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## \*\*\*Shells\*\*\*

### 1NC Obama Bad

#### Obama lose now – but could still shift

**Cass, 6/2** (Connie, writer @ AP, Business Week, <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V4SLHO1.htm>)

Nothing upsets a president's re-election groove like ugly economic numbers. A spring slowdown in hiring and an uptick in the unemployment rate are weighing on Barack Obama, while enhancing Republican challenger Mitt Romney's argument that the president is in over his head. Some questions and answers about how Friday's economic news may play in a close presidential race: Q: How bad is this for Obama? A: Pretty awful. Polls show Obama's handling of the economy is his biggest weak spot. Americans overwhelmingly rate the economy as their biggest worry. And jobs are what they say matters most. But the president still has time for the jobs outlook to improve. Five more monthly unemployment reports are due -- the last coming just four days before the Nov. 6 election. The fall numbers will mean more when voters head to the polls.

#### Funding Transportation Infrastructure popular and can swing elections – prefer ev about likely voters.

**HNTB ‘12**

National highway survey polled a random nationwide sample of 1,024 Americans April 2-10, 2012. It was conducted by Kelton Research. 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. HNTB Corporation is an employee-owned infrastructure firm serving public and private owners and contractors. With nearly a century of service, HNTB understands the life cycle of infrastructure and solves clients’ most complex technical, financial and operational challenges. “Americans value highways and bridges as a national treasure” – May 18th – http://www.hntb.com/news-room/news-release/americans-value-highways-and-bridges-as-a-national-treasure

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.

#### Even tiny shifts matter – our link is low threshold and linear

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models – http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/)

The last thing to remember is that when an election is quite close, it does not take very much to shift the race from one candidate being a 60/40 favorite to it being about even. At the betting market Intrade, Mr. Obama’s odds of re-election have consistently been around 60 percent. While, on the one hand, it is good not to overreact to new data at this early stage of the race, it is also worth remembering that even a one-point shift in a president’s approval ratings, or a modest change in the economic forecasts, can move a president’s re-election odds at the margin.

### 1NC Obama Bad – EPA Regs Module

#### Romney win rolls back EPA CO2 regs

**Star Ledger, 12** (6/3, <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.

#### EPA REGULATIONS CAUSE GLOBAL ECONOMIC COLLAPSE.

**CARUBA 9**. [Alan, Public Relations Counselor and member of the Society of Professional Journalists, American Society of Journalists and Authors and the National Association of Science Writers, How to Destroy the U.S. Economy: Regulate Carbon Dioxide, Canada Free Press, Factiva]

In the course of the first year of the Obama administration, it has become clear to many close observers that it is intent on destroying the U.S. economy and, with it, the Republic. It has virtually shut down all exploration for energy resources such as oil and natural gas despite the bonus of thousands of jobs and billions in tax revenue that this would generate. It has declared war on the mining and use of coal even though coal provides just over half of all the electricity generated nationwide. Its “Stimulus” bill, at this point, has largely distributed funds to state governments to help them pay for Medicare and other entitlement programs. The program has claimed new jobs in congressional districts that don’t even exist. All the while unemployment has risen and there is no evidence of any actual new jobs because, sensibly, large businesses and small are waiting to see if Obamacare will take over one-sixth of the nation’s economy, slashing billions from Medicare, and raising the cost of health insurance. The other major legislative initiative, Cap-and-Trade is a huge tax on energy use, raising the cost of doing business in America. “Business Fumes Over Dioxide Rule” was a headline in the December 7 edition of The Wall Street Journal. Considering that one major corporation after another has gone out of its way to demonstrate how “Green” they are, it is a little late in the day for corporate America to wake up to discover that the entire agenda of Green organizations has been to strangle the economy in general and their ability to operate in particular. Two Obama appointments signaled the Obama administration’s intent. One was the appointment of Carol Browner, a former EPA director in the Clinton years and an avowed socialist, as its climate czar, and the appointment of Lisa Jackson as the new Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. Others include the Secretary of the Interior and of Energy, all global warming scare mongers. The EPA is momentarily expected to announce an “endangerment” finding that carbon dioxide (CO2) is a “pollutant” and thereby subject to EPA regulation under the Clean Air Act. If that is true than everyone exhaling in the nation is, by definition, a polluter. Humans exhale about six pounds of CO2 every day. In January, I wrote a commentary, “Glorious Carbon Dioxide”, that was a look at the science of CO2. It can be found [here](http://www.acuf.org/issues/issue124/090126cul.asp). One simple fact invalidates the EPA’s claim. All life on Earth is dependent on two gases, oxygen and carbon dioxide. A reduction of CO2 would be a reduction of the gas that all vegetation relies upon for its existence, but the EPA claims that a rise in CO2 is responsible for a rise in the overall temperature of the Earth. The EPA is doing this as a completely natural cooling cycle has been occurring since 1998. It is doing this despite ample scientific data that demonstrates that CO2 does not play any role in the increase of the Earth’s average temperature, but in fact increases many decades, even centuries, after such an increase. It is the Sun that determines the climate of the Earth, not CO2, and the Sun is in a natural cycle called a solar minimum, producing less radiation to warm the Earth. At times in the Earth’s 4.5 billion year history, the amount of CO2 has been much higher than its present concentration of a mere 3.618% of the atmosphere. Estimates of how much man-made CO2 contributes to this tiny amount are set at 0.117%. Despite this, the EPA is intent on regulating man-made CO2 emissions as if this would make any difference in light of the fact that many other nations also emit CO2 in the process of developing their economies. China and India come to mind and it is no accident that both were exempted from the UN Kyoto Protocols to limit CO2 emissions. The entire purpose of the current Climate Change Conference taking place is Copenhagen is a treaty to limit CO2 emissions that the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change asserts is necessary to avoid a “global warming” that is NOT happening. The conference, however, must ignore revelations that one of its primary providers of climate data, the Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia, has been deliberately fudging the data, falsifying it to justify the treaty. Another major source of such data has been NASA’s climate program, both of which have fought efforts under the Freedom of Information Acts of both the UK and the USA, to require them to make their data available for scientific peer review. As the Wall Street Journal article points out, “An ‘endangerment’ finding by the Environmental Protection Agency could pave the way for the government to require businesses that emit carbon dioxide and five other greenhouse gases to make costly changes in machinery to reduce emissions—even if Congress doesn’t pass pending climate-change legislation.” If either the EPA or the climate change legislation called Cap-and-Trade are put in place or enacted, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is on record warning that it would “choke off growth by adding new mandates to virtually every major construction and renovation project.” It would add to the cost of all electricity by industry, business, and all consumers. As the Wall Street Journal article notes, “Electricity generation, transportation and industry represent the three largest sources of U.S. greenhouse-gas emission.” What it doesn’t say is that such emissions play no role in climate change. Other nations, however, would not be subject to such costs and the result would be a mad rush to move as many U.S. industries as possible to foreign shores. Other businesses would have to shut down or raise the price of everything they produce. The current Recession would escalate into a full-blown Depression as millions of **jobs** would disappear or never return.

#### extinction

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

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

### 1NC Obama Bad – Iran Strikes Module

#### Obama will strike Iran as October Surprise if he’s losing – Key to heg and prevents Israel strikes which are far worse, fail and cause multiple scenarios for conflict

Chemi **Shalev** is an Israeli journalist and political analyst. Chemi Shalev is a US foreign correspondent for Haaretz newspaper **12-27**-2011 <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/west-of-eden/will-a-u-s-attack-on-iran-become-obama-s-october-surprise-1.403898>

Will a U.S. attack on Iran become Obama’s ‘October Surprise’? Israelis and many Americans are convinced that President Obama will ultimately back away from attacking Iran. They may be wrong. 1. “When American officials declare that all options are on the table, most Israelis do not believe them. They have concluded, rather, that when the crunch comes (and everyone thinks it will), the United States will shy away from military force and reconfigure its policy to live with a nuclear-armed Iran.” This was the bottom line of “What Israelis Hear When Obama Officials Talk About Iran”, an article written by William Galston, a senior research fellow at Brookings, after he canvassed the Israeli participants in the recent Saban Forum held in Washington in early December. Since that diagnosis, rendered only three weeks ago, the content, tone and intensity of American pronouncements on Iran have undergone progressively dramatic changes. These include: • December 16: President Obama, in a speech before the Union of Reform Judaism, goes from the passive “a nuclear Iran is unacceptable” to the assertive “We are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.” • December 19: Secretary of Defense Panetta, hitherto the main articulator of the pitfalls of an attack on Iran, suddenly ups the ante by declaring that Iran might be only a year away from acquiring a nuclear bomb, that this the “red line” as far as the U.S. is concerned, and that Washington “will take whatever steps necessary to deal with it." • December 20: General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, tells CNN that “the options we are developing are evolving to a point that they would be executable, if necessary”, adding: 'My biggest worry is that they (Iranians) will miscalculate our resolve'. • December 21: Dennis Ross tells Israel’s Channel 10 television that President Obama would be prepared to “take a certain step” if that is what is required and “this means that when all options are on the table and if you’ve exhausted all other means, you do what is necessary". • December 22: Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak, commenting on the above statements, says that they "make clear a fact that was already known to us from closed-door (discussions). It makes clear to Iran that it faces a real dilemma." • December 23: Matthew Kroenig, former Special Adviser on Iran at the Pentagon, publishes an article in the prestigious Foreign Affairs, entitled “Time to Attack Iran”, in which he lays out the case for an American offensive against Iran – sooner rather than later. Israeli analysts, however, remain unconvinced. Influenced, perhaps, by their own experience with Israel’s cynical political leadership, they have ascribed much of this newly-found oomph in American utterances to an elections-inspired attempt by the Obama Administration to “show support for Israel” at a time of political need. Conversely, they maintain that the change in the American tone is a result of new intelligence information that was presented by Barak to Obama in their December 16 meeting in Washington. Both of these assessments may or may not be true, but they fail to tell the whole story. The timing of the reinvigorated American rhetoric is undoubtedly tied to the December 18 withdrawal of the last American troops from Iraq. The U.S. Army and the Pentagon have long opposed inflammatory rhetoric toward Tehran during the withdrawal, for fear it might endanger U.S. troops in Iraq. With the withdrawal complete, the Administration felt free to adopt a much more belligerent tone, literally overnight. As to the substance of American policy, Israelis appear to have persuaded themselves that, despite his vigorous prosecution of the war in Afghanistan and his successful and deadly pursuit of al-Qaida, Obama remains “soft” on Iran and will ultimately back down when push comes to shove. This perception has been fed by Obama’s ill-fated attempt to “engage” with Iran, his initial courtship of the Arab and Muslim world, what is widely perceived as his pro-Palestinian tendencies – and the overall animosity and prejudice directed at the president by many of his detractors. The Republicans are so convinced, in fact, that they are basing much of their foreign policy campaign against Obama on the assumption that he will ultimately capitulate to Tehran. That may be a dangerous assumption on their part. In his speech at the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony in December 2009 – possibly forgotten because of the ridiculously premature or spectacularly misdirected awarding of the prize - Obama spoke of a "just war" which can be waged “as a last resort or in self-defense”. After warning of the danger posed by Iran’s nuclear campaign, he said “those who seek peace cannot stand idly by as nations arm themselves for nuclear war.” In the days after that speech in Oslo, Christian theologian Reinhold Niebuhr was often cited as a source of inspiration for Obama, and it was Niebuhr who wrote, “contemporary history refutes the idea that nations are drawn into war too precipitately. It proves, on the contrary, that it is the general inclination of democratic nations at least to hesitate so long before taking this fateful plunge that the dictator nations gain a fateful advantage over them.” Obama may not want to fall into that pattern. People believe what they want to believe, but Obama has already proven - in Afghanistan, in Libya, in the offensive against al-Qaida, in the drone war in Somalia, Pakistan and Yemen – that he is no pacifist and does not shy way from using military force when necessary. And while he has stuck to his prepared script that “all options are on the table," people who have heard Obama speak about Iran in closed sessions have no doubt that if all else fails, including “crippling” sanctions and international isolation, Obama would order a U.S. attack on Iran, if he was convinced, as he appears to be, that it posed a clear and present danger to America’s national security. 2. And there can be no doubt - notwithstanding claims by the radical left and the isolationist right - that a nuclear Iran would be an unmitigated disaster for American interests, above and beyond the existential threat to Israel. Arab countries would be confronted by a stark choice between subservience to Tehran and the dangerous pursuit of their own nuclear prowess; Muslim extremism would flourish at a particularly precarious juncture in Arab history, compelling newly-emergent Muslim parties, especially in Egypt, to opt for extreme belligerence toward America and Israel; under a protective nuclear umbrella, Hamas and Hezbollah and others of their ilk would be able to run amok with impunity; the entire Middle East would be destabilized and America’s oil supplies held hostage by a self-confident and bellicose Iran. The standing of the U.S., after it is inevitably perceived as having lost out to the Ayatollahs, would reach an all-time low. Russia and China would gradually become the dominant powers in the region. Tehran would be free to expand and further develop its nuclear arsenal and ballistic missile capability. And Israel, America’s main ally in the region – perhaps in the world – would face a continuous mortal and ultimately paralyzing threat from an increasingly implacable enemy. Given their doubts about Obama’s resolve to order a U.S. military attack, Israeli analysts have tended to focus on the existence, or lack thereof, of an American “green light” for an Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. Indeed, one of the arguments made by Kroenig in Foreign Affairs is that a U.S. attack “can also head off a possible Israeli operation against Iran, which, given Israel’s limited capability to mitigate a potential battle and inflict lasting damage, would likely result in far more devastating consequences and carry a far lower probability of success than a U.S. attack.” But it is far from clear whether America’s acknowledged operational and logistical advantage is the most compelling argument against an Israeli attack, and whether Israel is indeed incapable of “inflicting lasting damage” on Iran. After years and years of preparation, and with the wily Barak at the helm, one should “expect the unexpected” from an Israeli attack. It would definitely not be a rerun of the 1981 bombing raid on Iraq’s nuclear reactor at Osirak, not in scope, not in intensity, not in the means of delivery and not in the yield and sophistication of the weapons that will be thrown into battle. But there are other profound drawbacks to an Israeli attack and corresponding advantages to an American offensive. An Israeli attack would rally the Arab and Muslim world behind Iran, strengthen radical Islamists, neutralize potentially sympathetic countries as Saudi Arabia and further distance Turkey from Israel and the West. The U.S. would have no choice but to support Israel, even though such support would inflame animosity toward Washington throughout the Muslim world. An American attack, on the other hand, would restore Washington’s stature and power of deterrence in the Arab world, could unite most of the Sunni monarchies and oil Sheikdoms in tacit assistance, at the very least, for the military effort, could facilitate Turkish neutrality and enable European support, and would sideline the incendiary issue of Israel, just as it did when Jerusalem maintained a “low profile” during the first two Gulf wars. It might also decrease the intensity of a combined Iranian-Hamas-Hezbollah and possibly Syrian counterattack against Israel, and would, in any case, free Israel to defend itself and to effectively deal with such an onslaught. And yes, though hardly devoid of risks, it might very well ensure Barack Obama’s reelection next November. 3. To be sure, despite Republican protestations to the contrary, American voters are ambivalent about a U.S. attack on Iran. In a recent Quinnipiac University Survey, 55 per cent of voters said the U.S. should not take military action against Iran – but 50 per cent would nonetheless support it, if all else fails. And 88 per cent believe that a nuclear Iran posed a serious threat or a somewhat serious threat to American national security. In the end, it would all come down to timing. The closer to elections that an American attack on Iran would take place, the more it would work in Obama’s favor. Though his left wing flank and possibly large chunks of the Democratic Party would not differentiate between Iraq and Iran, would draw historic parallels with the Bush Administration’s bogus evidence of Iraq’s WMD capabilities and would vehemently criticize Obama for “betraying his principles” - Obama would probably sway most independents and even moderate Republicans who would be swept up in the initial, patriotic wave of support for a campaign against a country that the Republican candidates for the presidency have described as America’s number one enemy. And Obama could point out to the American public that contrary to Iraq, no ground troops would be involved in Iran. A significantly earlier attack, however, would be far riskier. The initial patriotic fervor might dissipate and the wider ramifications would begin to sink in, including potential Iranian retaliation against American targets, and, perhaps more significantly, the disruption of oil supplies, an unprecedented spike in oil prices and an ensuing and crippling blow to U.S. economic recovery. If one wants to be absolutely cynical, perhaps Panetta’s one-year deadline was intentionally calibrated with this election timeline. Though there is no basis to suspect Obama of making political calculations, and without detracting from what is sure to be a serious American effort to get sanctions and possibly regime change to do the trick – October would be ideal. That’s the month that Henry Kissinger chose in 1972 to prematurely declare that “peace is at hand” in Vietnam, thus turning Richard Nixon’s certain victory over George McGovern into a landslide; that’s the month that Ronald Reagan feared Jimmy Carter would use in 1980 in order to free the Iran hostages and stop the Republican momentum; and that’s the month that many of Obama’s opponents are already jittery about, fearing the proverbial “October Surprise” that would hand Obama his second term on a platter. Two things are certain: the Republicans, who are now goading Obama for being soft on Iran and beating their own war drums, would reverse course in mid air with nary a blink and accuse the president of playing politics with American lives and needlessly embroiling it in a war which probably could have been avoided if he had been tough on Iran in the first place. And what about the Jewish vote? That would be Obama’s, lock, stock and barrel, including those Jewish voters who cannot forgive him for the Cairo speech, the bow to King Abdullah, the 1967 borders, the lack of chemistry with Netanyahu and that the fact that he has yet to produce evidence that he isn’t, after all, a closet Muslim. And in Israel, no doubt about it, he would be forever revered as the ultimate Righteous Gentile.

### 1NC Obama Good

#### Obama win likely but its super close and could easily swing

**Silver, 6/7** (Nate, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical modelshttp://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/)

The first look at the 2012 FiveThirtyEight presidential forecast has Barack Obama as a very slight favorite to win re-election. But his advantage equates to only a two-point lead in the national popular vote, and the edge could easily swing to Mitt Romney on the basis of further bad economic news. Mr. Obama remains slightly ahead of Mr. Romney in most national polls, and he has had a somewhat clearer advantage in polling conducted at the state level. Mr. Obama would be about 80 percent likely to win an election held today, according to the model. However, the outlook for the Nov. 6 election is much less certain, with Mr. Obama having winning odds of just over 60 percent. The forecast currently calls for Mr. Obama to win roughly 290 electoral votes, but outcomes ranging everywhere from about 160 to 390 electoral votes are plausible, given the long lead time until the election and the amount of news that could occur between now and then. Both polls and economic indicators are a pretty rough guide five months before an election.

#### Funding Transportation infrastructure unpopular with the public – they fear wasteful planning and don’t see the upside.

**Orski ‘12**

Ken Orski is editor and publisher of Innovation NewsBriefs, an influential and widely read transportation newsletter, now in its 20th year of publication. Orski has worked professionally in the field of transportation for close to 40 years. He served as Associate Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration under President Nixon and President Ford. He is a magna cum laude graduate of Harvard College and holds a J.D. degree from Harvard Law School. NewGeography – 02/05/2012 – 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 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.

#### Even tiny shifts matter – our link is low threshold and linear

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical modelshttp://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/)

The last thing to remember is that when an election is quite close, it does not take very much to shift the race from one candidate being a 60/40 favorite to it being about even. At the betting market Intrade, Mr. Obama’s odds of re-election have consistently been around 60 percent. While, on the one hand, it is good not to overreact to new data at this early stage of the race, it is also worth remembering that even a one-point shift in a president’s approval ratings, or a modest change in the economic forecasts, can move a president’s re-election odds at the margin.

### 1NC Obama Good – EPA Regs Module

#### Obama win key to EPA regs – solves CO2 and oil dependence

**Star Ledger, 12** (6/3, <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.

#### EPA REGULATIONS ARE THE ONLY WAY TO SOLVE GLOBAL WARMING AND CLIMATE LEADERSHIP

**Parenti ’10** (Christian Parenti, a contributing editor at The Nation and a visiting scholar at the Center for Place, Culture and Politics, at the CUNY Grad Center, 4-20-10, “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.

#### THE IMPACT IS EXTINCTION.

**Tickell 08** [Oliver, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction]

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming**,** *Bob Watson told the Gurdian 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 ourextinction***.*** 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.

