, there would be no manufacturing, mining, drilling or production, he said.¶ "It's the same old song," Fitch said.¶ In this case, companies would not be limited because of available technologies as several exist to clean emissions from the plants, he said. Fitch said he has spoken with EPA representatives.¶ "The EPA would be more than willing to go with the one that is the most effective for Eramet," Fitch said.¶ Eramet and Felman also are working with U.S. Rep. Bill Johnson, R-Ohio, and U.S. Rep. Shelley Moore Capito, R-W.Va. The two members of Congress have joined 50 other legislators in a letter on Monday to EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson to reconsider the proposed rules.¶ "We have been informed that the scientific justification for the proposed rule is outdated and may not be supported by real-world data, and that the standards may not be achievable in practice by real world facilities," the letter said. "In establishing the proposed standards, EPA relies upon a science assessment issued in 1993, neglecting recent peer-reviewed scientific information. To achieve the proposed standards, EPA's proposal assumes that the affected facilities would install technologies that may not be appropriate or effective as applied to ferroalloys production facilities."¶ The EPA is asked, before it issues a final rule, to ensure that standards are based on the best scientific and technical information and that it works with Eramet and Felman to identify feasible technologies to achieve the environmental goals and protect jobs and the economy.¶ "This is something we've seen over and over from this EPA. Regulations coming out of Washington are hurting the economy and destroying jobs," Capito said. "The EPA has attempted to dismantle the coal industry through regulation and the consequences have been disastrous. Dozens of coal-fueled fire plants and factories have shut down across the country."¶ Also signing the letter were U.S. Rep. David McKinley and U.S. Rep. Nick Rahall of West Virginia. Johnson said the Obama administration's attack on jobs and free enterprise by out-of-control government regulation must end.¶ "This is a threat to our economy and our national security, and it is totally unacceptable," Johnson said.

#### Steel industry collapse kills the economy and military readiness.

**Shaiken**, 3/22/**2002** (Harley – professor of global economy at the University of California, Berkeley, Detroit News, p. http://www.detnews.com/2002/editorial/0203/25/a11-446451.htm)

But because an advanced industrial economy needs a vibrant steel industry, not just a source of steel products, the U.S. steel industry needs some temporary resuscitation and long-term structural support to survive. More than 30 firms have gone bankrupt since 1998 -- and far more would likely have fallen over the edge without President George W. Bush's recent modest measures. The hard lesson of this debacle might well have been that it's easier to see an industry like steel implode than to rebuild it when it's needed. Why does America need a steel industry? Steel executives want to keep their companies afloat and the steelworkers union wants to preserve members' jobs. But beyond their immediate concerns, an important, long-term public interest is involved. First, steel provides critical linkages throughout manufacturing. A healthy steel industry can spur innovations in downstream industries such as autos. These industries would enjoy earlier access to new processes and products. U.S. steel firms, for example, are spearheading an international consortium on advanced vehicle concepts. It doesn't help that three of the largest U.S. firms involved are in bankruptcy. Second, steel remains an important source of well-paid, middle-class jobs. While more than 70,000 jobs are threatened at bankrupt steel producers, an additional 250,000 jobs at suppliers and firms dependent on steelworker spending are impacted, according to Professor Robert Blecker at American University. A collapsing steel industry cuts a wide swath of destruction through communities. Finally, a domestic industry provides more stable sources of supply, which is pivotal in a national security crisis. Steel is genuinely a strategic industry unless we are thinking about aluminum aircraft carriers and mahogany tanks.