### 1NC Obama Bad – Iran Strikes Module

#### Obama will strike Iran as October Surprise if he’s losing – their “No Strikes” ev doesn’t assume our link

Chemi **Shalev** is an Israeli journalist and political analyst. Chemi Shalev is a US foreign correspondent for Haaretz newspaper **12-27**-2011 <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/west-of-eden/will-a-u-s-attack-on-iran-become-obama-s-october-surprise-1.403898>

Will a U.S. attack on Iran become Obama’s ‘October Surprise’? Israelis and many Americans are convinced that President Obama will ultimately back away from attacking Iran. They may be wrong. 1. “When American officials declare that all options are on the table, most Israelis do not believe them. They have concluded, rather, that when the crunch comes (and everyone thinks it will), the United States will shy away from military force and reconfigure its policy to live with a nuclear-armed Iran.” This was the bottom line of “What Israelis Hear When Obama Officials Talk About Iran”, an article written by William Galston, a senior research fellow at Brookings, after he canvassed the Israeli participants in the recent Saban Forum held in Washington in early December. Since that diagnosis, rendered only three weeks ago, the content, tone and intensity of American pronouncements on Iran have undergone progressively dramatic changes. These include: • December 16: President Obama, in a speech before the Union of Reform Judaism, goes from the passive “a nuclear Iran is unacceptable” to the assertive “We are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.” • December 19: Secretary of Defense Panetta, hitherto the main articulator of the pitfalls of an attack on Iran, suddenly ups the ante by declaring that Iran might be only a year away from acquiring a nuclear bomb, that this the “red line” as far as the U.S. is concerned, and that Washington “will take whatever steps necessary to deal with it." • December 20: General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, tells CNN that “the options we are developing are evolving to a point that they would be executable, if necessary”, adding: 'My biggest worry is that they (Iranians) will miscalculate our resolve'. • December 21: Dennis Ross tells Israel’s Channel 10 television that President Obama would be prepared to “take a certain step” if that is what is required and “this means that when all options are on the table and if you’ve exhausted all other means, you do what is necessary". • December 22: Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak, commenting on the above statements, says that they "make clear a fact that was already known to us from closed-door (discussions). It makes clear to Iran that it faces a real dilemma." • December 23: Matthew Kroenig, former Special Adviser on Iran at the Pentagon, publishes an article in the prestigious Foreign Affairs, entitled “Time to Attack Iran”, in which he lays out the case for an American offensive against Iran – sooner rather than later. Israeli analysts, however, remain unconvinced. Influenced, perhaps, by their own experience with Israel’s cynical political leadership, they have ascribed much of this newly-found oomph in American utterances to an elections-inspired attempt by the Obama Administration to “show support for Israel” at a time of political need. Conversely, they maintain that the change in the American tone is a result of new intelligence information that was presented by Barak to Obama in their December 16 meeting in Washington. Both of these assessments may or may not be true, but they fail to tell the whole story. The timing of the reinvigorated American rhetoric is undoubtedly tied to the December 18 withdrawal of the last American troops from Iraq. The U.S. Army and the Pentagon have long opposed inflammatory rhetoric toward Tehran during the withdrawal, for fear it might endanger U.S. troops in Iraq. With the withdrawal complete, the Administration felt free to adopt a much more belligerent tone, literally overnight. As to the substance of American policy, Israelis appear to have persuaded themselves that, despite his vigorous prosecution of the war in Afghanistan and his successful and deadly pursuit of al-Qaida, Obama remains “soft” on Iran and will ultimately back down when push comes to shove. This perception has been fed by Obama’s ill-fated attempt to “engage” with Iran, his initial courtship of the Arab and Muslim world, what is widely perceived as his pro-Palestinian tendencies – and the overall animosity and prejudice directed at the president by many of his detractors. The Republicans are so convinced, in fact, that they are basing much of their foreign policy campaign against Obama on the assumption that he will ultimately capitulate to Tehran. That may be a dangerous assumption on their part. In his speech at the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony in December 2009 – possibly forgotten because of the ridiculously premature or spectacularly misdirected awarding of the prize - Obama spoke of a "just war" which can be waged “as a last resort or in self-defense”. After warning of the danger posed by Iran’s nuclear campaign, he said “those who seek peace cannot stand idly by as nations arm themselves for nuclear war.” In the days after that speech in Oslo, Christian theologian Reinhold Niebuhr was often cited as a source of inspiration for Obama, and it was Niebuhr who wrote, “contemporary history refutes the idea that nations are drawn into war too precipitately. It proves, on the contrary, that it is the general inclination of democratic nations at least to hesitate so long before taking this fateful plunge that the dictator nations gain a fateful advantage over them.” Obama may not want to fall into that pattern. People believe what they want to believe, but Obama has already proven - in Afghanistan, in Libya, in the offensive against al-Qaida, in the drone war in Somalia, Pakistan and Yemen – that he is no pacifist and does not shy way from using military force when necessary. And while he has stuck to his prepared script that “all options are on the table," people who have heard Obama speak about Iran in closed sessions have no doubt that if all else fails, including “crippling” sanctions and international isolation, Obama would order a U.S. attack on Iran, if he was convinced, as he appears to be, that it posed a clear and present danger to America’s national security. 2. And there can be no doubt - notwithstanding claims by the radical left and the isolationist right - that a nuclear Iran would be an unmitigated disaster for American interests, above and beyond the existential threat to Israel. Arab countries would be confronted by a stark choice between subservience to Tehran and the dangerous pursuit of their own nuclear prowess; Muslim extremism would flourish at a particularly precarious juncture in Arab history, compelling newly-emergent Muslim parties, especially in Egypt, to opt for extreme belligerence toward America and Israel; under a protective nuclear umbrella, Hamas and Hezbollah and others of their ilk would be able to run amok with impunity; the entire Middle East would be destabilized and America’s oil supplies held hostage by a self-confident and bellicose Iran. The standing of the U.S., after it is inevitably perceived as having lost out to the Ayatollahs, would reach an all-time low. Russia and China would gradually become the dominant powers in the region. Tehran would be free to expand and further develop its nuclear arsenal and ballistic missile capability. And Israel, America’s main ally in the region – perhaps in the world – would face a continuous mortal and ultimately paralyzing threat from an increasingly implacable enemy. Given their doubts about Obama’s resolve to order a U.S. military attack, Israeli analysts have tended to focus on the existence, or lack thereof, of an American “green light” for an Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. Indeed, one of the arguments made by Kroenig in Foreign Affairs is that a U.S. attack “can also head off a possible Israeli operation against Iran, which, given Israel’s limited capability to mitigate a potential battle and inflict lasting damage, would likely result in far more devastating consequences and carry a far lower probability of success than a U.S. attack.” But it is far from clear whether America’s acknowledged operational and logistical advantage is the most compelling argument against an Israeli attack, and whether Israel is indeed incapable of “inflicting lasting damage” on Iran. After years and years of preparation, and with the wily Barak at the helm, one should “expect the unexpected” from an Israeli attack. It would definitely not be a rerun of the 1981 bombing raid on Iraq’s nuclear reactor at Osirak, not in scope, not in intensity, not in the means of delivery and not in the yield and sophistication of the weapons that will be thrown into battle. But there are other profound drawbacks to an Israeli attack and corresponding advantages to an American offensive. An Israeli attack would rally the Arab and Muslim world behind Iran, strengthen radical Islamists, neutralize potentially sympathetic countries as Saudi Arabia and further distance Turkey from Israel and the West. The U.S. would have no choice but to support Israel, even though such support would inflame animosity toward Washington throughout the Muslim world. An American attack, on the other hand, would restore Washington’s stature and power of deterrence in the Arab world, could unite most of the Sunni monarchies and oil Sheikdoms in tacit assistance, at the very least, for the military effort, could facilitate Turkish neutrality and enable European support, and would sideline the incendiary issue of Israel, just as it did when Jerusalem maintained a “low profile” during the first two Gulf wars. It might also decrease the intensity of a combined Iranian-Hamas-Hezbollah and possibly Syrian counterattack against Israel, and would, in any case, free Israel to defend itself and to effectively deal with such an onslaught. And yes, though hardly devoid of risks, it might very well ensure Barack Obama’s reelection next November. 3. To be sure, despite Republican protestations to the contrary, American voters are ambivalent about a U.S. attack on Iran. In a recent Quinnipiac University Survey, 55 per cent of voters said the U.S. should not take military action against Iran – but 50 per cent would nonetheless support it, if all else fails. And 88 per cent believe that a nuclear Iran posed a serious threat or a somewhat serious threat to American national security. In the end, it would all come down to timing. The closer to elections that an American attack on Iran would take place, the more it would work in Obama’s favor. Though his left wing flank and possibly large chunks of the Democratic Party would not differentiate between Iraq and Iran, would draw historic parallels with the Bush Administration’s bogus evidence of Iraq’s WMD capabilities and would vehemently criticize Obama for “betraying his principles” - Obama would probably sway most independents and even moderate Republicans who would be swept up in the initial, patriotic wave of support for a campaign against a country that the Republican candidates for the presidency have described as America’s number one enemy. And Obama could point out to the American public that contrary to Iraq, no ground troops would be involved in Iran. A significantly earlier attack, however, would be far riskier. The initial patriotic fervor might dissipate and the wider ramifications would begin to sink in, including potential Iranian retaliation against American targets, and, perhaps more significantly, the disruption of oil supplies, an unprecedented spike in oil prices and an ensuing and crippling blow to U.S. economic recovery. If one wants to be absolutely cynical, perhaps Panetta’s one-year deadline was intentionally calibrated with this election timeline. Though there is no basis to suspect Obama of making political calculations, and without detracting from what is sure to be a serious American effort to get sanctions and possibly regime change to do the trick – October would be ideal. That’s the month that Henry Kissinger chose in 1972 to prematurely declare that “peace is at hand” in Vietnam, thus turning Richard Nixon’s certain victory over George McGovern into a landslide; that’s the month that Ronald Reagan feared Jimmy Carter would use in 1980 in order to free the Iran hostages and stop the Republican momentum; and that’s the month that many of Obama’s opponents are already jittery about, fearing the proverbial “October Surprise” that would hand Obama his second term on a platter. Two things are certain: the Republicans, who are now goading Obama for being soft on Iran and beating their own war drums, would reverse course in mid air with nary a blink and accuse the president of playing politics with American lives and needlessly embroiling it in a war which probably could have been avoided if he had been tough on Iran in the first place. And what about the Jewish vote? That would be Obama’s, lock, stock and barrel, including those Jewish voters who cannot forgive him for the Cairo speech, the bow to King Abdullah, the 1967 borders, the lack of chemistry with Netanyahu and that the fact that he has yet to produce evidence that he isn’t, after all, a closet Muslim. And in Israel, no doubt about it, he would be forever revered as the ultimate Righteous Gentile.

#### Iran strikes causes multiple scenarios for extinction.

**Chossudovsky -06** (Michel Chossudovsky, The Next Phase of the Middle East War, Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=3147)

The Bush Administration has embarked upon a military adventure which threatens the future of humanity. This is not an overstatement. If aerial bombardments were to be launched against Iran, they would trigger a ground war and the escalation of the conflict to a much broader region. Even in the case of aerial and missile attacks using conventional warheads, the bombings would unleash a "Chernobyl type" nuclear nightmare resulting from the spread of nuclear radiation following the destruction of Iran's nuclear energy facilities. Throughout history, the structure of military alliances has played a crucial role in triggering major military conflicts. In contrast to the situation prevailing prior to the 2003 invasion of Iraq, America's ongoing military adventure is now firmly supported by the Franco-German alliance. Moreover, Israel is slated to play a direct role in this military operation. NATO is firmly aligned with the Anglo-American-Israeli military axis, which also includes Australia and Canada. In 2005, NATO signed a military cooperation agreement with Israel, and Israel has a longstanding bilateral military agreement with Turkey. Iran has observer status in The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and is slated to become a full member of SCO. China and Russia have far-reaching military cooperation agreements with Iran. China and Russia are firmly opposed to a US-led military operation in the diplomatic arena. While the US sponsored military plan threatens Russian and Chinese interests in Central Asia and the Caspian sea basin, it is unlikely that they would intervene militarily on the side of Iran or Syria. The planned attack on Iran must be understood in relation to the existing active war theaters in the Middle East, namely Afghanistan, Iraq and Lebanon-Palestine. The conflict could easily spread from the Middle East to the Caspian sea basin. It could also involve the participation of Azerbaijan and Georgia, where US troops are stationed. Military action against Iran and Syria would directly involve Israel's participation, which in turn would trigger a broader war throughout the Middle East, not to mention the further implosion in the Palestinian occupied territories. Turkey is closely associated with the proposed aerial attacks. If the US-UK-Israeli war plans were to proceed, the broader Middle East- Central Asian region would flare up, from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Afghan-Chinese border. At present, there are three distinct war theaters: Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine-Lebanon. An attack directed against Iran would serve to integrate these war theaters transforming the broader Middle East Central Asian region into an integrated war zone. (see map above) In turn the US sponsored aerial bombardments directed against Iran could contribute to triggering a ground war characterized by Iranian attacks directed against coalition troops in Iraq. In turn, Israeli forces would enter into Syria. An attack on Iran would have a direct impact on the resistance movement inside Iraq. It would also put pressure on America's overstretched military capabilities and resources in both the Iraqi and Afghan war theaters. In other words, the shaky geopolitics of the Central Asia- Middle East region, the three existing war theaters in which America is currently, involved, the direct participation of Israel and Turkey, the structure of US sponsored military alliances, etc. raises the specter of a broader conflict. The war against Iran is part of a longer term US military agenda which seeks to militarize the entire Caspian sea basin, eventually leading to the destabilization and conquest of the Russian Federation.

## \*\*\*Temporary Uniqueness\*\*\*

### Obama Win Now

#### Obama will win – edge in the polls and increased Democratic enthusiasm

CNN 7/2/12 (CNN Poll: Health care ruling has not impacted race for White House, so far, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/02/cnn-poll-health-care-ruling-has-not-impacted-race-for-white-house-so-far/)

And while the CNN/ORC International survey released Monday indicates the president with a very slight three point edge over Romney among registered voters nationwide, the presumptive GOP nominee appears to hold an eight point advantage among voters who live in the 15 states considered in play in the race for the White House. But according to the poll, which was conducted in the four days following the high court's health care ruling, there's been a surge in enthusiasm by Democrats nationwide, and registered voters say that Obama would handle health care better than Romney. In a general election showdown between the president and the presumptive GOP nominee, 49% of registered voters nationwide say that if the November election were held today, they would vote for Obama, with 46% saying they'd vote for Romney. The president's three point edge is within the poll's sampling error. The results are identical to the numbers from the last CNN poll, conducted in late May.

#### Obama will win – Ohio, Florida and Pennsylvania polls prove

Jensen 6/28/12 (Kristin Jensen, Obama Tops Romney in Poll of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida Voters, http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Obama-Tops-Romney-in-Poll-of-Pennsylvania-Ohio-3666769.php)

President Barack Obama holds an edge over presumed Republican nominee Mitt Romney in the election battleground states of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Florida, a Quinnipiac University poll shows. Obama leads Romney by 9 percentage points in Ohio, 6 points in Pennsylvania and 4 points in Florida, according to the June 19-25 “swing-state” survey released today. Obama has gained ground in Ohio and Florida while his lead in Pennsylvania diminished slightly, compared with a comparable Quinnipiac poll released on May 3. A move by Obama to stop deportations of some illegal immigrants brought to the U.S. as children helped win over voters, said Peter Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute. The president holds almost a 2-1 lead among Hispanic voters in Florida, the poll found. “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,” Brown said in an e-mailed statement. No one has won the White House since 1960 without carrying at least two of the three states surveyed in this poll; Obama won all of them in 2008. The three states combined hold 67 of the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.

#### Ahead in key swing states – polls prove

The Telegraph 6/27/12 (Peter Foster, US election 2012: Barack Obama receives timely poll boost, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/barackobama/9360044/US-election-2012-Barack-Obama-receives-timely-poll-boost.html)

Barack Obama re-election campaign received a significant boost on Wednesday as two new polls showed him pulling ahead of Mitt Romney, his Republican challenger, in the key battleground states that will decide November's general election. Despite a turbulent month for Mr Obama, battered by disappointing jobs numbers and a high-profile Republican by-election victory in Wisconsin, the president was found to have established an eight-point lead in 12 key swing states, according to a poll by NBC and The Wall Street Journal. The numbers, which were supported by the results of a Quinnipiac University poll, make grim reading for Mr Romney and contradict a widespread perception among political pundits of both stripes that the former Massachusetts governor had been gaining ground on Mr Obama. The Quinnipiac results showed Mr Obama leading by a comfortable nine points in Ohio – the state seen by many analysts as the key barometer of the 2012 campaign – by six points in Pennsylvania and a marginal four points in Florida. Analysis of the NBC/WSJ data showed that Mr Obama is, for now, managing to retain the coalition of black, female and young voters who propelled him to a landslide victory in 2008. Mr Romney leads among the Tea Party movement and white males.

#### Ahead in swing states and looks better on paper.

Reuters 6/27/12 (Susan Heavey and Alistair Bell, Obama takes lead in swing states, economy still weighs, 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.

#### Obama win now – demographic shifts and swing state advantage

**Frontrunner, 6/11**

The New York Times (6/9, Harwood, Subscription Publication, 1.23M) reported that in several presidential swing states, "demographic changes add another variable to a campaign conversation that has largely revolved around high unemployment and slow growth" -- and could work to President Obama's advantage. An analysis "for the liberal Center for American Progress" concluded that "that in 12 battleground states, the proportion of votes cast by working-class whites, a group Mr. Obama lost lopsidedly in 2008, will drop by three percentage points this fall," while "the proportion cast by minority voters, who backed Mr. Obama by overwhelming margins, will rise by two percentage points." The Chicago Sun-Times (6/10, Sweet, 370K) reported that Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, in an interview to air on CNN's Fareed Zakaria GPS Sunday, "predicted that the presidential election will be decided in 'five states, 500 precincts.'" He did not specify the states. Several Swing States Have A Relatively Low Unemployment Rate. Charles Babington, in a piece for the AP (6/11) titled, "Ohio's Job Growth Doesn't Guarantee An Obama Win," says, "About 10 battleground states will decide the election, and seven of them have employment levels that beat the US average." Babington adds, "Most of the states are led by Republican governors eager to highlight their progress in creating jobs," which "complicates...Romney's claim that the economy has been so mismanaged that Obama deserves to be ousted." Babington says Ohio Gov. John Kasich "tries to finesse the political dilemma by saying jobs have increased despite Obama's policies."

#### Err neg – Obama starts with math edge and campaign advantages in remaining swing states

**CNN, 6/4** (http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/04/cnn-electoral-map-seven-states-up-in-the-air-in-fight-for-white-house/)

With just over five months to go until the November election, a new CNN Electoral Map indicates a tight battle between President Barack Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney for the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House. According to the CNN map unveiled Monday, the president leads Romney in 19 states and the District of Columbia, which if he carried those in the general election would give him 247 electoral votes. Romney, the unofficial GOP presidential nominee pending the party's convention, leads in 24 states, which would give him 206 electoral votes. – Follow the Ticker on Twitter: @PoliticalTicker The map currently indicates that seven states are true toss-ups. Those states are Colorado (9 electoral votes), Florida (29), Iowa (6), Nevada (6), New Hampshire (4), Ohio (18) and Virginia (13). Eighty-five electoral votes are up for grabs in those seven states. Four states currently lean towards Obama: Michigan (16), New Mexico (5), Pennsylvania (20) and Wisconsin (10). Four states currently lean towards Romney: Arizona (11), Indiana (11), Missouri (10), and North Carolina (15). "Elections generally break one way late, meaning if you head into the final weeks with six toss-ups, four or five - and sometimes all - break with the winner. And so that could well happen this time. But if you look at the map today, this looks a lot more like Bush vs. Gore than it does Obama vs. McCain," says CNN Chief National Correspondent John King, anchor of "John King, USA." "It's no surprise that Florida and Ohio are toss-ups and potential 'deciders' - they traditionally play that role in presidential politics. What is fascinating is the number of plausible scenarios under which one or two of the 'smaller' battlegrounds could prove decisive," King added. "Iowa and New Hampshire, for example - what a delicious storyline if it all ends in the states where it began. Colorado and Virginia are relative newcomers to the 'swing state' role, and now critical to what amounts to a multi-dimensional chess game." Overall, 15 states right now are either toss-ups or lean towards either the president or Romney. "The 2012 presidential election likely will be decided by these 15 key states, worth a total of 183 electoral votes," CNN Political Research Director Robert Yoon says. "Determining what qualifies as a battleground state is not an exact science, but it's a rough mix of several criteria, including polling, past election results, the state's political, demographic, and economic trends; whether the campaigns and parties will devote resources to the state, such as ad spending, candidate visits, field offices, and staff, and the presence of other high-profile races on the ballot. CNN's Electoral Map will take into account all these factors, as well as its own reporting and analysis." There are factors that aren't as clear as what the map shows, King said. "President Obama starts with a mathematical edge and the psychological advantage of knowing he won each of the tossups last time. A different year, yes, but in most places he has veteran teams who know the states and so also know where there are weaknesses and erosion when compared to 2008. Governor Romney has less room for error - he has to win Ohio and most likely needs to win Florida, too."

#### Electoral college and swing state advantages

**Cohen, 5/26** (Micah, Assistant @ FiveThirtyEight.com, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/may/27/michael-cohen-obamas-election-chances?newsfeed=true>)

That Obama is neck and neck with Romney is what should perhaps be most shocking. The track record of presidential incumbents battling high unemployment, sluggish economic growth and an electorate overwhelmingly convinced the country is on the wrong track is generally not good. In fact, there's a name for them: one-termers. If anything, Obama's ability to keep his head above water against Romney is an indication of his unusually high favourability ratings and Romney's improving but still lacklustre personal marks. But anyone who thought Obama was going to have an easy time of it was deluded. And with minefields on the way to November, such as a potential Supreme Court decision that could gut his main domestic accomplishment (in healthcare) and a financial crisis in Europe that could eventually infect the United States, the road ahead may not be so easy for the president. Still, none of this means it is time for liberals to start looking for rental properties in Vancouver or Toronto. In fact, the one place where Obama appears to have something of a political advantage is the only place that actually matters – the electoral college. For British readers not familiar with the electoral college, it is an invention of America's Founding Fathers that makes democracy in the United States messy, complicated and unfair. Rather than simply count up all the votes and give the presidency to the one who has the most, candidates must win states and their resulting number of electoral votes. (This, by the way, is why Al Gore, who won 500,000 more votes than George W Bush in 2000, ended up making documentaries… and the United States invaded Iraq.) In 2000, the key battleground state was Florida. But it wasn't the only showdown state: places such as Wisconsin (which Gore won by 5,000 votes); Iowa (where he won by 4,000) New Mexico (which he won by a mere 500) were incredibly competitive. Even in traditionally liberal states such as Minnesota and Oregon, Gore won by mere percentage points. In 2004, the map was remarkably similar – only New Hampshire, New Mexico and Iowa changed columns and while John Kerry won many of the same states that Gore won, he did so by similarly slim margins. But in 2008, things changed dramatically. States that were once highly competitive such as Wisconsin, Michigan and Nevada moved decisively into the Democratic column; states that were perennial swing states, such as Florida and Ohio, were won by Obama and even states such as Virginia and North Carolina that were barely on their radar screen in 2004 went Democratic. Part of this was a function of the Republicans' broken political brand, but it was also a function of Obama himself and his appeal to blacks, Hispanics and college-educated whites. This new electoral map was a reflection of the Democratic coalition he was seeking to create. Conversely, for Republicans, their electoral map remains disturbingly static. Since 2000, the number of solid Republican or Republican-leaning states is largely unchanged – and no state that even Kerry won in 2004, except perhaps New Hampshire, Wisconsin or Pennsylvania, is considered a Republican target this year. With the caveat that one can only read so much into polls taken five months before election day, Obama enjoys a small but noteworthy advantage in the Electoral College. According to a recent tally by the RealClearPolitics website, Obama has 227 solid or "leaning" electoral votes, while Romney has 170. Combined, that represents 39 of the 50 states (plus the District of Columbia). These are places where residents will for the most part hear more about the election than experience it first hand since candidates will likely not make more than a token appearance in them. Of the 11 other states, Obama is either leading or tied in nine of them. For Romney to become president, he needs to win the majority of these swing states, not just perennial targets such as Florida and Ohio, but also North Carolina and Virginia (places where Obama is leading or tied). Amazingly, if he were to win all four of these states he could still lose the election. In fact, for Romney, it's extremely difficult to construct a scenario where he wins the election while losing Florida. Barring an electoral free-fall for Obama, places that were highly competitive such as Wisconsin, Minnesota, New Mexico, Michigan and Nevada will likely not be seriously contested. In the end, what this means for election day is that more likely than not the battle will be waged on turf that strongly favours the president.

#### Narrow swing state lead

**Burns, 5/24** (Alexander, Politico.com, <http://www.politico.com/blogs/burns-haberman/2012/05/nbcmarist-polls-obama-leads-close-swingstate-races-124438.html>)

Obama leads close swing-state races New battleground polling out this morning from NBC News and Marist College: President Barack Obama holds a narrow advantage over presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney in three of the most pivotal presidential battleground states — Florida, Ohio and Virginia — according to new NBC-Marist polls. But in each of these states, Obama's share of the vote is below the 50 percent threshold usually considered safe haven for an incumbent president, and Romney has narrowed the margin in these three battlegrounds since earlier this year. In Florida and Virginia, Obama leads Romney by identical 4-point margins, 48 percent to 44 percent … In Ohio, the president is ahead by 6 points, 48 percent to 42 percent. As NBC points out, those are tighter margins than in the network's last round of swing-state polling. Democrats are also up in the Virginia, Florida and Ohio Senate races, though by small gaps that indicate all three are likely to be close in November.

#### Obama lead but its close

**CSM, 6/10**

Polls show the election close, but Obama still has the edge, according to recent voter surveys. Three recent polls (Gallup, Rasmussen, and Fox News) show Obama very near the critical 50 percent mark on public approval. Meanwhile, Congress' approval rate dwindles below 20 percent - useful to the Obama campaign if it intends (like Harry Truman in 1948) to run against a "do-nothing" Congress. Looking at a wide range of national and state polls, analyst Nate Silver of the FiveThirtyEight blog at the New York Times gives Obama an 80 percent chance of winning if the election were held today. "However, the outlook for the Nov. 6 election is much less certain, with Mr. Obama having winning odds of just over 60 percent," Mr. Silver writes. "The forecast currently calls for Mr. Obama to win roughly 290 electoral votes, but outcomes ranging everywhere from about 160 to 390 electoral votes are plausible, given the long lead time until the election and the amount of news that could occur between now and then." Any major gaffes between now and Election Day - by either Obama or Romney - could tip the results.

#### Obama win now – Virginia lead

**Conroy, 6/13** (Scott, Political Reporter @ RealClearPolitics, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/06/13/northern\_virginia\_edge\_could\_be\_pivotal\_for\_obama\_114458.html)

Northern Virginia Edge Could Be Pivotal for Obama SPRINGFIELD, Va. -- For President Obama's organizational machine in Virginia, Tuesday's jam-packed statewide schedule was typical. There was a voter registration drive outside a Bonnie Raitt concert in Charlottesville, an afternoon phone bank at the Hopewell library just south of Richmond, and a volunteer recruitment meeting at a private home in this distant suburb of Washington, D.C. All told, the Obama campaign listed on its website 62 separate events throughout the Commonwealth that day. Recent weeks have seen regular openings of new Obama field offices across Virginia (there are now 15), and the dozens of paid staffers working out of the campaign headquarters in Richmond and elsewhere around the state have become increasingly visible. In what both sides regard as one of the election’s three or four most critical swing states, Obama has opened up a slim yet significant three-point lead in the latest RCP average of Virginia polls. Though he shows strength in other regions of the state, the president largely has the expansive D.C. suburbs to thank for that advantage.

### Obama Lose Now

#### Romney will win – CNN poll proves he is ahead in swing states

The Hill 7/3/12 (Jonathan Easley, Poll: Romney up big in battleground states, http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/236135-poll-romney-up-big-in-battleground-states)

Mitt Romney has a sizeable lead in 15 battleground states, according to a CNN/ORC poll released late Monday. The Republican candidate leads President Obama 51 percent to 43 in 15 states that will be critical in determining the outcome of the 2012 election. Obama won 12 of these battleground states in 2008 — Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin — and will need to keep about half of those in 2012 if he’s to secure reelection. The poll also included Missouri, Indiana and Arizona as battleground states. That’s good news for Romney, showing he has a base of support in those states, though the blanket poll of 534 registered voters doesn’t give an indication of which candidate leads in an individual state, or by how much. Two polls released last week showed Obama with an edge in several swing states. An NBC News/Wall Street Journal survey found Obama leading Romney 50 percent to 42 among likely voters in 12 battlegrounds, and a Quinnipiac University poll found Obama leading Romney by 9 points in Ohio, 6 in Pennsylvania and 4 in Florida.

#### Obama will lose – typical blue states turning red.

Chambers 6/29/12 (Dean Chambers, Arlington Conservative Examiner, Romney holds lead in electoral vote map, http://www.examiner.com/article/romney-holds-lead-electoral-vote-map)

Former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee running against President Obama in November, continues to lead in a sufficient number of states to win the election. At this time, Romney would get at least 298 electoral votes if the election were held today. Six states, which are Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Nevada, and Oregon are too close to call. In these states one candidate might lead by less than the margin of error in the reliable polls, but neither candidate has a majority. A look at the map, at the left, shows it is looking more red and this trend is gradually moving in that direction as we get close to election day in November. I expect the continued unpopular nature of Obamacare, given it being upheld by the high court, will further energize conservative and tea party movement support for Mitt Romney. Those pink states will become more red and don't be surprised to see the swing states go red. The most solid states going for President Obama right now are Vermont, New York, Delaware, Maryland, his home state of Illinois, Hawaii, and California. These states total must over 100 electoral votes, or a similar number to those states won by Michael Dukakis when he ran against George H. W. Bush in 1988. That is clearly what the trend is starting to show, that this election could look a lot more like 1988 than the 2000 or 2004 scenario that many pundits are predicting. Florida, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Michigan are showing signs of staying in the Romney camp and I expect that trend to continue. Pennsylvania will be a bit more of a challenge for Romney to win but it's possible he can do it. If we see Romney campaigning a lot in the next two months in states like Pennsylvania, Michigan, and perhaps even Minnesota and Colorado, that will be a sign the Romney campaign is operating from a position of strength. If we see the attacks ads from Obama get more vicious, that will be another indication. This campaign can still yet get more negative than it has, and the more Romney leads in the polls the political experts know are credible, as opposed to the doctored and manipulated ones put out by the mainstream media, the more the attacks on Romney will grown more negative.

#### Romney will win – huge spending edge

Lee 6/28/12 (Kristen A, Obama campaign official: We could lose!, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2012-06-28/news/32461244\_1\_small-donors-obama-campaign-official-billionaires)

President Barack Obama’s campaign is issuing a dramatic warning to its supporters: We could lose this election. “If we're drastically outspent in this election, there's a very good chance we will lose to Mitt Romney,” deputy campaign manager Julianna Smoot wrote in an email to supporters Wednesday night. “This is a distinct possibility. The financial landscape in this race has changed over the last few weeks.” ROMNEY RAISES MORE MONEY THAN OBAMA FOR FIRST TIME IN RACE FOR WHITE HOUSE Smoot then made a last-minute plea for supporters to give money to the Obama campaign before the next Federal Election Commission fundraising deadline on June 30. For added incentive, she said donors will be entered in a contest to win two seats beside Obama on his campaign bus next week. The desperate tone follows the surprise news earlier this month that Mitt Romney and the GOP raised more money in May than Obama and the Democratic Party. And Republicans have an additional fundraising weapon in their arsenal: the Republican super PAC, “Restore Our Future,” which has taken in multi-million dollar donations from billionaires like casino magnate Sheldon Adelson. A pro-Obama super PAC, “Priorities USA,” has been much less successful in attracting major donors. According to The Washington Post, the Republican Party is now looking to further increase its money-making edge by filing a lawsuit that challenges the government’s overall cap on individuals’ donations to political candidates and party committees. If the Republican National Committee’s lawsuit is successful, the Post said it would mean that one donor could give more than $2 million to candidates and parties as long as the funds are spread among House and Senate members and state organizations.

#### Romney will win – Super PACs money proves.

Graham 6/28/12 (Darwin Bond Graham, Money = wins, http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/money-wins/content?oid=6480953)

Regardless of previous affiliations, all of the major conservative super PACs are now shifting their devastating abilities to raise cash and produce negative ads onto President Barack Obama, reported The New York Times last week. By shifting their focus, these PACs may soon see spikes in contributions from wealthy California conservatives. According to Kousser, there are several obvious reasons why Romney did better among California’s GOP. “He’s more of a California Republican than Gingrich or Santorum. Romney is more moderate than the national Republican Party. Second, he’s a Mormon, and California has more Mormons. It’s not surprising that a candidate who fits the ideological mold and is knit into a religious group with deep roots in the state fits better here.” However, there was another key reason for Romney’s success. California’s conservative political donors decided early on to pool their money behind the Restore Our Future super PAC. Numerous hedge-fund and private-equity executives with major California financial companies like TPG Capital, Altamont Capital Partners, Chaparal Investments, Canyon Partners, Sutter Hill Ventures, Trident Capital, and more widely known investment banks that have California offices, like Goldman Sachs, constitute the richest core of Romney’s California allies. Kousser isn’t surprised. “These are his friends. He has a long relationship working with them from Bain Capital. They feel like he understands their issues.” The predominance of private-equity and hedge-fund managers in the super PAC scene is very much the product of personal networks that stem back decades, and Romney personifies these links like no other politician. Romney’s ability to raise big money, especially from California, is thanks largely to his former business colleagues and employees at Bain & Company and Bain Capital. Dick Boyce, Romney’s go-to guy in Northern California, once worked in Bain Capital’s sister company, Bain & Company. Dick Boyce donated $300,000 to the Restore Our Future PAC to fund attacks against Romney’s rivals during the primaries. For Romney’s several fundraising forays into California in recent months, Boyce has been among the welcoming committee, hosting parties with $2,500 covers at the door and $50,000 per-plate dinner charges. Decades ago when Romney and colleagues in Bain Capital engineered takeovers of companies, Boyce would move his operations team into the executive offices to restructure the business and squeeze out bigger profits for investors, mainly Bain Capital partners. The seed money for their current fortunes, out of which they peel campaign contributions today, was created in the 1980s and ’90s orchestrating leveraged buyouts and restructurings—practices that have been widely criticized for leading to job cuts and bankruptcies. One of Dick Boyce’s earliest gigs for Bain Capital was taking over FTD Flowers, at the time a nonprofit organization. When Boyce exited FTD as Bain’s profit-engineering CEO, he brought in another Bain & Company employee, Margaret Whitman, to fill his shoes. Today Meg Whitman is better known as Hewlett-Packard’s CEO, and a former candidate for California governor (having the distinction of spending a record sum of personal wealth on her own bid to buy that office). Whitman also has the distinction of being ranked No. 331 on Forbes’ global billionaires list, with a personal fortune valued at $1.3 billion. Her Atherton mansion is not too far from Dick Boyce’s Portola Valley residence. Whitman is another friend and key supporter of Romney, having donated her limit of $2,300 to the candidate’s campaign, but more importantly having made a $100,000 contribution to the Restore Our Future super PAC. Two other major contributors to the Restore Our Future super PAC have Bain & Company backgrounds: Duhamel spent several years at Bain & Company after graduating from Stanford Business School. Co-founder of Altamont Capital Jesse Rogers is a Bain & Company alumnus. Rogers gave $125,000 to Restore Our Future. Excepting this handful of conservative California millionaires and billionaires who have already made their imprint in the GOP primaries, Kousser said, “I think Californians for the most part haven’t been engaged in this presidential race. That was reflected in the poor turnout for the recently passed primary elections.” Even if California’s majority of liberal voters remain irrelevant in the electoral strategies of Obama and Romney, Kousser believes wealthy residents will engage further. “Californians will play an increasingly larger role in funding this race. California and New York City are ATMs for both parties.” In the general election now underway, the biggest super PACs are expected to expend many millions more on attack ads in key states. The Romney-friendly Restore Our Future PAC has held a decided edge over liberal PACs expected to support Obama. According to the Federal Elections Commission, Restore Our Future has raised more than $61 million so far and has about $14 million in cash on hand. By contrast, Priorities USA Action, the Obama-linked super PAC, has only raised $14.5 million, and only has $5 million in cash on hand. While liberal funders are expected to become more engaged in the presidential campaign now, conservative funders are still outspending them. When asked once which competing teams of private-equity capitalists “win” in a competition to takeover a public company, Romney’s friend and former colleague Dick Boyce once said, “The one with the most money.” Having already helped to bankroll the GOP’s primary, and selected Romney through a battle of super PACs, wealthy California residents like Boyce seem to be intent on proving this dictum in politics, too.

#### Romney win now – polls, turnout, economy

**Ponnuru, 6/25**

Ramesh Ponnuru, Senior Editor, National Review, lexis

'We've gotta wake up," James Carville wrote in a May 31 fundraising e-mail. "Everywhere I go, people are telling me that 'Obama has it in the bag.' Newsflash: nothing is in the bag." He's right: Democrats have been overconfident about President Obama's chances this fall. Only slowly, if at all, is it dawning on them that Mitt Romney poses a serious challenge. For months now, the polls have suggested that Obama, while not a sure loser, is in trouble. In the Real Clear Politics average of polls, the president has not cracked a 50 percent approval rating so far in 2012. In both its average and Pollster.com's, the candidates have since the first week of May been consistently less than three points apart. There are several reasons Romney is giving Obama a tough race. The primary campaign distorted perceptions of the general-election campaign. It seemed to take forever for Romney to win the Republican nomination, and his poll numbers sank during the long slog. (Except for his "negatives": the percentage of people who told pollsters they had an unfavorable impression of him. That number rose.) Plenty of coverage suggested that Romney was going to have trouble unifying the party. Republicans grew pessimistic. But it should have been obvious that these perceptions were dependent on circumstances that were already changing. The primary highlighted Romney's deficiencies from the point of view of conservatives. In the general election, Republicans were never going to be choosing between Romney and Santorum or Gingrich. They were going to face a choice between Romney and a candidate who favors higher taxes, took health care farther down the road to government control, and will continue to appoint liberal judges as long as he can. On each of these issues Republicans strongly prefer Romney's position. That is why they quickly consolidated behind him once he wrapped up the nomination. While Romney has his weaknesses as a candidate, the arduousness of the primary campaign made them look more fatal than they are. The timing of the elections worked against him. Jay Cost, a writer for The Weekly Standard, points out that winning the Florida primary in 2008 gave John McCain the momentum to do well on Super Tuesday. This time around, Romney won Florida, his poll numbers improved, and then . . . and then the next actual primary was held four weeks later, and Super Tuesday a week after that. Momentum dissipated. Some of Romney's vulnerabilities in the primary won't matter much in the general election. His primary opponents had an incentive to use his record of flip-flops to portray him as unconservative and untrustworthy, but Obama can't simultaneously portray him as a right-wing extremist and a flip-flopper. All signs point to his deploying the right-wing-extremist attack, since it's scarier. The country is closely divided. After the 2006 and 2008 elections, some analysts decided that the country now had a natural Democratic majority. In retrospect -- and again, this should have been obvious at the time -- those seem like abnormally Democratic years (as 2010 seems like an abnormally Republican one). Even if 2008 had been a happy year for our nation, Republicans would have had to contend with the public's instinct that it was time for a change after eight years of their party in the White House. But there was also an economic crisis, which hit just weeks before the election. The Republican presidential nominee nonetheless won 46 percent of the vote. Republicans were always likely to do significantly better in 2012, simply because the odds of their facing similarly awful circumstances again were so low. You can't make history twice. There's another reason the Republicans' 2008 performance was likely to represent a floor for the next election. Strong turnout among voters who were young, black, or both swelled Obama's totals. Both black voters and young white voters are likely to vote for Obama again, but probably not in the same numbers, because the excitement of voting in the first black president has faded. Obama didn't change the map. Because his 2008 victory reached deep into "Republican territory" -- that is, he carried seven states that had gone for George W. Bush twice -- some analysts thought Obama had made assembling an Electoral College majority harder for the Republicans. But his sweep was a function of a national Democratic wave, not a permanent geographic realignment. As Sean Trende points out in his book, The Lost Majority, Obama's winning coalition was actually narrower geographically than Bill Clinton's. Missouri, which was very recently a swing state, seems now to be a lost cause for the Democrats. And Obama's hold on the states he carried in 2008 is weak. Florida seems to have become more Republican over the last decade, too. The Democrats have written off Indiana, and are surely ruing their decision to hold their national convention in North Carolina, not least because its state Democratic party is immersed in scandal. Even some states long in the Democratic fold look iffy. Wisconsin, which has not voted for a Republican presidential candidate since 1984, seems to be in play. Minnesota last voted for a Republican in 1972, but its Democratic tilt (compared with the national electorate) declined a little in the 2008 election, and a solid Romney victory nationally could well sweep it in. The economy hasn't cooperated. We haven't had a strong recovery, or one that most people trust will last. Democratic optimism about Obama has been tied not only to Romney's primary struggle but also to a few months of data suggesting the economy was picking up. But we have now had a few months of more recent, ominous data -- and the continuing crisis in Europe, or heightened tension in the Middle East, could tip us back into recession.

#### Romney win but its close – undecided voters will break for Romney now

**CBS News, 6/12** (Lexis)

(CBS News) President Obama and presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney are in a close race now but the president's approval rating below 50 percent is good news for his rival, a former Republican party chairman said Tuesday. "When you look at President Obama's numbers, he's consistently somewhere between, you know, 44 and 47 percent, which historically is a danger zone for an incumbent president running for re-election," Romney campaign adviser Ed Gillespie said on "CBS This Morning." Gillespie noted that most voters have already formed an opinion about Mr. Obama. "Often, at the end of an election with an incumbent president, the undecideds tend to break pretty strongly in favor of the challenger candidate," Gillespie said. Still, Gillespie cautioned that the nation is pretty evenly divided, especially in the crucial "swing states" that will decide the election.