### Ext – EPA Regulations Hurt Steel Industry

#### EPA regs collapses the domestic steel industry

Gibson 10 (Thomas, President & CEO American Iron and Steel Institute, 3-8, Manufacturing Industry at Risk, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/03/whats-the-upshot-of-blocking-e.php>)

It is imperative that Congress delay EPA’s efforts to regulate GHG emissions from stationary sources. Most American manufacturing facilities, including steel mills, will be impacted if Congress does not delay EPA’s regulation of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from stationary sources. This will impose additional economic burdens and regulatory delays that will impede new business investment and slow efforts to get the economy moving again. Legislative action to stop EPA regulation of stationary sources is essential to preserving jobs and promoting economic growth while Congress considers comprehensive legislation to address climate change. Furthermore, EPA regulation will only exacerbate the competitiveness problems facing energy-intensive, trade-exposed industries by increasing their costs while their overseas competitors continue to avoid regulation. Only a comprehensive legislative approach to climate change can address the important international competitiveness and carbon leakage issues that are critical to energy-intensive, trade-exposed industries like steel. We have already lost 11.7 million manufacturing jobs over the last decade, 2.1 million alone since the start of the recession. The steel industry has already voluntarily stepped up to the plate by reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 31% since 1990. Especially in light of the tepid economic recovery and the rampant expansion of steelmaking capacity that has occurred in non-regulated economies like China, the risks and uncertainties of unilateral regulation under the Clean Air Act are simply too great for the EPA to control.

### Ext – Steel Key to Hegemony

#### The steel industry key to maintaining hegemony

**Buyer 2007**(Member of the House of Representatives, 7-31-7 (Steve, Before the International Trade Commission, Regarding the five-year sunset review on Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine (Inv. Nos. 701-TA-404-408 and 731-TA-898-908 )

A robust steel industry is fundamental to the security and economic viability of this nation. If you were to contemplate the ten resources considered essential to the successful establishment of a nation, steel would be high on that list. A fruitful domestic steel industry maintains its viability by being adaptive, technologically savvy, and flexible so that it can maintain its competitive edge in the world market. That competitive edge lends itself to economic security and stability here at home. Both of those elements are vital ingredients to a nation's ability to develop and maintain an adequate defense. I believe we must remain vigilant to protect ourselves from a future without a steelmaking infrastructure sufficient to meet our national defense needs. In the years that have followed the tragic events of September 11, 2001, national defense has dominated public attention. When contemplating the tumultuous nature of this global war against terror in which we are immersed, I think it is apparent that we cannot accept a situation in which we are reliant on the kindness of strangers to meet our security-related steel needs. Depending on trusted friends and allies may not be wise, since they have requirements of their own for steel. Simply put, the defense of our nation depends on steel. Our aircraft carriers, cruisers, tanks, HUMMVEES, are all made of steel. We cannot become dependent on foreign sources for this material so vital to our national defense. The United States is the only superpower in the world. We cannot project our force around the globe, which from time to time is necessary, without the ability to move people and equipment quickly. It is in our national interest to maintain a vigorous steel industry. The economic stability of the steel industry here at home, and our ability to remain competitive abroad, directly impacts our national security. The efficient low-cost producers that comprise the membership of our domestic steel market can compete effectively against any foreign producer in the global economy. To ensure their stature, the steel industry has invested billions of dollars in modernizing itself while simultaneously improving environmental compliance. It has learned the hard way the benefit of cutting-edge technology. These producers are heavily concentrated in northwest Indiana and at the end of 2006 they employed over19,000 Americans in that region. Companies like Nucor of Crawfordsville and Steel Dynamics of Pittsboro contribute substantially to the ensuring a healthy local economy and thereby contribute to a stable and healthy national economy. The nation's annual production of over 100 million tons of steel, of which Indiana is the second-largest producer among the states, keeps this country at the top of the worldwide steel industry. However, if the competitive nature of this market is unfairly influenced by steel dumping or by illegal subsidies given to foreign producers by their governments or other entities, the integrity of the domestic and global market is jeopardized. In those instances, the domestic market loses its ability to effectively compete with its global rivals. When that occurs, it negatively impacts the economic stability of our domestic steel industry which in turn threatens our national security. We need to ensure that companies like Nucor and Steel Dynamics have the opportunity to modernize and grow to adequately meet the demands of the global market without the fear of sustaining financial damage from unfair or illegal trade practices. To ensure that our nation's defense remains adequate and capable, we must continue to enable mechanisms that will influence other countries to play by the rules Simultaneously, we must be cognizant, and take appropriate action, to recognize those instances in which anti-dumping and countervailing duties are no longer required to safeguard our economic and security interests. In either instance, we cannot allow to go unchallenged the continuous violations of international and U.S. trade laws that lend to a skewed market and undercut the ability for fair competition to flourish in the global economy. The preservation of the economic integrity of our domestic steel industry is fundamental to our ability to protect our very existence as a nation.

### EPA Regulations – No Rollback

#### Romney won’t roll back EPA --- filibuster checks.

Star Ledge’ 12 (June 03, 2012, “Scary times for environment -- especially if Mitt Romney wins”, http://blog.nj.com/njv\_editorial\_page/2012/06/scary\_times\_for\_environment\_--.html)

A President Romney might not be able to reverse those regulations without new legislation. And even if Republicans make gains, Democrats will be able to block the worst legislation with 41 votes in the Senate. The dreaded filibuster rule could finally come in handy.

#### Romney is not serious about EPA rollbacks.

Star Ledge’ 12 (June 03, 2012, “Scary times for environment -- especially if Mitt Romney wins”, http://blog.nj.com/njv\_editorial\_page/2012/06/scary\_times\_for\_environment\_--.html)

And, of course, you never know how seriously to take Romney. You get the sense he might not believe some of the crazy things he says, that he wouldn’t be as bad as he promises to be. As governor of Massachusetts, he imposed tough emissions rules on coal plants, and even stood outside one and said, "This plant kills people."

### Obama Economic Policy Bad

#### Obama economic policies fail – only hurt the economy

**Kazyak 12** (William Kazyak, writer for The Herald, 2/15/12, The Herald of Arkansas State University, “The economic crisis: Obama’s failed policies,” http://www.asuherald.com/opinion/the-economic-crisis-obama-s-failed-policies-1.2702090#.UAghazGe6g2)

Since President Obama took office, the U.S. has been in a tailspin, economically speaking. Supporters of President Obama and his policies like to tout the progressively "better" unemployment numbers, but a closer look at these numbers reveals that they have gotten "better" right around holiday seasons. These are periods when employers traditionally hire extra help, but only temporarily. Checking to see how many people are no longer seeking employment would yield even more depressing numbers, since individuals in this category are no longer considered unemployed. President Obama's landmark policies, the Stimulus and Obamacare, are the primary reasons for our sickly economy. The stimulus package was supposed to boost the economy back to health. But once money is spent, it's gone. You can't "re-spend" it. Obamacare, though, was probably the biggest hit to the economy. In one fell swoop, President Obama and liberals succeeded in deterring any long-term hiring by companies by making it more expensive for companies to have full-time employees.

### Obama Economic Policy Bad – Buffett Rule Bad

#### Buffett rule kills any recovery, at best.

**Lowrey 12** (Annie Lowrey, writer for the New York Times, 4/16/12, NYT, “For Two Economists, the Buffett Rule Is Just a Start,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/17/business/for-economists-saez-and-piketty-the-buffett-rule-is-just-a-start.html?src=me&ref=general)

The two economists argue that even Democrats’ boldest plan to increase taxes on the wealthy — the Buffett Rule, a 30 percent minimum tax on earnings over $1 million — would do little to reverse the rich’s gains. Many of the Republican tax proposals on the table might increase income inequality, at least in the short term, according to William G. Gale of the Tax Policy Center and many other left-leaning and centrist economists. Conservatives respond that high tax rates would stifle economic growth, at a minimum, and cause some businesses and high-income workers to flee to other countries. When top American tax rates were much higher, from the 1940s through the 1970s, businesses could not relocate as easily as they can now, say critics of Mr. Piketty and Mr. Saez. “I materially disagree with the idea you can raise a marginal tax rate to 70 percent and not have an impact on economic growth,” said Ike Brannon, an economist at the American Action Forum. “It’s absurd on its face.”