#### Obama lose now – turnout

**US News and world report, 6/8** (lexis)

Folks are still crunching the numbers coming out of Gov. Scott Walker's victory in Tuesday's Wisconsin recall, which is only producing more bad news for President Barack Obama. In its aftermath the race is shaping up as a proxy for the president's potential performance against his likely opponent in the November 2012 election, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney. Wisconsin is critical to both campaigns, with Obama unlikely to be able to win without it and Romney much more easily able to reach the "magic number" of 270 electoral votes if he carries it. What the president will be able to do depends in large part on how much of his winning coalition he can reassemble later this year. It's not looking good, especially among the younger voters who were such an important part of Obama's 2008 victory. [Check out our editorial cartoons on President Obama.] According to Crossroads Generation, a group dedicated to reaching young people with the messages promoting individual liberty, limited government, and free enterprise, in the recall election Walker carried the vote of those under the age of 25. "According to exit polling," the group said, "for voters aged 18-29, the Democrats' advantage among this group was cut in half compared to 2010. While Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett held a ten-point advantage among 18-29 year olds in the 2010 election, that gap was reduced to five points in Tuesday's election." Younger voters were a significant presence in Tuesday's election. Voters under the age of 30, Crossroads Generation said, made up 16 percent of all voters in the recall election, a higher proportion than in the 2010 gubernatorial election. [See a collection of political cartoons on the 2012 campaign.] "Wisconsin is a state where young voters make a big difference," said Crossroads' Kristen Soltis, who see the results as predictive for the fall. "When an election is focused on the economy and fiscal responsibility, my generation is ready to support candidates with plans for getting us back on track," she said. If Obama is having trouble attracting younger voters to his coalition, as the results from Wisconsin suggest may be the case, then it will be just that much harder for him to go on to victory in the presidential race. The White House is hoping for a "base election," one in which each party turns out as many of its most stalwart supporters as it can while independents, moderates, and occasional voters stay home, as was the case in George W. Bush's victory over Massachusetts Sen. John Kerry in 2004. Romney, on the other hand, looks to be running a campaign that broadens the base, reaching out to everyone who is unhappy with the way the president has governed over the last four years, as Ronald Reagan did in 1980. At the moment anyway, it looks like more voters help Romney while fewer voters are the key Obama's re-election.

#### Obama losing now because democrat divisions

**The Hill, 6/11/12**

The Hill, “Divisions in Dem Coalition Resurface,” 6-11-2012 (http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/231967-as-november-election-nears-splits-in-democratic-coalition-resurface)

Divisions in the Democratic coalition have burst into view, endangering both President Obama and his party colleagues in Congress as November’s election nears. Fissures have opened over everything from tax policy and former President Bill Clinton’s  off-message comments to recriminations following the party’s fiasco in the Wisconsin recall, which some say should have been avoided. Democrats disagree over the wisdom of Obama’s attacks on Republican Mitt Romney’s private equity background at Bain Capital and are split over the proposed construction of the Keystone XL pipeline from Canada’s vast oil sands. The divides are opening just as Republicans appear more unified, which underlines the danger for Democrats and highlights an abrupt reversal in the two major parties’ fortunes.

#### Obama suffering severe losses now and will soon on Health Care and Immigration

**Cassata, 6/6/12**

Donna Cassata, Writer for the Associated Press, Republished in the Green Bay Press Gazette, “Walker’s Victory is More Bad News for Obama, Democrats,” 6-6-2012 (http://www.greenbaypressgazette.com/article/20120606/GPG010403/120606081/Wisconsin-governor-recall-election-Scott-Walker-Barack-Obama-president)

Just one week old, June already is proving a cruel month for President Barack Obama and the Democrats — and it could get a lot worse. The **political blows** from Tuesday's bitter loss in Wisconsin's gubernatorial recall and from last week's abysmal unemployment numbers, bad as they were, **could multiply before the month is out**. The Supreme Court will pass judgment shortly on the president's **signature legislative achievement** — the 2010 law overhauling the nation's health care system — and also will decide on his administration's challenge to Arizona's tough immigration law. If Chief Justice John Roberts and the court strike down all or part of the health care law, it could **demoralize Democrats** who invested more than a year — and quite a few political careers — to secure the bill's passage. And in Arizona, aside from the big immigration case, the Democrats are fighting to hold onto the House seat of Gabrielle Giffords, who resigned in January to focus on recovering from her gunshot wound. In next Tuesday's special election, former Giffords aide Ron Barber is locked in a close race with Republican Jesse Kelly, who lost to her in 2010 by just 4,156 votes. Facing an election-year summer fraught with political peril, the Democrats are struggling to revive supporters' spirits and counteract developments that could energize Republicans and solidify public opinion that the country is on the wrong track and in need of new leadership.

#### Obamas in trouble but it could go either way

**Cass, 6/2** (Connie, writer @ AP, Business Week, <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V4SLHO1.htm>)

It's a toss-up so far. There hasn't been time to measure the impact of Friday's figures. But in an Associated Press-GfK poll last month, people were split over who they'd trust most to handle the economy, Romney or Obama. Asked specifically whether they approve of the way Obama has dealt with unemployment, about half did and half didn't, mostly along party lines. Still, jobs are clearly a weakness for Obama. His poll numbers are stronger than Romney's on many other qualities, such as which candidate understands regular people, is a strong leader and says what he really believes.

### Obama Wins Florida Now

#### Obama will win Florida – ahead in key polls

Reuters 6/27/12 (Susan Heavey and Alistair Bell, Obama takes lead in swing states, economy still weighs, 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.

#### Obama will win Florida – Immigration order boosts him

Jensen 6/28/12 (Kristin Jensen, Obama Tops Romney in Poll of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida Voters, http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Obama-Tops-Romney-in-Poll-of-Pennsylvania-Ohio-3666769.php)

President Barack Obama holds an edge over presumed Republican nominee Mitt Romney in the election battleground states of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Florida, a Quinnipiac University poll shows. Obama leads Romney by 9 percentage points in Ohio, 6 points in Pennsylvania and 4 points in Florida, according to the June 19-25 “swing-state” survey released today. Obama has gained ground in Ohio and Florida while his lead in Pennsylvania diminished slightly, compared with a comparable Quinnipiac poll released on May 3. A move by Obama to stop deportations of some illegal immigrants brought to the U.S. as children helped win over voters, said Peter Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute. The president holds almost a 2-1 lead among Hispanic voters in Florida, the poll found. “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,” Brown said in an e-mailed statement. No one has won the White House since 1960 without carrying at least two of the three states surveyed in this poll; Obama won all of them in 2008. The three states combined hold 67 of the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.

#### Hispanic voters favor Obama now

Jensen 6/28/12 (Kristin Jensen, Obama Tops Romney in Poll of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida Voters, http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Obama-Tops-Romney-in-Poll-of-Pennsylvania-Ohio-3666769.php)

In Florida, Obama leads Romney 45 percent to 41 percent, the poll showed. In the swing-state poll released May 3, the president led by 1 point, meaning the race in the state was a virtual dead heat. The revised deportation policy Obama announced June 15 and his June 22 address to the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials meeting in Lake Buena Vista, Florida -- following a Romney speech to the group by one day -- boosted the president’s standing with Hispanics in that state, according to Quinnipiac poll data. In a June 12-18 poll by Quinnipiac solely of Florida voters -- in which Obama also led overall by 4 percentage points -- the president had a 10-point edge over Romney among Hispanics surveyed, 49 percent to 39 percent. In the latest poll, Obama’s lead over Romney among this bloc has grown to 24 points, 56 percent to 32 percent.

### Obama Loses Florida Now

#### Romney will win Florida – will pick Rubio as VP to get Hispanic vote.

Groening 7/3/12 (Chad, Rubio may be best choice for Hispanic vote, http://www.onenewsnow.com/Politics/Default.aspx?id=1625286)

A conservative political scientist and pundit believes the recent Supreme Court ruling on Arizona's immigration enforcement bill will motivate Mitt Romney to select Marco Rubio as his vice-presidential running mate. President Barack Obama has been riding high since last week's double victories handed to him by the Supreme Court. ObamaCare was upheld, and earlier in the week the high court wiped out three of the four sections of Arizona's immigration law, with the remaining section subject to federal court review. Dr. Charles W. Dunn of Regent University believes the immigration ruling will strengthen Florida Senator Marco Rubio's VP chances. "Romney is going to need Florida," he says. "And he has to reduce the impact of that immigration ruling, which is helping Obama with the Latino base. Romney needs 40 percent plus of that Latino vote. He's not getting it now. For example, he's looking at some of those battleground states that he'd expected to win, but now the polls are showing he is not. A Rubio vice-presidential nomination could help undercut the significance of the strength that Obama now has with the Latino community that he didn't have just two weeks ago." Dunn believes Republicans need to tread very carefully on the issue of immigration if they want to attract the Hispanic vote. Well over half of the more than 4,000 respondents in a recent OneNewsNow poll said "Hispanic support" would be the biggest asset Rubio would bring to the Romney ticket.

#### Rubio give Romney the edge in Florida.

AFP 7/3/12 (Michael Mathes, As Romney chills out on holiday, VP chatter heats up, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5gqc3WJzahAJ1Bc6NRXmjoT3R3IFQ?docId=CNG.f4459e0f53e077e76c4c5d00465deede.4e1)

Romney also has timely campaign decisions to make. Between now and the Republican convention in late August, he needs to zero in on the person he hopes will become his vice president after November's election. At least two potential picks will be in or near Wolfeboro this week. Senator Kelly Ayotte campaigned with Romney in her native New Hampshire at the start of his six-state bus tour last month, and she is joining the same July 4 parade as Romney, her office said. And Senator Rob Portman, a veteran Washington insider from the key swing state of Ohio, will attend a Saturday reception in Concord coordinated by New Hampshire Republicans. Several vice presidential candidates are still in the mix. Senator Marco Rubio could help Romney win the largest swing state of all, Florida, and neutralize Obama's advantage among Hispanics. Former Minnesota governor Tim Pawlenty has a personable working-man connection with voters that Romney, a multimillionaire former businessman and investor, lacks. The choice ultimately will be made by one person. "This is an election with one voter, Mitt Romney, and he gets to decide who he thinks should be the vice president of the United States," New Jersey Governor Chris Christie told CNBC, hinting he was open to the job.

#### **Voter purge means Romney wins Florida.**

DemocracyNow 6/28/12 (Florida Judge Rejects Federal Challenge to Voting Purge, http://www.democracynow.org/2012/6/28/headlines/florida\_judge\_rejects\_federal\_challenge\_to\_voting\_purge)

A federal judge in Florida has rejected the federal government’s effort to halt the state’s controversial voter purge. The Justice Department had asked the court to stop Florida’s effort to remove thousands of registered voters from the rolls, people Florida officials say are non-U.S. citizens. Critics say 87 percent of those targeted are people of color and say the purge is part of an effort to disenfranchise Democratic voters in a key election state. A number of Florida counties had already frozen their involvement following the Justice Department’s objections, but Wednesday’s ruling could mean the purge resumes.

### GOP Base Mobilized Now

#### GOP base mobilized now -- opposition to Obama causes a rally-around-Romney effect

**Malone, 6/7/12**

Jim Malone, “Romney Rising, Obama Slipping,” Voice of America News, 6-7-2012 (http://blogs.voanews.com/2012-election/2012/06/07/romney-rising-obama-slipping/)

We know the Republicans seem unified in their dislike for President Obama and a strong desire to throw him out of office.  This anti-Obama feeling will likely **trump any conservative hesitation about** Mitt **Romney** not being enough of a true-believer to turn out the party faithful. The best thing Romney has going for him right now is how negatively Republicans feel about the president — and not any enthusiasm they may have for the former Massachusetts governor. On the economy, the latest meager jobs numbers and a looming sense that the country may be headed for more rocky times in the months ahead are clearly bad news for the president.  This will help the Romney effort to make the election simply a referendum on President Obama, a simple thumbs-up or down on his first three years in office.

#### GOP base mobilized now because of the Wisconsin recall

**Malone, 6/7/12**

Jim Malone, “Romney Rising, Obama Slipping,” Voice of America News, 6-7-2012 (http://blogs.voanews.com/2012-election/2012/06/07/romney-rising-obama-slipping/)

Republican Scott Walker’s relatively easy win in the Wisconsin recall election has a lot for Republicans to cheer and just as much for Democrats to be concerned about.  Walker became a lightning rod for union activists and Democrats after he pushed the Wisconsin legislature to strip away most union collective bargaining rights. The showdown over Walker’s efforts to cut the state budget energized Democrats both in Wisconsin and around the country and sparked a recall effort to try and oust him from office. But **the recall attempt** also **energized Republicans**. Walker has become a conservative folk hero around the country for taking on unions and their Democratic allies in the legislature, just the kind of fight conservatives and Tea Party supporters were spoiling for.

The New York Times reports that some conservative activists are already talking Walker up as a possible candidate for national office one day. It says some might be tempted to push him as Romney’s running mate this year, though that seems unlikely. Democrats first were divided over who should run against Walker, eventually settling on Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett, who was not a favorite among the union activists.  It then came down to a turnout fight and in a possible harbinger of what may come in November, Republicans rallied to Walker’s side with help from independents and even a few Democrats who opposed the recall.

### Healthcare Ruling Doesn’t Impact Election

#### Healthcare decision doesn’t impact the elections

CNN 7/2/12 (CNN Poll: Health care ruling has not impacted race for White House, so far, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/02/cnn-poll-health-care-ruling-has-not-impacted-race-for-white-house-so-far/)

Thursday's landmark Supreme Court decision upholding the country's health care law appears to have had exactly zero impact on the presidential election so far, and has produced virtually no change in opinions on President Barack Obama or Republican challenger Mitt Romney, according to a new national poll. And while the CNN/ORC International survey released Monday indicates the president with a very slight three point edge over Romney among registered voters nationwide, the presumptive GOP nominee appears to hold an eight point advantage among voters who live in the 15 states considered in play in the race for the White House.

### Healthcare Ruling Helps Obama

#### Healthcare ruling helps Obama – increases fund raising an makes Republicans look weak

The Washington Times 6/28/12 (Dave Boyer, Obama hails ruling as win for ‘middle class’; justices hand tax issue to GOP, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/28/republicans-ruling-focuses-election-obamas-health-/?page=2)

The president joked this spring about the possibility of the court overturning his primary achievement. At the annual White House Correspondents’ Dinner, he said, “In my first term, we passed health care reform; in my second term, I guess I’ll pass it again.” Democratic strategists are feeling emboldened that the Supreme Court under conservative Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. has aided Mr. Obama’s agenda. “The late decisions by the Supreme Court this summer leaves the GOP’s agenda in tatters,” said Simon Rosenberg, president of NDN, a Democratic think tank in Washington. “Their efforts to overturn two administration efforts — immigration and health care reform — have failed. Obama comes out of this week much stronger, the Republicans weaker. His first term will now be seen as consequential, their opposition feckless.” The ruling also promised to boost campaign fundraising. The Romney campaign reported raising about $1 million in the first three hours after the decision was announced. Shortly after 9 p.m., Romney campaign spokeswoman Andrea Saul tweeted that Mr. Romney’s website had “raised $3.2 million online & counting!”

#### Healthcare ruling helps Obama – second chance for Obama to sell it.

Chicago Sun-Time 6/28/12 (Supreme Court ruling a boost to Obama, challenge for Romney, Lynn Sweet, http://www.suntimes.com/news/sweet/13467095-452/supreme-court-ruling-a-boost-to-obama-challenge-for-romney.html)

GOP opponent Mitt Romney has been vowing to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, and that was his main reaction after the 5-4 ruling. Much easier said than done. The ruling obviously is a boost for Obama’s re-election. However, it has also energized the opposition who may be more inclined now — that the differences are starker in the wake of the high court decision — to forget about the health care law Romney signed while Massachusetts governor. Romney has a specific challenge — tell people with more detail than he has so far just how more of the nation’s uninsured could get coverage. And his plan faces a laugh-test: How would it plausibly get through a divided Congress? Even if Romney wins the election this November, he could possibly face a GOP-controlled House and a Democratic-run Senate, just as it is now. Romney cannot erase Obamacare with a pen stroke. The Obama team, with the ruling, gets a second chance to make a first impression. The Tea Party movement dubbed the Obama law “Obamacare” from the get-go, and with a massive campaign against the law that many knew little about, drove public opinion against it. But something is happening along the way. People — no matter their ideology — are already getting benefits under the law Obama signed on March 23, 2010. While the Obama team may have flubbed selling “Obamacare” back then, they are now in a position to take back the name and use it with pride. That’s because a lot of the benefits are front-loaded, and the controversial provisions — such as the individual mandate upheld by the court that calls for everyone to buy insurance — don’t kick in until 2014. Right now — today — parents can keep kids up to 26 on their policies. People with pre-existing conditions are getting coverage. Some seniors are paying less for prescription medicines. People are entitled to get more preventative services without a co-pay. Come August, some people will start getting rebate checks of about $150 if the insurance carrier they use did not spend 80 percent of the premium on medical care. The Obama team has a particular expertise in collecting the stories of people. Sometimes through the years I have thought the technique overused. But not with this one. People who are getting treatment and coverage they otherwise would not have — and that includes peace of mind — have stories to tell that transcend partisan politics. Each of these stories — whether by paid media, word-of-mouth or social networking — is an ad for Obama. The reality Romney faces is that it is impossible for Republicans to repeal and replace the Obama health care law before the election. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) on Thursday said he scheduled a vote to repeal “Obamacare” on July 11.

### Healthcare Ruling hurts Obama

#### Healthcare ruling hurts Obama – energizes the GOP

Brown 6/28/12 (Lara M. Brown, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Villanova University, http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/does-the-supreme-courts-healthcare-ruling-help-obama/political-win-for-barack-obama-will-only-excite-the-gop)

But nothing excites a party more than a political loss. And so today, while Democrats are basking in the sunlight of this decision, Republicans are raising unbelievable amounts of money and strongly coalescing behind Romney's candidacy. Social conservatives and small government libertarians now believe their only hope to save America from becoming a European-style social democracy is to elect Mitt Romney and repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. If anything, the Supreme Court has helped the GOP more than it helped Obama. By ruling that the individual mandate is only constitutional because it's a tax, the Supreme Court has done two critical things to further the cause of conservatives: One, place a limiting principle on the commerce clause, which will surely become an important precedent; and two, allow the GOP to run against the Affordable Care Act as the "largest tax increase in history." Obama would do well to rein in his excitement and focus on making sure his party's base doesn't get too comfortable with this win. The seeds of destruction are often found in success.

#### Healthcare ruling helps Romney – fires up conservative - they’re already increasing donations.

USA Today 6/29/12 (By Aamer Madhani, Jackie Kucinich, and Susan Page, Analysis: Victory for Obama now, but what of election?, http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/judicial/story/2012-06-28/health-care-impact-election/55901880/1?csp=34news)

“It's obviously a big policy win in terms of the Affordable Care Act," says Phil Musser, a Republican strategist who was senior adviser for Tim Pawlenty's presidential bid. "But this will mobilize the hell out of conservatives in the fall." Mike Franc of the conservative Heritage Foundation says the financial impact of the law on the middle class will probably become a key Romney talking point on the campaign trail in the coming months. "It won't be the only talking point," he says, "but it will probably be the first one." The money started rolling in almost immediately after the decision. The conservative group Americans For Prosperity announced it was launching a $9 million advertising blitz today to make the case that Obama "forced through the largest tax in American history." By evening, Romney spokeswoman Andrea Saul announced the campaign had received more than $2.5 million in contributions. The Republican National Committee and conservative groups emphasized the court's rationale that the individual mandate — the heart of the law that allows the government to fine Americans who can afford coverage but don't purchase it — is constitutional only because the penalty "functions like a tax" and is therefore allowed under Congress' taxing power. In an interview in 2009, Obama had argued that the individual mandate was not a tax.

### A2: Transportation Thumper

#### Recent Bill didn’t impact election – but the plan still does.

Reuters 6/29/12 (US Congress to vote on transportation, student loan bill, http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/29/usa-transportation-idINL2E8HS60520120629)

Congressional negotiators have cleared the way for votes on legislation covering transportation construction, student loan rates, and flood insurance after finalizing a compromise agreement on how to pay for those priorities. The House and Senate were set to consider the measure on Friday, one day before temporary funding for highway, bridge and transit projects was to expire and three days before an increase in federal student loan rates was set to take effect. "We have a number of issues we're trying to work through," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said, expressing disappointment that Congress would not act on the legislation Thursday night. "That's the way it is." Congress took more than two years to reach a transportation bill covering millions of construction jobs, and did so only because the potential consequences of inaction in a shaky economy proved too risky in an election year. Ambitious proposals to shore up U.S. infrastructure gave way to a bill that basically keeps transportation funding at current levels. The blueprint was based on a bipartisan proposal by the Democratic-led Senate that is supported by the Obama administration.