#### Buffett rule won't help the economy nearly enough

**Kiely 12** (Eugene Kiely, writer for FactCheck.org, 4/13/12, Annenberg Public Policy Center, “Obama and the ‘Buffett Rule’,” http://www.factcheck.org/2012/04/obama-and-the-buffett-rule/)

Furthermore, imposing the Buffett Rule wouldn’t raise as much money as you might think listening to the president and vice president. It would generate $20 billion a year in additional tax revenue — which is about 3 percent of the $609 billion deficit the White House projects for fiscal year 2015 (and only 1.5 percent of last year’s $1.3 trillion deficit). Williams said the bottom line is that there is a “big difference” in income tax rates paid by the wealthy and the very wealthy. That’s because the very wealthy, like Buffett, accumulate wealth not through income but through investment profits, dividends and interest, which are taxed at the current capital gains tax rate of 15 percent, rather than the current top income tax rate of 35 percent. (The capital gains would return to 20 percent and the top income rate to 39.6 percent, if the Bush tax cuts expire, as explained by the Congressional Budget Office’s analysis of the president’s budget.) “Some pay a lot of [income] taxes and some don’t pay a lot of taxes,” Williams said. “That was made very obvious by the fact that Mitt Romney paid just 13.9 percent [in 2010].” The Obama campaign has a “Pass the Buffett Rule” calculator on its website that allows visitors to compare their tax rates with Romney’s. But that’s misleading, too. Romney, like Buffett, isn’t your average rich guy. He reported earning $21.7 million in 2010 — mostly in dividends and investment income. His 13.9 percent tax rate was far lower than the 24.1 percent average for those earning more than $1 million. But visitors to the campaign site wouldn’t know that, and they wouldn’t know it listening to Obama and Biden, either.

#### Obama and Biden misrepresent Buffett Rule – not as comprehensive

**Kiely 12** (Eugene Kiely, writer for FactCheck.org, 4/13/12, Annenberg Public Policy Center, “Obama and the ‘Buffett Rule’,” http://www.factcheck.org/2012/04/obama-and-the-buffett-rule/)

In their zeal to pass the “Buffett Rule,” President Obama and Vice President Biden leave the false impression that many, if not most, millionaires (people who earn $1 million or more a year) are paying a lower tax rate than the middle class. The fact is that even without the Buffett Rule “more than 99 percent of millionaires will pay” a higher tax rate than those in the very middle of the income range in fiscal year 2015, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center. The president and vice president have given a series of speeches in recent days to gather public support for the Buffett Rule. The proposal is named after billionaire investor Warren Buffett, who famously wrote that many of his office staff pay a higher tax rate than he does. It would require high-income taxpayers to pay an effective tax rate of at least 30 percent of their adjusted gross income. (The effective tax rate includes not just income taxes, but also the employee share of payroll taxes and other federal taxes.) The proposal is expected to come up for a Senate vote during the week of — yes, you guessed it — April 15. But Obama and Biden have distorted the facts when explaining the proposal and its impact. In an April 10 speech, the president described the Buffett Rule this way: “[W]hat the rule says is you should pay the same percentage of your income in taxes as middle-class families do.” But that’s largely the case now. Two days later, Biden declared that Buffett is “not alone,” and there are “tens of thousands and several millions of people who are in that same situation.” It may be “tens of thousands,” but certainly not “several millions.” Warren Buffett is the exception, not the rule.

### AT: Obamacare – Rollback Inevitable

#### Obama reelection doesn’t ensure survival of Obamacare—no voter support

**Rasmussen**, **2012** (Scott Rasmussen, founder and president of Rasmussen Reports, 29 June 2012, “ObamaCare will not survive,” Tribune, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1022671291)

If the president is re-elected, the law has a better chance of surviving, but it would still face an uphill struggle. Legislative battles to protect the law would most likely dominate his second term. To understand why, keep in mind that most Americans initially supported the concept of health care reform because they wanted the cost of care to be reduced. But only 18 percent believe the current law will accomplish that goal. A massive 81 percent also believe it will end up costing the government more than projected. The president believes that government regulation can control the cost of care, but most voters disagree. Voters think that consumer choice and competition between insurance companies will do more to reduce costs than additional regulations. Individual Americans recognize that they have more power as consumers than they do as voters. Their choices in a free market give them more control over the economic world than choosing one politician or another. Seventy-six percent think they should have the right to choose between expensive insurance plans with low deductibles and low-cost plans with higher deductibles. A similar majority believes everyone should be allowed to choose between expensive plans that cover just about every imaginable medical procedure and lower-cost plans that cover a smaller number of procedures. All such choices would be banned under the current health care law. Americans want to be empowered as health care consumers. They don't want the government telling them what to do.