## \*\*\*Uniqueness Prodicts/Indicts\*\*\*

### Experts Key/Online Prediction Markets bad

#### Expert predictions best – prediction markets and other online hacks should be ignored

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/17, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12510>)

To be honest, I’ve never been a big fan of Intrade, the Iowa Electronic Markets, or any of the other online prediction markets. People go to these sites and trade contracts or positions (read: take bets) on whether a given event will occur, such as which party will control the House or Senate (to the extent that anyone can control the Senate) after the next election, or which candidate will win the presidential race. The theory of collective intelligence—the rationale for paying attention to sites such as Intrade—was made by James Surowiecki in his 2004 book, The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies, and Nations. My bias is to listen to the experts. I am more likely to pay attention to a crowd if the crowd is composed of political analyst Stu Rothenberg, NBC Political Director Chuck Todd, and about a dozen other folks whose opinions I respect rather than a random mass of people who have their own opinions, often times with little to back them up. Pros have enormous amounts of experience and background knowledge about a subject. Rothenberg, Todd, and other professionals constantly work their contacts and scrutinize data, including polling data, that are not necessarily available to the public. What they say and think is worth considering. When we agree, I feel reassured; when we disagree, I go back and test my assumptions, just in case they are right and I am wrong. The system has worked well for me. Having said all of that, I’ve finally found a use for Intrade. The website is a very convenient way to quantify conventional wisdom. According to Intrade on a recent (Monday) night, President Obama had precisely a 58.8 percent chance of getting reelected. Apparently, his odds had dropped about six-tenths of 1 percentage point in the previous day. This decline is presumably a result of the crowd’s assessment of the impact of Obama’s endorsement of same-sex marriage (as if that will really have an impact six months from now). On that Monday, the Intraders saw Republicans as having a 74.9 percent chance of keeping their House majority. Democrats had a 29.8 percent chance of regaining the chamber. These predictions strain credibility a bit, as the odds add up to more to than 100 percent, but that’s another matter. On this one wager, the numbers are not too far off The Cook Political Report’s prediction that Republicans have a 75 percent chance of holding the House (and, yes, Democrats have a 25 percent chance of taking it). In the Senate, Intrade says that Republicans have a 56 percent chance of taking control (its phrase, not mine). Democrats have a 27.9 percent chance. My hunch is that the odds of neither side controlling the Senate are 100 percent. At The Cook Political Report, we see the Senate as purely a 50-50 proposition. But it’s the 58.8 percent chance of Obama winning that interests me today, because that prediction stands in stark contrast to what most pollsters, Democrats and Republicans alike, whom I talked with privately, believe. The number crunchers who conduct and analyze polls, and others who study these things closely, see a lot of metrics pointing to a very close contest that could go either way. They don’t see an election in which either Obama, or Mitt Romney, is likely to have an almost six-in-10 chance of winning. Take the polls, for example. The averages of all major national polls show the race as extremely close. Pollster.com gives Obama a 1.2-percentage-point lead over Romney, 46.3 percent to 45.1 percent. Realclearpolitics.com pegs Obama’s lead at 2 points, 47 percent to 45 percent. Gallup’s seven-day tracking poll puts the president’s lead at 1 point, 46 percent to 45 percent. Undecided voters, particularly, often break away from well-known, well-defined incumbents (the “what you see is what you get” rule for those in office). Does this really translate into a strong advantage for the president? Obama’s job-approval ratings are often “upside down” in pollster parlance, with disapprovals running higher than approvals in both Pollster.com (46.9 percent approve; 48.4 percent disapprove) and Realclearpolitics (48 percent approve; 48.5 percent disapprove). Gallup also shows 47 percent approve and disapprove numbers for the week of May 7-13. Is that really a decisive edge? In terms of the Electoral College, seven states—Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia—are likely to be extremely close. New Hampshire might also be tight. (I am increasingly skeptical that Obama can win North Carolina.) I pay a lot of attention to the top-dollar surveys by the Obama and Romney campaigns—and, for that matter, what highly regarded pollsters doing surveys for various senatorial and gubernatorial candidates and for ballot initiatives in the states say. I don’t put a lot of stock in the dime-store polls, which bloggers and Internet armchair analysts so avidly follow (ask them about calling cell phones; that separates the top-notch pollsters from the cut-rate crowd). Don’t get me wrong: I’m not predicting that Obama will lose. I’m only pointing out that the discrepancy is real between what the pros on the sidelines and those in the press box are seeing, versus those with the view from the cheap seats. Just sayin’.

### "likely voter” Polls Bad

#### Likely voter polls flawed

**Silver, 12**

(Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models – <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/>)

Likewise, most of the polls we are seeing now are of registered voters or adults rather than likely voters. That is something that needs to be accounted for. Usually a shift from registered voters to likely voters will improve the Republican candidate’s standing by a couple of points because Republican voters are older, wealthier and more likely to turn out in the average election. On the other hand, I do not think it is a good strategy to look solely at likely voter polls while ignoring the others. Some survey firms that use likely voter models have a history of a partisan skew in their polls that has nothing to do with the likely voter model itself.

### Job approval polls key/ Head to head polls bad

#### Only obama’s approval rating matters – head to head polls irrelevant

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 3/29, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12313

When you look back at Barack Obama’s 7-point victory over John McCain in 2008, think of a four-legged stool. Obama needed each leg to support his candidacy. One leg was independent voters (29 percent of the vote); they chose Obama over McCain by 8 percentage points, 52 percent to 44 percent. The second leg was young voters, ages 18-29 (18 percent of vote); they broke for Obama by 34 percentage points, 66 percent to 32 percent. The third leg was Latinos (9 percent); they favored Obama by 36 points, 67 percent to 31 percent. And, finally, African-Americans (18 percent) backed Obama by 91 percentage points, 95 percent to 4 percent. To win reelection, Obama doesn’t need to match those performances, unless he dramatically underperforms with other demographic groups. But he needs to get relatively close to them to build a sufficient popular-vote cushion to assemble 270 electoral votes. Let’s focus for now on just one leg of the stool, the young voters. Visit any college campus today, and you are likely to sense a lack of passion and energy for Obama. It’s far from clear that he can reproduce the unusually strong turnout among younger voters that he sparked in 2008 or match the 66 percent performance level he achieved then. The data back up the doubts. Gallup tracking surveys in January and February recorded Obama’s job-approval rating at 52 percent and 54 percent, respectively, among 18-to-29-year-olds. The polling suggests he would win the majority of the youth vote, but not anything close to 66 percent. As with other key voter groups, Obama’s numbers with young Americans are better than they were last fall, when his approval ratings among that sector were typically in the mid-to-high 40s. The pattern is a common theme across so many voter groups: Obama is doing better, but his gains aren’t enough to put him close to 2008 levels. You may have noticed that I tend to focus on job-approval numbers rather than trial-heat figures from candidate matchups. Historically, when you have a president seeking reelection, the approval ratings for that incumbent are better measures of voter support than the trial-heat figures. When an incumbent is running, the election is usually a referendum on that person rather than a choice between two people.

### A2: Presidential forecasting models bad

#### Despite flaws – forecasting models accurately predict likely winner

**Sides, 12** (John, Prof polis ci @ G. Washington, 3/12, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/29/in-defense-of-presidential-forecasting-models/?partner=rss&emc=rss>)

Part of Nate’s critique has to do how these models are sometimes (though not universally) constructed and modified. For example, he criticizes ad hoc adjustments to models to account for idiosyncratic features of a single election — fitting the model to noise rather than signal, as it were. I agree. He has also noted that elections forecasts have a lot of uncertainty and that more could be done to emphasize this. I agree with that, too. In fact, elections forecasters often raise similar points by way of critiquing of each other. But I am less critical of the accuracy of these models than is Nate. For one, forecasters have different motives in constructing these models. Some are interested in the perfect forecast, a goal that may create incentives to make ad hoc adjustments to the model. Others are more interested in theory testing — that is, seeing how well election results conform to political science theories about the effects of the economy and other “fundamentals.” Models grounded in theory won’t be (or at least shouldn’t be) adjusted ad hoc. If so, then their out-of-sample predictions could prove less accurate, on average, but perfect prediction wasn’t the goal to begin with. I haven’t talked with each forecaster individually, so I do not know what each one’s goals are. I am just suggesting that, for scholars, the agenda is sometimes broader than simple forecasting. Second, as Nate acknowledges but doesn’t fully explore (at least not in this post), the models vary in their accuracy. The average error in predicting the two-party vote is 4.6 points for Ray Fair’s model, but only 1.72 points for Alan Abramowitz’s model. In other words, some appear better than others — and we should be careful not to condemn the entire enterprise because some models are more inaccurate. Third, if we look at the models in a different way, they arguably do a good enough job. Say that you just want to know who is going to win the presidential election, not whether this candidate will get 51 percent or 52 percent of the vote. Of the 58 separate predictions that Nate tabulates, 85 percent of them correctly identified the winner — even though most forecasts were made two months or more before the election and even though few of these forecasts actually incorporated trial heat polls from the campaign. This view reflects my “forest, not the trees” approach to consuming these models. I assume that any individual model will always have errors. I assume that although some forecasters are historically more accurate than others, no one has some special forecasting sauce that makes his model the best. So when I see a range of forecasts, I tend to look at the direction that forecast is pointing. That tells me who is likely to win. Looked at this way, the “forest” will rarely lead me astray in “Dewey Defeats Truman” fashion. Perhaps that’s a low bar, but that’s all I am looking for. (And, as Election Day draws closer, there will always be purely poll-based forecasts to draw on as well, both nationally and within states.) To be sure, the forest-not-trees approach does not render criticisms of forecasting models irrelevant. Moreover, forecasters themselves often use “the trees” — i.e., errors in any one model’s predictions — to evaluate the models. So Nate is entirely justified in using these metrics himself. I am also not suggesting that problems in forecast models should be ignored as long as they get the winner right — after all, some models called the winner correctly but overestimated his vote share by 10 points — or that the models cannot be improved, or that there might be better ways of forecasting elections than any of these models. I am simply suggesting that viewed at a distance, the models will rarely “fail” (as the headline of Nate’s post has it) in a way that misleads the average person who follows politics and wants to know only who’s the likely winner, but doesn’t care about root-mean-square error.

## \*\*\*Obama Bad Links\*\*\*

### 2NC General Wall

#### First – extend our 1NC H.N.T.B. ev. It proves transportation funding is surprisingly popular amongst likely voters. It also shows that the issue can swing the election.

#### It single handedly swings votes

**A.D.S. ‘12**

A.D.S. Logistics – This article internally quotes the HNTB Report, a survey conducted by Kelton Research – Our staff of authors at ADS Logistics are pulled from all of our different divisions. Collectively they have over 100 years of experience in the metals, transportation, and supply chain management industry, which they comb through on a daily basis to bring you the best and most important information that you need to know – ADS Logistics Supply Chain Management Blog –

“Transportation Infrastructure Weighs Heavy on the Minds of Voters” – May 29, 2012 – 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. Why Do Voters Care? Though people may not discuss this issue as much as they talk about hot topics, it is easy to see why it is important to most. When highways and bridges are left to deteriorate, they become unsafe for travel. In addition, when new roads and bridges are not being built as the population grows, travel becomes more difficult. A crumbling infrastructure is not just unsafe, it is also unappealing, as some older roads and bridges have simply become eyesores that passers-by and local residents alike do not want to look at. Putting additional money into improving the infrastructure, therefore, can increase safety, travel, and appeal. So it should be obvious now why so many voters will consider this issue when voting in the upcoming election

#### Every voting demographic loves it – they *perceive* economic benefit and support federal funding

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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. 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

#### Passage is key to Obama’s jobs pitch – he gets credit and it swings the election – even GOP voters support spending

**Cooper, 12**

(Donna, Senior Fellow Economic Policy, Center For American Progress, 1/25, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure\_sotu.html)

Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending? President Obama’s Defeat Is More Important than Job Creation 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.

#### It’s the number one voter priority

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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.”

### Ext – Voters Perceive Economic benefit

#### Voters love it – perceive as key to econ and demonstrate effective governance

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

 The Bottom Line: Voters of all political stripes are tired of partisan gridlock in Washington—they want leaders to work together and seek compromise to get things done for the country. They overwhelmingly say elected leaders should cooperate when it comes to transportation infrastructure, seeing improvement in this area as a way to improve the economy, make communities safer, and improve Americans’ quality of life. And while voters oppose some funding streams they widely endorse others, and they clearly see a need for reform when it comes to financing transportation projects.

### Ext – Key Jobs Agenda

#### Key to Obama election – jobs perception, key campaign issue, media raises profile

**Johnson, 12** (Fawn, Correspondent, National Journal, 2/17, <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/infrastructure-becomes-campaig.php>)

Infrastructure Becomes Campaign Fodder 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.

#### Voters pay attention – it’s a key issue for them

**Callen ‘9**

ZACHARY A CALLEN – THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO – “THE SEAMS OF THE STATE: INFRASTRUCTURE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN AMERICAN STATE BUILDING” – A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO – THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE – AUGUST – http://gradworks.umi.com/3369449.pdf

Further, spatial development continues to be a salient political issue into the present day. In 2006, there was conflict over shipping ports that were sold to a foreign company based in Dubai. Much of the concern that originated about this sale related directly to issues of security and questions over where companies that controlled the entrance of goods to American shores should be housed (Sanger, 2006; Sanger and Lipton, 2006). More closely tied to daily experience, following the astronomic rise of gas prices in the summer of 2008, there was increased discussion about mass transit in American cities. Related to automobiles, but more grimly, the bridge collapse in Minnesota during the summer of 2007 raised serious questions about the age and maintenance of American infrastructure (Wald, 2008). The increasing costs and risks of infrastructure maintenance has actually led some states, such as Indiana, to turn over the operation of toll roads to private companies, an action that generated considerable debate (Desk, 2006). Thus, far from being a settled concern, infrastructure projects continue to generate considerable debate, conflict, and attention from voters. The issue that perhaps speaks most strongly to the ongoing pertinence of infrastructure politics is, of course, the sizable role infrastructure played in the most recent presidential campaign. Following his victory, Barack Obama made a sizable commitment to infrastructure repair and development as part of his economic development package in early 2009. Interestingly, an important facet of Obama's plan is the building of several high speed rail corridors throughout the country. Significantly, Obama's infrastructure plans also directly relate to the problem of federalism in American political development. The components of Obama's stimulus package that are geared towards infrastructure programs build directly on local projects, with federal funds being being utilized to jump start state and city e orts stalled by the economic recession (Baker and Broder, 2008). Thus, local competition for limited local resources continues to color modern infrastructure construction, much as in the antebellum period. As evidenced by these brief, contemporary anecdotes, space and how it should be organized within a federal system continues to be a topical political issue that challenges human ingenuity and sparks heated political conflict within the American federal system.

#### It’s the centerpiece of jobs agenda – swings election

**USA Today, 12** (5/1, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2012-05-01/federal-transportation-highway-bill/54660278/1>)

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.

#### Swings election – high profile and perceived as key jobs issue

**Lawder, 12** (David, Journalist @ Reuters, Reuters, 6/8, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/usa-infrastructure-boehner-idINL1E8H7AH320120607>)

Signaling that hopes for a deal on a transportation construction bill may be fading, U.S. House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner on Thursday floated the idea of a six-month extension of current funding to push the issue past the November elections. Boehner told reporters that if House and Senate negotiators fail to agree on new long-term funding by June 30, when the latest stop-gap authority for road, bridge and rail transit projects expires, he would not want another short-term extension. "Frankly, I think if we get to June 30, there would be a six-month extension and move this thing out of the political realm that it appears to be in at this moment," Boehner said. 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. Boehner said he still wanted agreement on a long-term transport bill. But House members are preparing to depart from Washington for another recess next week, leaving just two weeks to reach a deal, pass it through both chambers and get a signature from President Barack Obama. Four weeks of haggling so far has produced little progress on core differences. "I'm very hopeful that they will get into serious discussions quickly," Boehner said. A major sticking point in the House-Senate negotiations over the two-year, $109 billion transportation bill passed by the Senate is House Republicans' insistence on including approval of TransCanada Corp's $7 billion Keystone XL oil pipeline. Asked whether Boehner would insist on Keystone approval as a condition of a six-month extension or agree to a "clean" extension of current law, Boehner's spokesman, Kevin Smith, said no decisions have been made at this point. President Barack Obama opposes any move to fast-track the project until new environmental reviews are completed. The 1,700-mile pipeline, which would carry crude from Canadian oil sands to Texas refineries, was not included in a compromise offer made by lead Senate negotiators Barbara Boxer, a Democrat, and James Inhofe, a Republican. Boehner also has had a difficult time getting his own caucus to support a transportation bill -- even one with Keystone and new oil drilling rights included -- because of its costs. Many fiscal conservatives backed by the Tea Party movement will not support a multibillion spending bill at a time of high budget deficits. DELIBERATE ROADBLOCKS? Since presenting the Senate plan on Tuesday, Boxer has not received a counteroffer from House negotiators in the closed-door talks. The senator from California complained that another extension would exhaust the Highway Trust Fund because it is currently not collecting enough gasoline taxes to support current project spending levels. The fund is expected to be depleted sometime after Oct. 1. "I am very disappointed that Speaker Boehner is even talking about a long-term transportation extension, which would lead to the Highway Trust Fund going bankrupt, when all of our efforts must be focused on passing a transportation bill by the June 30th deadline, Boxer said in a statement. "Three million jobs and thousands of businesses are at stake." Although the current extension is keeping projects going that have already started, the uncertainty over long-term funding is hampering states' ability to proceed with long-term projects, preventing the hiring of hundreds of thousands of idled construction workers. Construction was particularly hard-hit in May's dismal U.S. jobs data released last week, with employment in the sector falling 28,000 during the month. House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi accused Republican leaders on Thursday of trying to undermine Obama by deliberately holding up the transport bill and thus keeping the U.S. economy weak for political gains in November's elections. "They're afraid of passing a transportation that would save more than 2 million jobs, that puts hundreds of thousands of construction workers back on the job," she said.

#### Plan perceived as highly visible jobs win – key to election

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO, Soul of America, 1/25, <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

As much as I’d like to disagree, I think you are correct. The Tea Party GOP is determined not to show any more infrastructure success under President Obama at this time. Team Obama realized this fact, so they didn’t name Transportation funding in his SOTU comment “Split the savings from Defense drawdown to rebuild America and pay down the Debt.” Team Obama deliberately withheld that contentious point so the GOP could not pounce on it in post-SOTU media coverage this week. But Obama will have plenty of time to talk and negotiate Transportation funding in the 9 weeks preceding March 31st. Two factors MAY simultaneously occur to change GOP negotiation about Surface Transportation before that date. 1. If Obama’s poll numbers rise, while Congress’ poll numbers remain static by late March, a small group of Congressional GOP, may break from the Tea Party’s iron fist for reasons of self-preservation. Yes the Tea Party will threaten to cut them from funding, but if some Congressional GOP don’t show serious attempts at job creation through at least Highway projects that their constituency can see, they’ll be hitting the bricks after November anyway. 2. In the next 2-3 weeks American public’s appetite for GOP personal attacks will wane. Even though many voters are disappointed that more jobs have not been created on Obama’s watch, they have not seen Gingrich, Santorum or Romney detail realistic job creation plans. To become the GOP presidential nominee, one of them must differentiate from the pack and Transportation funding is a proven means to illustrate realistic job creation. So Congress may negotiate a Transportation bill that includes Highway, Transit and some HSR funding.

#### Gives Obama a key win – swings election

**Laing, 12** (Keith, Transportation Columnist @ The Hill, 6/12, <http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/highways-bridges-and-roads/231939-house-senate-highway-funding-talks-veering-toward-stalemate>)

But one transportation industry source said on Friday that Boehner raising the possibility of what would be a tenth temporary extension of current highway funding, as well as the recent barbs thrown between Senate Majority Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.), showed the talks are now on “life support.” “I think House GOP, led by Cantor, is trying to run out the clock to the fall election and deny Obama a win,” the source told The Hill. Reid accused Cantor last week of trying to sabotage the U.S. economy by blocking an agreement on the transportation bill, a suggestion that was called “bull----” by a spokesman for Boehner. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (Calif.) echoed the sentiment from Reid, saying the GOP only wanted to approve extensions even though they are “using up the trust fund, the highway trust fund, they are hurting job creation — in fact people will lose jobs — and it's just the wrong thing to do." The sharp rhetoric from the highest-ranking leaders in both political parties is causing supporters of the multiyear highway bill to become more pointed in their comments about the ongoing congressional negotiations. “We’re doing more than urging them; we’re calling them out,” Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa (D) said on a conference call organized by the U.S. Conference of Mayors on Friday.

#### Plan swings election – key to economic message and outweighs spending turn

**Reuters, 12** (2/13, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/13/us-usa-budget-idUSTRE8191MJ20120213>)

Obama's 2013 spending proposal is expected to go nowhere in a divided Congress and is widely seen as more of a campaign document that frames his economic pitch to voters and seeks to shift the focus from deficits to economic growth. It fleshed out a major theme of his re-election campaign: "economic fairness." Obama wants wealthier Americans to bear more of the burden of slashing a federal deficit that was a trillion plus dollars for a fourth year in a row. The $3.8 trillion budget proposal is a "reflection of shared responsibilities," the Democratic president said at a campaign-style event in Annandale, Virginia, referring to his call for a minimum 30 percent tax on millionaires. Obama would like to use revenue from the so-called "Buffet Rule," named after billionaire investor Warren Buffett, to replace the Alternative Minimum Tax, which is aimed at ensuring the wealthy pay at least some tax but is now catching many middle class taxpayers. In one of his best platforms to lay out his economic priorities before the November 6 election, Obama called for more than $800 billion for job creation and infrastructure investment, including billions of dollars for roads, railways and schools. Analysts were skeptical of the proposals. "This is all politics; there is no fundamental strategy. This does not answer any of the warnings we saw from S&P," said William Larkin, fixed income portfolio manager at Cabot Money Management in Salem, Massachusetts. Standard & Poor's ratings agency last year cut the United States' top-notch AAA credit rating, citing concerns that Washington lacked the political will to tackle rising debt levels. The annual budget deficit was projected at $1.33 trillion in fiscal 2012, or 8.5 percent of gross domestic product, falling to $901 billion in 2013, or 5.5 percent of GDP. "The president's budget is a gloomy reflection of his failed policies of the past, not a bold plan for America's future. It is bad for job creation, our economy, and America's seniors," said House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner, the top Republican in Congress. Republicans also highlighted Obama's pledge in 2009 to halve the deficit by 2013, a target that he has failed to meet. The White House argues the depth of the recession he faced when he took office demanded emergency spending, and that it was more important to protect growth than impose austerity measures to trim the deficit. Obama's plan sets aside money to hire more teachers, police and firefighters and invest in manufacturing, while extending tax breaks to spur hiring, in an appeal to voters who remain worried about the economic recovery. "At a time when our economy is growing and creating jobs at a faster clip, we've got to do everything in our power to keep this recovery on track," Obama said. Republicans paint the president as a tax and spend liberal while Obama, who will take his plan on the road later this week in a trip to Wisconsin, California and Washington state, casts them as the party of the rich. The budget projects deficits remaining high this year and next before starting to decline, meaning more borrowing that will add well over $7 trillion to the national debt over the next decade. DEAD ON ARRIVAL Congress is free to ignore the plan and Republicans, who control the U.S. House of Representatives, have made clear that it will be dead on arrival as their party prepares an election battle over taxes, spending and the size of the government.

#### Its highly visible – plan gives Obama his biggest legislative victory of year

**Freemark, 12**

Yonah Freemark is an independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, from which he graduated in May 2008 with a BA in architecture. He writes about transportation and land use issues for The Transport Politic and The Infrastructurist, 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

Even so, it remains to be seen how the Administration will approach the development of a transportation reauthorization program. Such legislation remains on the Congressional agenda after three years of delays (the law expires on March 31st). There is so far no long-term solution to the continued inability of fuel tax revenues to cover the growing national need for upgraded or expanded mobility infrastructure. But if it were to pass, a new multi-year transportation bill would be the most significant single piece of legislation passed by the Congress in 2012.

### Ext – All Voting Demographics love it

#### Overwhelming bipartisan public support – key issue for voters

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

Even with a highly polarized electorate that remains steadfast in its belief that things in the nation are off on the wrong track there is wide agreement—across the partisan spectrum—that leaders in Washington should be seeking common ground. Nowhere is this more true than legislation related to the country’s transportation infrastructure. Indeed, two in three voters say that making improvements in infrastructure is very important, and most voters say that in its current state the nation’s transportation system is barely adequate. Voters seek better and safer roads and more public transportation options, widely agreeing that the United States would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

#### It’s a key issue and all voting demographics love it

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

Two in three voters say that improving the nation’s infrastructure is highly important, and many say our current infrastructure system is inadequate. 66% of voters say that improving the country’s transportation infrastructure is extremely (27%) or very (39%) important. Another 27% say it is somewhat important. Just 6% say it is not important. Again, majorities of Democrats (74%), independents (62%), and Republicans (56%) say this is very or extremely important, as do 59% of Tea Party supporters.

### 2NC Effective Governance link

#### Plan is the single most important issue to demonstrate effective governance

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

Key Findings 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.

#### That’s key to Obama victory and independent voters – regardless of plans popularity

**Marshall, 10** (Will, President and Founder of PPI, Progressive Policy Institute, Politico.com, 3/17, http://progressivepolicy.org/tag/deficits-and-debt/page/3)

Obama was elected on a promise to tackle the nation’s biggest challenges — with health reform as Exhibit A. Independent voters have drifted away from his winning 2008 coalition during the past year, in part because they are losing confidence in the Democrats’ ability to govern. The party may thus have more to fear from wasting a year to produce nothing than from passing a controversial bill. Failure won’t just make Democrats look bad; it will also vindicate the Republicans’ hyperpartisan campaign to torpedo comprehensive reform.

### 2NC Florida Link

#### Transportation investment massively popular in Florida– key to perception of effective economic policy

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Florida Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-ohio.pdf>)

Like the rest of the country, Florida’s state budget and economy face significant challenges. These challenges also create the opportunity – indeed the imperative – to revisit existing programs and ask if Florida is really getting everything it can from them. Right now, voters do not think the current approach is working. Polling nationwide shows people are dissatisfied with the economy and believe the nation is on the wrong track. People do not trust their state with their money. Only 10% of voters think the government spends money wisely, while fully 86% of voters think their state does a fair or poor job. Moving forward, Americans do think there is a better way. In a recent survey by Hart Research Associates, 68% of those polled believe “now is the time for the state to invest in transportation because if done right these investments will create new jobs and attract new businesses.” Voters are clear about their hopes for their state, and Smart Growth America has practical solutions to help make that vision a reality. In the following pages we outline an innovative, yet common sense approach to transportation spending that cuts costs, creates jobs, attracts businesses, and clearly shows that the state is responding to the fiscal and economic crisis with strong leadership that is not satisfied with a system that makes fair or poor use of taxpayer dollars.

### Ext – Florida Link

#### Massively popular in Florida – key issue, swings voter perception and not perceived as wasteful spending

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Florida Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-florida.pdf>)

The Need: If it continues on its current path, Florida’s transportation system is on track to become highly expensive, uncompetitive, and unsafe. Florida has invested heavily in transportation, but declining revenues and escalating debt service will reduce the state’s ability to maintain its facilities in a state of good repair. Carrying on business as usual will result in a deteriorated road network, inadequate transit network, and a six- to ten-fold increase in repair costs resulting from neglect and deferred maintenance. The Smart Solution: Florida is at a crossroads. While there is still a sizable gap between revenue and the large wish list of projects, this gap can be closed if the state makes strategic decisions about how to get the highest return on its investment. By making fiscally responsible choices about the state’s transportation priorities, Florida can not only save money and create jobs, but it can also help preserve the transportation system and create a more welcoming business climate on the mid- and long-term horizons. Spending more on repair and maintenance is a good investment: it saves the state money, saves citizens money, is a superior job creator, and is very popular among voters. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), every $1 spent to keep a road in good condition avoids $6-14 needed later to rebuild the same road once it has deteriorated. In addition, poor roads add an average of $335 to the annual cost of owning a car – in some cities an additional $740 more – due to damaged tires and suspensions and reduced fuel efficiency. While Florida has invested heavily in repair and maintenance in recent years, insufficient investment over the long-term has led to a backlog of roads and bridges in “poor” and “deficient” condition requiring $83 million annually in major rehabilitation costs over the next twenty years. Cont… Public transportation is popular with voters November 2010 National Poll by Hart Research Associates: 73% of those polled rated “the number of jobs created in the long term that would remain in [my] community” as the most important factor in developing the state transportation plan. 61% regardless of their party affiliation (and 57% of Independents) said they would feel more positively about a governor who favors a plan that “provides more choices such as buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail.” 64% said “buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail were a good or very good value for the cost.” March 2010 National Poll by Public Opinion Strategies and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates: 66% of respondents agreed they would like more transportation options available to them. 69% agreed their community would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system. Cont… With these smart transportation approaches, the leaders of Florida can demonstrate to voters the ability to be fiscally responsible while growing the economy.

### 2NC Labor Unions Link

#### AFL CIO Loves transportation spending

**Laing, 12** (Keith, Transportation Columnist @ The Hill, 6/12, <http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/highways-bridges-and-roads/231939-house-senate-highway-funding-talks-veering-toward-stalemate>)

Supporters of a multiyear bill found reason to cheer Friday when the House voted to defeat a motion to instruct conferees to limit spending levels on the proposed transportation bill. “An overwhelming House majority…rejected a motion that would have done serious damage to our nation’s transportation system and delivered a deathblow to our economy,” AFL-CIO Transportation Trades Department President Ed Wytkind said in a statement. The motion, from Rep. Paul Broun (R-Ga.), called for limiting spending on the highway bill to the amount of money that is collected through the 18.4 cents-per-gallon gas tax.

#### key to Obama victory – plan revitalizes their support

**Boyer, 12** (Dave, Columnist, Washington Times, 2/17)

Mr. Obama "is certainly indebted to organized labor," Mr. Semmens said. At the same time, some union leaders have been diverting resources away from national Democratic campaign committees and toward states such as Wisconsin and Ohio where Republicans have waged campaigns to eliminate or roll back collective-bargaining rights. AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka has spoken of a new strategy of labor forging an independent voice separate from the Democratic Party. Mr. Trumka also voiced anger last summer with Mr. Obama for his negotiations with congressional Republicans on debt reduction. Since then, Mr. Obama has promoted a plan to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to create construction jobs and to hire more teachers and police officers. In what is viewed as a tight presidential election, Mr. Obama's campaign team will need enthusiastic union support for a strong get-out-the-vote effort. Several trade unions have threatened to boycott the Democratic National Convention in Charlotte, N.C., because of its location in a right-to-work state and their disappointment with the weak economy.

### Ext – Labor Unions Love plan

#### Massive labor union support – high priority

**Siemers, 12**

(Erik, staff, Portland business journal, 1/27,

<http://www.bizjournals.com/portland/print-edition/2012/01/27/state-explores-private-equity.html?page=all>)

He noted how there’s a growing interest from labor unions in using funds from pensions and other investment assets on infrastructure projects. An example of that came in November, when the American Federation of Teachers — through the union-owned financial services firm Ullico Inc. — said it would invest up to $15 million in infrastructure and energy efficiency projects at Oregon schools. Ullico spokesman Bill Thornton said the company has placed a high priority on infrastructure investments, particularly projects such as toll-roads and sewage treatment plants that generate revenue while also putting union labor to work.

#### labor unions and business lobby love it

**Hastings, 12**

Doc, Chair, National Resources Committee, US House of Reps, 2/1, <http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=277534>

Business and Labor Organizations Support Republican Plan to Expand American Energy Production, Create Jobs, and Fund Critical Infrastructure

Organizations representing various sectors including agriculture, manufacturing, and energy are joining multiple labor unions to call for passage of energy portions of the American Energy & Infrastructure Jobs Act, a common sense Republican plan to expand American energy production, create jobs and fund high-priority infrastructure projects. What They’re Saying: U.S. Chamber of Commerce “This suite of bills would create jobs while keeping energy prices low, a true win-win scenario for American consumers.” Laborers International Union of North America LIUNA believes that expanding access to America’s domestic energy resources will create good jobs, lower energy prices and generate desperately needed new revenues. The fact that these revenues are intended to help pay for desperately needed infrastructure improvements is a win/win for the American people.” International Union of Operating Engineers Simply put, without an increase in employment in the construction economy, sluggish growth will continue to plague the American macro economy. These will be good-paying jobs for U.S. workers, and this legislation should be a congressional priority.” United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

### Ext – New Jobs Bill Key to Labor Support

#### Gives Obama a win on a key issue for labor - prevents them from bailing

**Bedard, 11** (Paul, Columnist @ US News and World Report, 8/25, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2011/08/25/afl-cio-threatens-obamas-re-election-over-jobs-)

AFL-CIO Threatens Obama's Re-Election Over Jobs The AFL-CIO, worried that President Obama's long-awaited September jobs announcement will be inadequate, is threatening to boycott the Democratic National Convention and maybe the 2012 elections unless bold action is taken to ease unemployment. "If they don't have a jobs program I think we'd be better to use our money doing other things," said AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka. [Check out editorial cartoons about the economy.] The leader of the nation's largest union, who regularly visits the White House to talk with Obama, sounded a warning today that he is worried that the president will simply propose "nibbly" things to spark some job creation instead of laying out a bold plan and promising to challenge Republicans in Congress to pass it. "People are frustrated and the more jobs aren't created, the more they're gonna get frustrated with everybody," he said in a Christian Science Monitor newsmaker roundtable breakfast. "This is going to be a moment when history and our members are going to judge him and they are going to be making an opinion. And if he puts all of his emphasis and focus on jobs creation, it's going give them one picture," said Trumka. "And if he continues to do little nibbly things around the end that aren't going to make a difference and aren't going to solve a problem, that will give another picture." [Read: Seven Ways Obama Can Gain Credibility on Jobs.] Besides suggesting that his national union won't attend the convention unless a big new jobs program is proposed, he also indicated that his union won't do much for Obama or Democrats in the 2012 elections. Asked if union participation in the election will drop, he said, "I think yes. I think the overall population participation will drop. Because people, if they think there's not going to be any solution they get upset." Oddly, he said that the union hasn't decided if it will participate in the convention though he said some affiliates already aren't going. That would be a slap at Obama. [See pictures of Obama behind the scenes.]

### Ext – Labor Key

#### Revitalizing labor support key to Obama election – because turnout, voter registration and fundraising – but support not resilient

**Flock, 12** (Elizabeth, columnist @ US News and World Report, 6/13, <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2012/06/13/afl-cio-redeploying-funds-from-obama-campaign-to-advocacy-and-infrastructure>)

The AFL-CIO has told Washington Whispers it will redeploy funds away from political candidates smack dab in the middle of election season, the latest sign that the largest federation of unions in the country could be becoming increasingly disillusioned with President Obama. The federation says the shift has been in the works for months, and had nothing to do with the president's failure to show in Wisconsin last week, where labor unions led a failed recall election of Governor Scott Walker. [See: Latest political cartoons] "We wanted to start investing our funds in our own infrastructure and advocacy," AFL-CIO spokesman Josh Goldstein told Whispers. "There will be less contributions to candidates," including President Obama. While there were "a lot of different opinions" about whether Obama should have gone to Wisconsin, according to Goldstein, "this is not a slight at the president." The AFL-CIO has been at odds with the president before Wisconsin on issues such as the public health insurance option and renewing the Bush tax cuts. The shift in funding is significant due to the federation's role in past presidential campaigns, where the AFL-CIO built up a massive political structure in the months leading up the election, including extensive "Get Out The Vote" efforts, as well as financial contributions.

**Unions Key**

**Cost, 12**

Jay Cost, “Beware the Union Label,” NPR, 6-12-2012 (http://www.npr.org/2012/06/12/154845061/weekly-standard-beware-the-union-label)

Public sector unions on the state and local levels have enjoyed enormous privileges for their 50 years of existence. Like their private sector counterparts, they have used collective bargaining to maximize their pay and benefits. Yet unlike trade and industrial unions, public sector unions essentially bargain with themselves. They are such an integral part of the Democratic coalition — delivering to Democratic candidates and causes not just money but massive numbers of voters and volunteers — that the party dare not defy them. Thus, "negotiations" between Democratic-led governments and public sector unions are really anything but.

### A2: Wisconsin Recall Proves Unions not key

#### Walker vote has no political lesson – recall made it unique

**Schultz, 12**

(Ed, The Ed Show, MSNBC, 6/6, lexis)

All of these Republicans are overlooking a very key fact here. A majority of Wisconsinites, 70 percent, in fact, said that they disagreed with the recall principle on its terms. NBC News exit polls showed only 27 percent of the voters said the recalls were appropriate for any reason, as long as people signed recall petitions. Sixty percent said recalls are appropriate only for official misconduct. Ten percent of Wisconsin voters said recalls are never appropriate. Not enough Wisconsinites -- this is the bottom line -- not enough Wisconsinites were convinced the recall was justified. Even if they don`t approve of Scott Walker, most Wisconsinites were not convinced he did enough to be removed from office. So the Republicans knew this, and they took advantage of it. Like Walker said, divide and conquer.

#### Labor union key even after Wisconsin -- still have huge numbers and money

**The Hill, 6/11/12**

The Hill, “Divisions in Dem Coalition Resurface,” 6-11-2012 (http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/231967-as-november-election-nears-splits-in-democratic-coalition-resurface)

Outside observers also suggest that reports of the demise of the union movement as a political force in the wake of the Wisconsin vote may be exaggerated. “What I expect to see is a weaker union movement that is less popular, but that doesn’t mean that public employee unions aren’t going to continue to be major players in electoral politics for the foreseeable future,” said Taylor Dark, a political science professor at California State University, Los Angeles, who is an expert on labor unions. “They will continue to have a lot of money and numbers.”

### 2NC Local Economic Targeting link

#### disproportionately targeted to key swing states – voters *perceive* key jobs benefits

**Bilotkach, 10**

Volodymyr, Department of Economics, University of California, Irvine, October, <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September)

The federal government plays a crucial role in the infrastructure investment in the United States, including allocation of funds to the airports. Given that airports are perceived to bring substantial benefits to the respective communities, federally funded airport infrastructure projects are both sought after, welcomed, and should be beneficial to the politicians capable of securing the funds. Complicated structure of the American political system creates possibilities for strong influence of political factors on the process of allocation of infrastructure investment funds. Understanding the role of politics in this area is of no trivial importance, as currently perception of the airports’ role is being revised. An increasing number of countries have started viewing airports as the firms rather than the infrastructure objects. Privatization and deregulation of the airports is also becoming more common. It is believed that involvement of the private sector will bring about efficiency gains, and that privately run airports may be more willing and able to contribute to solving the congestion problem. This study offers the first look at the issue of impact of political factors on the aviation infrastructure investment in the USA. We take advantage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (more broadly known as the Stimulus) to examine contribution of political factors to allocation of the $1.1 billion worth of the airport grants included into the package. The Stimulus provides an excellent case for studying political economy of airport (and more generally, infrastructure) investment, at least as far as involvement of the federal government is concerned. The law was set up rather hastily – Barack Obama was elected President in November of 2008, inaugurated on January 20, 2009, and ARRA became law on February 17, 2009. The criteria for the airport infrastructure projects to be funded under the ARRA were rather vague 2 . We can therefore suspect that the airport infrastructure grants could have been used by the Administration, or the Congress as a mechanism to reward districts which brought more votes in the latest election. Additionally, members of the corresponding Congress Committees (in particular, of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure) might have used ARRA as an opportunity to bring more money to their districts. Empirical research on the impact of politics on transport infrastructure investment deals mostly with the European data. The studies examining US evidence are rare, and include McFadden (1976) and Knight (2004). The former study looks at determinants of highway project selection by the California Division of Highways, while the latter examines congressional voting on transportation projects. Our data analysis showed the association between the airport’s location in the Congressional District with the larger Obama-McCain vote differential in November 2008 Presidential election, and the amount of the ARRA grant received by the airport. At the same time, district level election results are poor predictors of whether the airport receives the grant; and estimation results are not entirely robust to taking election results from the adjacent districts into consideration. We also detect rather robust evidence of the impact of Senate on the grant allocation process. This paper contributes to two broad strains of literature. First, we extend the literature on public provision of infrastructure. Research in this area has been addressing the issues of both effects of the publicly provided infrastructure on private sector productivity, and the determinants of the infrastructure investment. The former literature (e.g., Aschauer, 1989; Holz-Eakin, 1994) is much richer than the latter. Studies of the determinants of public infrastructure investment include Cadot et al. (2006), Castells and Sole-Olle (2005), Kemmerling and Stephan (2002, 2008), Fridstrom and Elvik (1997), Bel and Fageda (2009). All the listed papers study infrastructure investment in Europe, and the latter has the most relevance to our paper, as it examines (and confirms the existence of) the impact of political factors on airport investment in Spain. On the US side, we find a lot of studies asserting the disproportionate power of the Senate 3 (e.g., Hoover and Pecorino, 2005) and Congressional Committees (e.g., Garrett et al., 2006) in allocation of the federal funds across the jurisdictions. Garrett and Sobel (2003) find that states which are politically important to the president will have a higher rate of the disaster declaration; the authors also find the election year effects on the amounts of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) disaster payments. The only studies of political determinants of transport infrastructure investment in the US are McFadden (1976) – an examination of project choices by California Division of Highways, finding limited impact of political determinants on the selection process; as well as Knight (2004), asserting that congressmen respond to common pool incentives when voting for transportation projects.

#### That’s swings crucial states – regardless of national economic factors

**Skelley, 12**

Geoffrey Skelley, Political Analyst, U.Va. Center for Politics, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/unemployment-update-who-gets-the-credit/>

At the end of January, the Crystal Ball examined the latest state-by-state unemployment numbers and what they could mean for the presidential election. The fact that the nation’s economic difficulties have hit certain places harder than others could have a real impact on what we anticipate will be a close election in November. Our analysis suggested that the Obama campaign could tailor its economic message to each state based on the specific jobless conditions there. While critics of the president would surely prefer to point to statistics like labor-force participation, the unemployment figures presented below, while mixed, could be packaged to tell a positive story for the incumbent in some swing states. Obviously, the safe Blue and Red states on the chart are going to stick with their preferred party, even if their unemployment is high, as in the case of Democratic states (like California), or low, as in the case of Republican states (like the Dakotas). At the same time, the president would have trouble making a compelling case about jobs in Nevada or North Carolina, for instance — two states that he won in 2008 after George W. Bush won them in 2000 and 2004, and where unemployment, despite a downward trend, remains high. But he has a better argument in states where unemployment is below the national average.