### AT: Obamacare – Romney Alternative

#### Romney proposes consumer market based health care to replace Obamacare

**Rucker**, **2012** (Phillip Rucker, staff writer for the Buffalo News, 6/13/12, “Romney vows to replace 'Obamacare': Says he will create 'consumer market' for insurance,” Buffalo News, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1020387536)

ORLANDO, Fla. As the Supreme Court prepares to rule on the constitutionality of President Obama's health care overhaul, Mitt Romney laid out an alternative Tuesday that would make the health insurance system more like a "consumer market." Addressing supporters in Orlando, Romney fleshed out a plan he proposed earlier that would apply free-enterprise principles to the health care system rather than operate it like a "government-managed utility," letting competition drive down prices and increase quality. He also vowed to divert federal Medicaid dollars and other federal funding to state governments, making them responsible for covering the uninsured. And he promised that his plan would still help cover people with pre-existing conditions, one of the more popular components of Obama's law. Romney fiercely attacked what he and other Republicans have labeled "Obamacare." The presumptive GOP presidential nominee said that if the Supreme Court does not overturn the law in full, he would work to repeal whatever remains on his first day as president by granting a waiver to all 50 states to opt out of the law's restrictions. Romney likened the health care system under the Affordable Care Act to "a big government-managed utility" and argued that the law is casting a dark cloud over the nation's anemic economic recovery. The Obama campaign hit back at Romney's policy view in a statement Tuesday: "This morning, Mitt Romney promised that if he's elected, insurance companies will be able to discriminate against Americans with pre-existing conditions, charge women higher premiums than they charge men for the same coverage, and kick young adults off their parents' plans when they graduate high school or college. For too long, American families have faced a choice between going bankrupt to afford the care they need or going without that care at all, and Mitt Romney wants to take us back to that time." Romney said he wants to make the nation's health care system more like a consumer market, likening it to the tire, automobile and air-filter markets that he said keep costs down and quality up. To do so, he said, he would allow individuals and small businesses to buy coverage with the same tax advantage that larger businesses enjoy and to purchase insurance across state lines or join organizations for bargaining power with insurers.

# Miscellaneous Answers

### No Link – Perception

#### Transportation spending is not perceived by voters.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

### Too Far Out

#### Voters have short memories – they will forget the plan.

**Bloomberg 12** (Bloomberg, news site, 02/28/12, Business Week, Obama Skirts Deadlock With Executive Orders Favoring Allies, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-02-28/obama-skirts-deadlock-with-executive-orders-favoring-allies.html>)

Even though Obama pushed through some of the most comprehensive legislation in decades during the first two years of his term covering health care, financial rules and economic stimulus, that isn’t enough to get him re-elected, said Devine. “The shelf life on progress in the minds of voters is shorter than it is for fresh fruit,” he said.

#### Changing political and economic events makes vote prediction impossible.

**Tomma 2012** (Thomma, Steven, 02/19/2012, sacbee, Romney targets labor unions which, http://www.sacbee.com/2012/02/19/4275251/romney-targets-labor-unions-which.html

He's casting himself as one of the strongest anti-union candidates in memory, a move he hopes will appeal to anti-union conservatives, open rival Rick Santorum to charges of a pro-union voting record, win the pivotal Michigan primary on Feb. 28 and cement his now shaky grasp on the Republican nomination. Yet should it work, the union-bashing campaign offers uncertain prospects in a general election campaign, particularly in the unionized, industrial Rust Belt. States there such as Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin will be key battlegrounds. A changing political and economic landscape there makes it impossible to predict how voters would react. "Among Republicans, it plays fine," said Republican pollster Whit Ayres. "Down the road, there may be some issues."