*(Next Two Cards are optional)*

#### Specifically true for infrastructure investment

**Bilotkach, 10**

Volodymyr, Department of Economics, University of California, Irvine, October, <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September)

The literature suggests three possible sources of political influence: the White House (President), the US Senate, and the Congressional Committees. We hypothesize that the impact of the White House should be the strongest in this particular case – recall that passing the economic stimulus legislation was one of Barack Obama’s priorities as a candidate. As for hypotheses related to the impact of the White House, we can suppose that ARRA grants might have been used to reward districts which showed support to Obama, as evidenced by the election results. An alternative explanation – grants could be used to sway voters in the districts where support for Obama was not sufficiently strong – is less plausible, as the grants have been appropriated after the election and almost four years before the next Presidential election is scheduled to take place. Cont… Moreover, study of aviation related infrastructure offers an attractive environment for examining the more general issue of political factors behind the allocation of federal funds. Airports and airfields are ubiquitous, unlike, for instance, tornadoes or corn fields. Also, airports are generally viewed favorably by the public, unlike some other kinds of federally provided infrastructure (e.g., prisons). For this study, we make use of information on the airport infrastructure grants, appropriated under the ARRA of 2009. We supplement this data with airport characteristics, simple demographic measures, congressional district level results of November 2008 election (both Presidential and House), and Senate election results. Data analysis suggests the following general conclusions about the supposed impact of political factors on allocation of ARRA airport infrastructure grants. First, results of the presidential election appear to affect the amounts of grants, but do not have an impact on whether the airport receives the grant. Second, controlling for the State level composition of the Senate, we find that airports located in the States carried by a Republican at the latest Senate election show higher likelihood of obtaining the grant; the amounts involved are also higher. At the same time, airports located in States represented by two Democratic Party senators are also more likely to obtain the grants, other things equal. Third, we do not find strong evidence of impact of the House of Representatives election results or membership in Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Throughout the world, regulators have been reconsidering the role of the airports. Also, our understanding of the determinants of public infrastructure investment, and especially of the role of political factors, is far from complete. This study is one of the first attempts at looking into both issues together. We find that political factors matter. The next issue to be addressed – and the one which will require a more thorough investigation of these political factors – is what our results imply for such important public policy issues as airport regulation, privatization, and congestion.

#### That swings ohio and Virginia for obama

**Skelley, 12**

Geoffrey Skelley, Political Analyst, U.Va. Center for Politics, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/unemployment-update-who-gets-the-credit/>

Strategically, the Obama campaign wants to convince voters that the economy is in fact improving. Tactically, this has meant running ads in key swing states that generally promote Obama’s economic stewardship. Yet the campaign might be losing an opportunity if it doesn’t take greater ownership of positive state-specific numbers. Obama’s generic television ads might do more than simply target all the swing states as a bloc. Instead, he could focus on each state separately. If a state’s unemployment rate has improved over the past year, then the president’s campaign could run general election ads that trumpet the success. Ohio and especially Virginia are ideal for such advertising.

### A2: Obama Won’t Tailor local/state specific campaign

#### Obama will tailor campaign efforts to local factors and economic benefits

**Chicago Tribune, 12** (5/4, lexis)

Facing the reality of running their candidate as a bruised incumbent in a politically divided country, Obama's advisers say they are plotting a strategy that does not depend on a wave of support to lift the president's chances across the country. And it won't hinge on a single theme such as "change" that captured the zeitgeist in 2008. Instead, the Obama campaign is prepping for a block-by-block, hard-slog approach. The campaign, which the president kicks off this weekend, will be tailored to swing states and the key voters in those states. That means talking up the revival of manufacturing in Ohio. But in Virginia it means tapping into the growing suburban vote and using the state's GOP-controlled Legislature and Republican governor as a foil to energize female voters. "Each state's volunteers (will) help drive what is important for them to work on in that state," said campaign manager Jim Messina. Campaign advisers, however, stress that what voters in Columbus, Ohio, and Richmond, Va., hear from the president Saturday will not be inconsistent. "We are not the candidate who reinvents himself from week to week," David Axelrod, Obama's top campaign strategist, said in a dig at the GOP's Mitt Romney. Republicans, for their part, see this as an option of last resort for an incumbent who cannot run on his own record. "Overall, this will be a referendum on whether or not we want four more years of misery," said Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus. Even before the Obama campaign unveiled its national slogan, "Forward," its Ohio campaign had its own: "Made in Ohio." The slogan was rolled out on a media tour of auto manufacturing plants across northern Ohio -- a state he won by just 4 points in 2008.

### 2NC Ohio Link

#### Manufacturing groups love it

**Hastings, 12**

Doc, Chair, National Resources Committee, US House of Reps, 2/1, <http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=277534>

Business and Labor Organizations Support Republican Plan to Expand American Energy Production, Create Jobs, and Fund Critical Infrastructure Organizations representing various sectors including agriculture, manufacturing, and energy are joining multiple labor unions to call for passage of energy portions of the American Energy & Infrastructure Jobs Act, a common sense Republican plan to expand American energy production, create jobs and fund high-priority infrastructure projects. What They’re Saying: U.S. Chamber of Commerce “This suite of bills would create jobs while keeping energy prices low, a true win-win scenario for American consumers.” Laborers International Union of North America LIUNA believes that expanding access to America’s domestic energy resources will create good jobs, lower energy prices and generate desperately needed new revenues. The fact that these revenues are intended to help pay for desperately needed infrastructure improvements is a win/win for the American people.” International Union of Operating Engineers Simply put, without an increase in employment in the construction economy, sluggish growth will continue to plague the American macro economy. These will be good-paying jobs for U.S. workers, and this legislation should be a congressional priority.” United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Cont… National Association of Manufacturers “Access to affordable sources of energy is extremely important given that manufacturers use one-third of our nation’s energy supply… We welcome efforts by the House to create jobs through increased domestic energy production and investment in our transportation infrastructure. Manufacturers want to lead, and they can no longer afford to wait.”

#### That swings ohio – it’s the key issue in the key state

**King and Borger, 12** (John, CNN Anchor, Gloria, CNN Senior Political Analyst, CNN, 5/16, lexis)

We begin this evening with the campaign's biggest issue, the economy and jobs and in what arguably could end up being the defining battleground state, Ohio. Vice President Biden took the Obama campaign's case to blue-collar Youngstown today, casting Republican Mitt Romney as a son of privilege and Vice President Biden his record at a private investment firm suggests Governor Romney cares more about profits than workers. (BEGIN VIDEO CLIP) JOSEPH BIDEN, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: My mother and father dreamed as much as any rich guy dreams. (CHEERING AND APPLAUSE) BIDEN: They don't get us. They don't get who we are. (END VIDEO CLIP) KING: Now, where the vice president was today is you might say is a battleground within the battleground. Let's look at Ohio. This is the 2008 map. Barack Obama carried the state 52 percent to 47 percent, but, look, a lot of red in here for John McCain. President Obama, then Senator Obama won by winning where the people are. But look at this here. This is Youngstown. This is where the vice president was today. In the general election, then Senator Obama carried it quite convincingly. But let's go back to the Democratic primaries. Look at this. This was Hillary Clinton country. You have white blue-collar workers. And I am going to bring the state back now. Look at this. Hillary Clinton carried Ohio big-time. Senator Obama winning where you have African-American populations, but among white blue-collar workers back in 2008, that was a big problem for Senator Obama. That's the reason they sent Vice President Biden here into Youngstown, Ohio. Now, why will this be a battleground in the fall? Well, because it always is. Let's go back and take a look. This is the 2008 election. Again, Senator Obama winning a decent margin there, 52-47. But that's pretty close. If you go back to 2004, George W. Bush just barely winning. What's different about 2008 and 2004? Look down here. Hamilton County, Cincinnati area down here, President Obama, then Senator Obama, then carried it then. Make that go off. President Bush carried it in '04. President Bush carried it in 2000 as well. Also the suburbs around Cleveland, the suburbs around Columbus and again that area down around Cincinnati, those are the big battlegrounds in a general election in Ohio. Watch for the candidates to be there in the weeks ahead. Now, Governor Romney not in Ohio today. He was in another huge battleground state, down here in Florida. But -- but he had the industrial states like Ohio, jobs debate in mind, as he drew this contrast. (BEGIN AUDIO CLIP) MITT ROMNEY (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: We are able to help create over 100,000 jobs. And, secondly, on the president's watch, about 100,000 jobs were lost in the auto industry in auto dealers and auto manufacturers. So he is hardly one to point a finger. (END AUDIO CLIP) KING: Our chief political analyst, Gloria Borger, is here. You hear Governor Romney talking about the auto industry, manufacturing, jobs. That will be key in battleground, Ohio. And if you ask the voters right now, President Obama carried it in 2008. Republicans had a great year in 2010. As we head into 2012, they seem a bit conflicted as to the state -- the psychology of this election. How is the economy doing? GLORIA BORGER, CNN SENIOR POLITICAL ANALYST: Right. Well, and it's one of the reasons Ohio is such a battleground state, because there is really a mixed message there. We were looking at some of the numbers in the state. By a 2-1 margin, people in Ohio believe the state is in a recession, the country is in a recession. But 55 percent also believe that the economy, the recovery has begun. So, people who believe the recovery has begun, that's good for President Obama. People who believe they are still in a recession and it is terrible, 2-1, that would be better for Mitt Romney. And this is going to be fought, as you point out -- and I was talking to a Romney adviser today, a senior Romney adviser -- this is going to be fought in the suburbs of Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus and particularly suburban women. KING: It is fascinating. If you go back campaign, go back four more years, four more years, four more years, the state hardly changes. Certain areas are locked in Republican, certain areas locked in Democrat. But you have the area, the suburban area right around Cincinnati, the suburban area right around Columbus and the suburban area up along the lake up around Cleveland. Suburban voters and as you mentioned, suburban women, like in Pennsylvania, in those bigger states when they are locked so close, that's usually the key. BORGER: Right. And it's interesting because the Romney people believe that they can really do well with married suburban women. And President Obama's campaign believes that they have a lock on the sort of younger, single suburban women and of course urban women. So, that's going to be the real battleground. We talk about a large gender gap throughout country. But in these specific suburban areas is where it really counts in a battleground. KING: And the vice president is important to this president because that's his biggest weaknesses is those white, blue-collar guys I call them guys who work with their hands. BORGER: Right. And you heard Joe Biden make the class argument, I would say, very, very strongly today. They don't know how we feel, he said in Youngstown, Ohio. That is a message that Joe Biden can deliver, but that President Obama would have a tougher time delivering. KING: Gloria Borger, appreciate your insights. We are going to spend a lot of time Ohio, Ohio, Ohio. (CROSSTALK) (BEGIN VIDEOTAPE) KING: So why worry so much about just one state? Well, this one state could settle the election. No Republican has won the White House in modern times without carrying Ohio.

### Ext – Ohio voters love it

#### Transportation investment massively popular in Ohio – key to perception of effective economic policy

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Ohio Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-ohio.pdf>)

Like the rest of the country, Ohio’s state budget and economy face significant challenges. These challenges also create the opportunity – indeed the imperative – to revisit existing programs and ask if Ohio is really getting everything it can from them. Right now, voters do not think the current approach is working. Polling nationwide shows people are dissatisfied with the economy and believe the nation is on the wrong track. People do not trust their state with their money. Only 10% of voters nationwide (and 10% of those polled in the Midwest) think the government spends money wisely, while 86% of voters (85% in the Midwest) think their state does a fair or poor job. Moving forward, Americans do think there is a better way. In a recent survey by Hart Research Associates, 68% of those polled believe “now is the time for the state to invest in transportation because if done right these investments will create new jobs and attract new businesses.” Voters are clear about their hopes for their state, and Smart Growth America has practical solutions to help make that vision a reality. In the following pages we outline an innovative, yet common sense approach to transportation spending that cuts costs, creates jobs, attracts businesses, and clearly shows that the state is responding to the fiscal and economic crisis with strong leadership that is not satisfied with a system that makes fair or poor use of taxpayer dollars.

#### Massively popular in Ohio – key issue, swings voter perception and not perceived as wasteful spending

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Ohio Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-ohio.pdf>)

The Need: If it continues on its current path, Ohio’s transportation system is on track to become highly expensive, uncompetitive, and unsafe. Ohio has invested heavily in transportation, but declining revenues and escalating debt service will reduce the state’s ability to maintain its facilities in a state of good repair. Carrying on business as usual will result in a deteriorated road network, inadequate transit network, and a six- to ten-fold increase in repair costs resulting from neglect and deferred maintenance. The Smart Solution: Ohio is at a crossroads. While there is still a sizable gap between revenue and the large wish list of projects, this gap can be closed if the state makes strategic decisions about how to get the highest return on its investment. By making fiscally responsible choices about the state’s transportation priorities, Ohio can not only save money and create jobs, but it can also help preserve the transportation system and create a more welcoming business climate on the mid- and long-term horizons. Spending more on repair and maintenance is a good investment: it saves the state money, saves citizens money, is a superior job creator, and is very popular among voters. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), every $1 spent to keep a road in good condition avoids $6-14 needed later to rebuild the same road once it has deteriorated. In addition, poor roads add an average of $335 to the annual cost of owning a car – in some cities an additional $740 more – due to damaged tires and suspensions and reduced fuel efficiency. While Ohio has invested heavily in repair and maintenance in recent years, insufficient investment over the long-term has led to a backlog of roads and bridges in “poor” and “deficient” condition requiring $194 million annually in major rehabilitation costs over the next twenty years. Cont… Public transportation is popular with voters November 2010 National Poll by Hart Research Associates: 73% of those polled rated “the number of jobs created in the long term that would remain in [my] community” as the most important factor in developing the state transportation plan. 61% regardless of their party affiliation (and 57% of Independents) said they would feel more positively about a governor who favors a plan that “provides more choices such as buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail.” 64% said “buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail were a good or very good value for the cost.” March 2010 National Poll by Public Opinion Strategies and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates: 66% of respondents agreed they would like more transportation options available to them. 69% agreed their community would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system. Cont… With these smart transportation approaches, the leaders of Ohio can demonstrate to voters the ability to be fiscally responsible while growing the economy.

### Ext – Manufacturing Voters Key Ohio

#### Manufacturing voters key to ohio

**Chicago Tribune, 12** (5/4, lexis)

Facing the reality of running their candidate as a bruised incumbent in a politically divided country, Obama's advisers say they are plotting a strategy that does not depend on a wave of support to lift the president's chances across the country. And it won't hinge on a single theme such as "change" that captured the zeitgeist in 2008. Instead, the Obama campaign is prepping for a block-by-block, hard-slog approach. The campaign, which the president kicks off this weekend, will be tailored to swing states and the key voters in those states. That means talking up the revival of manufacturing in Ohio. But in Virginia it means tapping into the growing suburban vote and using the state's GOP-controlled Legislature and Republican governor as a foil to energize female voters. "Each state's volunteers (will) help drive what is important for them to work on in that state," said campaign manager Jim Messina. Campaign advisers, however, stress that what voters in Columbus, Ohio, and Richmond, Va., hear from the president Saturday will not be inconsistent. "We are not the candidate who reinvents himself from week to week," David Axelrod, Obama's top campaign strategist, said in a dig at the GOP's Mitt Romney. Republicans, for their part, see this as an option of last resort for an incumbent who cannot run on his own record. "Overall, this will be a referendum on whether or not we want four more years of misery," said Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus. Even before the Obama campaign unveiled its national slogan, "Forward," its Ohio campaign had its own: "Made in Ohio." The slogan was rolled out on a media tour of auto manufacturing plants across northern Ohio -- a state he won by just 4 points in 2008. A message stressing manufacturing and the auto bailout is key in a state where the campaign must persuade skeptical independent voters to give the president another shot.

### Ohio Link – A2: Spending Turn

#### Perception of economic benefit massively swamps spending concerns for ohio voters

**NYT, 12** (3/7, lexis)

A majority of voters in Ohio said the economy was the top issue for them, according to exit polling, far outpacing the federal budget deficit, abortion or illegal immigration. Voters citing the economy were more apt to support Mr. Romney. Mr. Santorum won a broad majority of those who cited abortion as their top issue.

### 2NC Virginia Link

#### It fires up the dem base in virginia

**ProgressVA.org, 11** (11/17, <http://www.progressva.org/progressivepoint/stand_up_with_virginia_for_jobs.html>)

The Richmond Times Dispatch reports at noon today, "unemployed workers and Occupy Richmond members will join activists from Virginia Organizing, Moveon.org, Service Employees International Union, and AFL-CIO [and] will declare an 'Emergency for the 99 percent.' Rally-goers will gather at the foot of the bridge to call attention to Rep. Cantor's obstruction of the American Jobs Act, which would help provide much-needed jobs repairing many of the 1,267 other bridges in Virginia that engineers have identified as having a 'major defect in its support structure or its deck.'" Progressive Point: Investing in Virginia's roads and bridges will help get our economy moving. The state of the Hamilton Street bridge in Richmond is a local example of a national problem, as is Congressman Eric Cantor's obstruction of the American Jobs Act. While today is a day of national action for all of the 99%, Virginia has a severe need for infrastructure investments and the jobs it will provide. Virginia Organizing shares, "The American Jobs Act would provide $809,000,000 in infrastructure funding for Virginia and 10,500 infrastructure jobs." Today at noon, Virginia rally-goers will join others across the country in calling for Congress to create jobs, invest in infrastructure, and end the obstructionism epitomized by Eric Cantor. His allegiance to millionaires instead of his constituents is costing the country and Virginia. Our representatives must choose investing in infrastructure and creating jobs for Virginians and stop playing politics with our future.

#### Dem base mobilization key to virginia

**Chicago Tribune, 12** (5/4, lexis)

Facing the reality of running their candidate as a bruised incumbent in a politically divided country, Obama's advisers say they are plotting a strategy that does not depend on a wave of support to lift the president's chances across the country. And it won't hinge on a single theme such as "change" that captured the zeitgeist in 2008. Instead, the Obama campaign is prepping for a block-by-block, hard-slog approach. The campaign, which the president kicks off this weekend, will be tailored to swing states and the key voters in those states That means talking up the revival of manufacturing in Ohio. But in Virginia it means tapping into the growing suburban vote and using the state's GOP-controlled Legislature and Republican governor as a foil to energize female voters. "Each state's volunteers (will) help drive what is important for them to work on in that state," said campaign manager Jim Messina. Campaign advisers, however, stress that what voters in Columbus, Ohio, and Richmond, Va., hear from the president Saturday will not be inconsistent. "We are not the candidate who reinvents himself from week to week," David Axelrod, Obama's top campaign strategist, said in a dig at the GOP's Mitt Romney. Republicans, for their part, see this as an option of last resort for an incumbent who cannot run on his own record. "Overall, this will be a referendum on whether or not we want four more years of misery," said Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus. Even before the Obama campaign unveiled its national slogan, "Forward," its Ohio campaign had its own: "Made in Ohio." The slogan was rolled out on a media tour of auto manufacturing plants across northern Ohio -- a state he won by just 4 points in 2008. A message stressing manufacturing and the auto bailout is key in a state where the campaign must persuade skeptical independent voters to give the president another shot. In Virginia, however, Obama's campaign will have to worry less about swaying voters and more about turning out sympathetic ones. In Richmond on Wednesday, the campaign office was humming as a phone bank of 30 volunteers tried to boost turnout for the president's rally at Virginia Commonwealth University. Obama's campaign also is seeking to motivate suburban women in northern Virginia by branding the efforts of state Republicans to tighten abortion laws as part of a "war on women." "We can see what is happening. We as women are under attack," said Jean Cunningham, a co-chairwoman of the state's Women for Obama effort. A new Washington Post poll shows Obama leading Romney 56 percent to 38 percent among women in that state. An earlier ABC News/Washington Post survey showed Obama leading Romney among women by a similar margin nationwide. Overall, Obama leads 51 percent to 44 percent in Virginia. \ \ - - -\ \ Romney,

#### Virginia is the key

**Silver, 12**

Nate, 6/7, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/>

The model suggests that the campaigns might do best to concentrate their resources. As much as campaign operatives love to talk about how they are expanding the map, contemplating unusual parlays of states in which they reach 270 electoral votes, the election is very likely to come down to a mere handful of states. In many ways, the relative ordering of the states is more predictable than how the election as a whole will play out. The term the model uses for these key states is tipping point states, meaning that they could tip the balance between winning and losing in an election that came down to the final vote. Foremost among these tipping point states are Ohio and Virginia. In 2008, both states had a very slight Republican lean relative to the rest of the country. However, the economy is comparatively good in each state, and Mr. Obama’s polling has held up reasonably well in them, putting them almost exactly in balance. Mr. Obama is given just slightly over 50 percent odds of winning each one, just as he is given a very slight overall lead in our national projection. But if Mr. Obama’s national standing slips, he would probably lose his lead in those states as well.

### Ext - Virginia Link

#### Transportation investment massively popular in Virginia – key to perception of effective economic policy

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Virginia Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-virginia.pdf>)

Like the rest of the country, Virginia’s state budget and economy face significant challenges. These challenges also create the opportunity – indeed the imperative – to revisit existing programs and ask if Virginia is really getting everything it can from them. Right now, voters do not think the current approach is working. Polling nationwide shows people are dissatisfied with the economy and believe the nation is on the wrong track. People do not trust their state with their money. Only 10% of voters think the government spends money wisely while fully 86% think their state does a fair or poor job. Moving forward, Americans do think there is a better way. In a recent survey by Hart Research Associates, 68% of those polled believe “now is the time for the state to invest in transportation because if done right these investments will create new jobs and attract new businesses.” Voters are clear about their hopes for their state, and Smart Growth America has practical solutions to help make that vision a reality. In the following pages we outline an innovative, yet common sense approach to transportation spending that cuts costs, creates jobs, attracts businesses, and clearly shows that the state is responding to the fiscal and economic crisis with strong leadership that is not satisfied with a system that makes fair or poor use of taxpayer dollars.

#### Massively popular in Virginia – key issue, swings voter perception and not perceived as wasteful spending

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Virginia Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-virginia.pdf>)

The Need: If it continues on its current path, Virginia’s transportation system is on track to become highly expensive, uncompetitive, and unsafe. Virginia has invested heavily in transportation, but declining revenues and escalating debt service will reduce the state’s ability to maintain its facilities in a state of good repair. Carrying on business as usual will result in a deteriorated road network, inadequate transit network, and a six- to ten-fold increase in repair costs resulting from neglect and deferred maintenance. The Smart Solution: Virginia is at a crossroads. While there is still a sizable gap between revenue and the large wish list of projects, this gap can be closed if the state makes strategic decisions about how to get the highest return on its investment. By making fiscally responsible choices about the state’s transportation priorities, Virginia can not only save money and create jobs, but it can also help preserve the transportation system and create a more welcoming business climate on the mid- and long-term horizons. Spending more on repair and maintenance is a good investment: it saves the state money, saves citizens money, is a superior job creator, and is very popular among voters. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), every $1 spent to keep a road in good condition avoids $6-14 needed later to rebuild the same road once it has deteriorated. In addition, poor roads add an average of $335 to the annual cost of owning a car – in some cities an additional $740 more – due to damaged tires and suspensions and reduced fuel efficiency. Cont… Public transportation is popular with voters November 2010 National Poll by Hart Research Associates: 73% of those polled rated “the number of jobs created in the long term that would remain in [my] community” as the most important factor in developing the state transportation plan. 61% regardless of their party affiliation (and 57% of Independents) said they would feel more positively about a governor who favors a plan that “provides more choices such as buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail.” 64% said “buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail were a good or very good value for the cost.” March 2010 National Poll by Public Opinion Strategies and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates: 66% of respondents agreed they would like more transportation options available to them. 69% agreed their community would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system. Cont…. With these smart transportation approaches, the leaders of Virginia can demonstrate to voters the ability to be fiscally responsible while growing the economy.

### Link Booster – Obama Spin

#### Obama push is normal means – controls spin, builds visibility and widespread support

**Natale, 10**

 Patrick J. Natale, P.E, Executive Director, American Society of Civil Engineers, 10/27, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments

President Obama’s Labor Day announcement calling for a $50 billion investment in infrastructure should be an encouraging sign to the nation. It’s going to take that kind of vision and leadership to make the case for improvement and push for needed investments. Without a compelling national voice demonstrating what improvement means for our quality of life and economy, infrastructure will remain out of sight and out of mind. In the past, our leaders dreamed big when it came to infrastructure, and those dreams brought us railroads, canals, telecommunications, electrification, interstate highways, clean water and parks. Their leadership and investment built the foundation for the life we enjoy today, but if we don’t work to maintain and rehabilitate the nation’s failing infrastructure we put all those gains and quality of life improvements at risk. It’s not as though we lack the solutions and technology to support the big infrastructure dreams of the next century, and with the current economic climate, we could be bringing them to fruition in the most cost efficient way possible. All that’s missing is the popular will to pay for it. Critics of the President’s announcement are right to point out that his plan is a little thin on the ‘how’ when it comes to paying for it all, and that it won’t eclipse the need to enact new authorizing legislation for the nation’s roads, transit, airports and waterways. ASCE agrees. We need a reliable revenue stream and a multi-year plan to begin improving the nation’s infrastructure. However, having the man with the biggest microphone on earth stumping for pavement, bricks and mortar is vitally important to the overall improvement of the nation’s infrastructure systems. We have been sounding the alarm for years but we haven’t done enough to get the users engaged on the issue. With Obama’s involvement and support, maybe now we can shift this from being just a transportation issue to being an American issue.

#### Obama spin builds public support, visibility and pro-jobs perception

**Natale, 10**

 Patrick J. Natale, P.E, Executive Director, American Society of Civil Engineers, 10/27, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments

Congress has delayed putting together a comprehensive transportation reauthorization for over a year. A new bill is long overdue. With the economic recovery flagging, the administration and Congress need to sell this to the public as an economic investment first and foremost. As a recent report authored by three former secretaries of transportation concluded, America's decaying transportation system is endangering our prosperity and our stance in the global economy. Transportation projects have often been obscured by heated political debates. The reality is simply this: the nation urgently needs to put people back to work and to boost the economy -- two things transportation investments do extraordinarily well. The administration needs to take a vocal role in educating the public about the urgent need for a transportation reauthorization.

## \*\*\*Obama Bad Links – A2: Turns\*\*\*

### A2: New Infrastructure Unpopular/Repairs Distinction

#### Voters support not limited to maintenance – want new transportation

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

The Rockefeller Foundation funded this survey as part of the Foundation’s Transportation initiative, a $66 million investment aimed at promoting equitable and sustainable transportation policies at the federal and state level. Through this investment, the Foundation is committed to the development of policies that provide access to opportunity, more transportation options and help create vibrant and healthy communities, all while increasing access to good jobs for lower income Americans.

“Half a century ago, Americans built an interstate highway system that enabled unrivaled economic prosperity and opportunity, said Rockefeller Foundation President Judith Rodin. “Today, almost half of Americans think that their transportation options and roads are inadequate. The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey shows that American voters want Washington to work together to pass laws that ensure we fix the infrastructure we have and provide more Americans with more transportation options befitting a 21st century economic power.”

#### Voters top priority is *new* transportation infrastructure – not just repairs

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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.”

### A2: Obstructionism Turn

#### Blaming GOP obstructionism only hurts Obama

**Leonard, 12** (Andrew, Staff Writer @ Salon, 6/4, <http://www.salon.com/2012/06/04/obamas_blame_game_problem/>)

Of course, the more time Obama spends blaming Republicans for the current state of the economy, the more he reminds voters a) that the economy sucks and b) of his own inability to overcome GOP obstructionism. It’s a no-win situation, and it invites unappetizing scrutiny of Obama’s record: For example, Obama allowed himself to get sucked into a fight over who could cut the deficit faster when that was the exact wrong strategy, both politically and economically; he failed to pick a major fight with Republicans over getting the right people appointed to the Federal Reserve early enough in his first term; and his efforts to address the foreclosure crisis have been almost comically incompetent. Any sustained campaign of throwing mud at Republicans over blocking Obama’s agenda just reminds us of how bad Obama has been at pursuing his own agenda.

#### GOP obstructionism hurts Obama worse with voters – he appears ineffective

#### Bancroft and Company LLC consulting,

GOP's obstructionism stains Democrats' image with voters By not cooperating with the president on his signature issues, Republicans have made it appear he is ineffective. President Obama and his family were in Maine just a week or so ago. By all accounts, they had a typical Maine summer vacation experience, filled with lots of outdoor activities, and the requisite number of lobster rolls. Seeing the president, Michelle and their two girls on summer vacation, enjoying the kinds of things many of us enjoy in the summer, takes some of the edge off the corrosive political dialogue that often magnifies our differences and adds an unpleasant element of personal vilification to national politics. The most recent issue of The Economist has a column "respectfully proposing a temporary ban on references in political debate to both American greatness and American exceptionalism." It makes the case for the ban because those overworked phrases in American political debate have lost all serious meaning. By way of explanation, the British newsweekly refers to President Obama's rather innocent and diplomatic comment in France last year when asked if he believed in American exceptionalism. He said he did -- and also that others like the Brits (it was a British reporter who asked the question) probably thought of themselves as exceptional. Some conservatives have seized on this comment as showing that the president is somehow not worthy of his office. Charles Krauthammer in The Washington Post penned the most recent comments on the president's response -- suggesting that it shows the president does not truly believe in American greatness. We could write Krauthammer's column off as simply representing a slow week and a dearth of good material, but for the fact that his was one of several similar columns on this issue from the pundits of the right. I am sympathetic to The Economist's plea. It is summer -- a time when most Americans put politics aside. We tend to take a more relaxed view on life -- often by getting away for a few days of vacation, by putting aside hefty nonfiction reading for the engaging summer novel, by coming home a little earlier from work and enjoying the coolness of long, light-filled evenings. Some of us even stop watching the news on TV -- a piece of summer relaxation that has the potential to raise one's joyfulness index by several points. Remember back to the election of 2008? It seems so long ago now. Many of us were drawn to candidate Obama that summer and fall because he spoke about a kinder, gentler political dialogue -- a way to bridge our differences and generate bipartisan solutions to our most serious problems. For me it is a stretch to recall how frustrated I was by the uber-partisan politics of George W. Bush. Here we are but two years later right back in the same corrosive dialogue. Whatever happened? From the perspective of this former Republican, much of the blame falls on national Republican leadership. From the beginning of the Obama presidency, Sen. Mitch McConnell, Rep. John Boehner and company made the political calculus that it would be better tactics to simply oppose the president on all issues -- save perhaps the war in Afghanistan. The president certainly tried to bring Republicans on board for the three major initiatives that have defined his presidency: the federal stimulus bill, the health care reform bill, and, most recently, the financial reform bill. Each of these pieces of legislation was landmark in scope, yet fewer than a handful of Republicans voted for them. I believe there is a strong case to be made for each of these pieces of legislation. Each addressed an element of national crisis -- the time when we should be putting partisanship aside to do the nation's work. The president was willing with each of these bills to entertain significant Republican input. Instead he got obstructionism. I frankly don't understand why there is not more backlash against Republican leadership for backing away from addressing real national crises. Instead, it appears the Republican tactic is actually working.

#### Obama gets blame for inaction – he doesn’t effectively campaign against GOP obstructionism

**Krugman, 12**

Paul, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, NYT, 6/4, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/04/opinion/krugman-this-republican-economy.html?src=me&ref=general>

So the Republican electoral strategy is, in effect, a gigantic con game: it depends on convincing voters that the bad economy is the result of big-spending policies that President Obama hasn’t followed (in large part because the G.O.P. wouldn’t let him), and that our woes can be cured by pursuing more of the same policies that have already failed. For some reason, however, neither the press nor Mr. Obama’s political team has done a very good job of exposing the con. What do I mean by saying that this is already a Republican economy? Look first at total government spending — federal, state and local. Adjusted for population growth and inflation, such spending has recently been falling at a rate not seen since the demobilization that followed the Korean War. How is that possible? Isn’t Mr. Obama a big spender? Actually, no; there was a brief burst of spending in late 2009 and early 2010 as the stimulus kicked in, but that boost is long behind us. Since then it has been all downhill. Cash-strapped state and local governments have laid off teachers, firefighters and police officers; meanwhile, unemployment benefits have been trailing off even though unemployment remains extremely high. Over all, the picture for America in 2012 bears a stunning resemblance to the great mistake of 1937, when F.D.R. prematurely slashed spending, sending the U.S. economy — which had actually been recovering fairly fast until that point — into the second leg of the Great Depression. In F.D.R.’s case, however, this was an unforced error, since he had a solidly Democratic Congress. In President Obama’s case, much though not all of the responsibility for the policy wrong turn lies with a completely obstructionist Republican majority in the House. That same obstructionist House majority effectively blackmailed the president into continuing all the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy, so that federal taxes as a share of G.D.P. are near historic lows — much lower, in particular, than at any point during Ronald Reagan’s presidency. As I said, for all practical purposes this is already a Republican economy. As an aside, I think it’s worth pointing out that although the economy’s performance has been disappointing, to say the least, none of the disasters Republicans predicted have come to pass. Remember all those assertions that budget deficits would lead to soaring interest rates? Well, U.S. borrowing costs have just hit a record low. And remember those dire warnings about inflation and the “debasement” of the dollar? Well, inflation remains low, and the dollar has been stronger than it was in the Bush years. Put it this way: Republicans have been warning that we were about to turn into Greece because President Obama was doing too much to boost the economy; Keynesian economists like myself warned that we were, on the contrary, at risk of turning into Japan because he was doing too little. And Japanification it is, except with a level of misery the Japanese never had to endure. So why don’t voters know any of this? Part of the answer is that far too much economic reporting is still of the he-said, she-said variety, with dueling quotes from hired guns on either side. But it’s also true that the Obama team has consistently failed to highlight Republican obstruction, perhaps out of a fear of seeming weak. Instead, the president’s advisers keep turning to happy talk, seizing on a few months’ good economic news as proof that their policies are working — and then ending up looking foolish when the numbers turn down again. Remarkably, they’ve made this mistake three times in a row: in 2010, 2011 and now once again.

#### Media coverage means GOP avoids blame for obstructionism

**Shah, 12**

Adam H. Shah most recently worked as senior counsel for the Judicial Selection Project at Alliance for Justice. Previously, he was an associate with the New York City law firm Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton. Shah graduated with honors from the University of Chicago with a degree in history and received a J.D. magna cum laude from the University of Michigan Law School, where he was contributing editor of the Michigan Law Review. He is a Deputy Editorial Director at Media Matters for America, 4/18, http://mediamatters.org/blog/201204180018

How The Mainstream Media Enables Senate GOP Obstructionism Of The Majority's Will Yesterday, we documented how the conservative media, following the release of a report by the Secretary of the Senate, covered up obstructionism by Senate Republicans in order to cast Democrats as "do-nothing" and "lazy." In fact, Republicans have routinely resorted to filibusters to try to block bills that would have otherwise passed the Senate. But the right-wing media would not easily get away with this if not for the complicity of the mainstream media. On Monday, a majority of senators voted in support of legislation to enact the Buffett Rule, which would set a minimum effective tax rate for annual income in excess of $1 million. Fifty-one senators voted in favor of the bill, while 45 senators opposed it. The legislation did not pass the Senate, however, because a Republican filibuster meant that a supermajority of 60 senators was needed in order to pass the bill. But the mainstream media was noticeably derelict in reporting that the bill had majority support and was blocked by procedural tricks by the minority. For instance, The Boston Globe article on the subject stated: "Monday night's Buffett rule vote, which blocked consideration of the bill in a 51-45 tally, was timed to coincide with Tuesday's IRS filing deadline." The article continued: "Republicans prevented the measure from receiving the 60 votes necessary to open debate. All Republicans but Senator Susan Collins of Maine voted against it. All Democrats except for Mark Pryor of Arkansas voted for it." Unless a reader knew the number of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, the reporting makes it seem that 51 senators voted against the bill rather than in favor of it. USA Today similarly failed to inform its readers that the bill received majority support. USA Today noted that the bill failed "to reach a supermajority needed to pass a tax plan," but never made clear that the bill did have a majority or that a supermajority was necessary because Republicans used procedural tricks to prevent an up-or-down vote. Indeed, the most natural reading of the article makes it seem that 51 senators voted against the Buffett Rule. The article reported: The Democratic-controlled Senate failed on Monday to reach a supermajority needed to pass a tax plan offered by President Obama to require millionaires to pay a 30% minimum effective tax rate. The 51-45 defeat of the "Buffett rule," named after billionaire investor Warren Buffett, fell mostly along party lines. The bill needed 60 votes to move forward. Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, was the only Republican to vote with Democrats, while Arkansas Democrat Mark Pryor sided with the GOP. While The Washington Post noted in the body of its article on the subject that 51 senators voted in favor of the Buffett Rule, the headline of its article was: "Senate rejects consideration of 'Buffett rule' tax increase for millionaires." And The New York Times reported the facts necessary for readers to know that the Buffett Rule got majority support, but still failed to straightforwardly report that 51 senators voted in favor of the Buffett Rule. Instead, the Times stated: "[T]he fierce debate preceding the 51-45 vote -- the Democrats were nine votes short of the 60 they needed -- set off a week of political wrangling over taxes that both parties insist they are already winning." With the mainstream media making it so difficult for readers to learn that Senate Republicans are using procedural tricks to block the will of the Senate majority on issues like the Buffett Rule, it's that much easier for the right-wing media to hide the obstructionism of Senate Republicans.

#### Attempts to blame GOP obstructionism fail – president gets the blame

**Saunders, 12**

Debra J. Saunders, Columnist @ San Fransisco Chronicle, Creators Syndicate, January 7, 2012, lexis

The bigger issue, however, concerns Team Obama's apparent decision to win re-election by playing to the liberal base, not the American political middle. While the administration should be working to heal the economy, the administration is busy pointing fingers at bad Republicans. Tea Party Express co-founder Sal Russo likened the Obama strategy to Bush guru Karl Rove's strategy to win re-election in 2004 by ginning up the base. Russo doesn't see how it could work for the Democrats this year. To independent voters especially, the president's failure to work with Congress doesn't compute. "Look, you're president," Russo said. "Why can't you just walk over to Congress and talk to these guys?" To the average Joe, there's only one standard, noted Russo. "You've got to get the job done."

### 2NC – A2: Spending – All\*

#### ( ) Our link outweighs – support for infrastructure investment outweighs concerns about spending or mismanagement – voters perceive economic benefit

**Halsey ‘12**

(Ashley Halsey III is a staff writer for The Washington Post – Washington Post – April 24, 2012 – lexis)

The plan to energize public support was outlined Monday in a report by transportation experts brought together by the Miller Center at the University of Virginia. After a conference in November, the group concluded that most Americans are aware of the infrastructure crisis and support spending to address it. "Recent public-opinion surveys have found overwhelming support for the idea of infrastructure investment," the report said. "After the 'bridge to nowhere' controversies of recent years, the public has become sensitized to issues of pork-barrel spending and understandably demands to see a clear connection between federal expenditures, actual transportation needs, and economic benefits." Despite apprehension about wasteful spending, the report said, more than two-thirds of voters surveyed by the Rockefeller Foundation said infrastructure improvement was important and 80 percent said spending on it would create millions of jobs. The transportation group, co-chaired by former transportation secretaries Norman Y. Mineta and Samuel K. Skinner, compiled a comprehensive study on infrastructure in 2010. That report estimated that an additional $134 billion to $262 billion must be spent per year through 2035 to rebuild and improve roads, rail systems and air transportation.

#### That’s true for every voting group – it’s a key issue and they want federal funding

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (2/14, http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure)

Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform Four in five voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation will boost local economies and create jobs An exclusive Rockefeller Foundation survey released today reveals overwhelming bipartisan support for federal investment in transportation and infrastructure projects. The survey showed that 71% of voters think leaders in Washington should seek common ground on legislation related to roads, bridges and transit systems, including 66% of Tea Party supporters and 71% of Republicans. Two out of three voters say that improving the country’s transportation infrastructure is highly important. Nearly half of all voters said that roads are often or totally inadequate and that only some public transportation options exist. Eighty percent of voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation will boost local economies and create millions of jobs, and view it as critical to keeping the United States as the world’s top economic superpower.

#### Perceived as saving money

**Barcaskey, 11**

RICHARD J. BARCASKEY, Executive Director, CAWP, Construction Association of Western Pennsylvania, Pitt Post Gazette, 7/18)

Neglecting our infrastructure will only force taxpayers to pay more later since it is more expensive to fix broken infrastructure than it is to properly maintain it. The public can discern the difference between wasteful government spending and desperately needed investments that boost economic activity and support private-sector commerce. Let's hope that in the coming months we will see our federal elected officials working to achieve bipartisan support for a bill that is both fiscally responsible and responsive to our nation's very significant transportation needs.

### 2NC A2: Spending – Big Gov/GOP Base

#### Opposition to big government irrelevant – GOP base can’t be more mobilized and it doesn’t appeal to swing voters

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12467)

Here’s some totally unsolicited advice from the peanut gallery, first for Mitt Romney and then for Barack Obama. Having devoted every waking hour for the last year and a half to catering to the carnivores in his party, Romney needs to cut back on the red-meat rhetoric that was required of him to win the GOP nomination. The vast majority of conservatives would vote for very nearly anyone running against Obama. In a New York Times piece, Campbell Robertson wrote that “the antipathy toward the current administration among Republican voters, described here in terms ranging from the vulgar to the apocalyptic, can hardly be exaggerated.” While Romney must win a few Democratic votes, he doesn’t need to switch to a vegan or even a vegetarian diet. By the same token, independent and swing voters don’t eat all their meals at steak houses. He needs a more balanced and reasoned rhetoric, appealing to brains and not just to glands. A discussion with Republicans and conservatives about health care reform has usually entailed talking about big government. Independents, meanwhile, were concerned about Obama’s health care law because they already had health insurance. They were reasonably happy with it and were fearful that any major changes to the system would either raise premiums or cut benefits. Unlike conservatives and Republican partisans, independents don’t see health care or any other issue through an ideological lens. Transitioning from primary to general-election politics is rarely easy. Candidates and campaign operatives develop Pavlovian conditioning. For months, they talk exclusively to partisans, looking for rhetoric that will elicit heads moving up and down in agreement. This rhetoric may create frowns or at least cause puzzled responses from swing voters. Sitting Romney down in front of a laptop, watching focus groups with swing voters, may resensitize him.

#### Caving to the right wing spending fears undermines Obama with independents and dem base

**Calmes, 11** (Jackie, White House Correspondent, NYT, 7/30, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/31/us/politics/31dems.htm)

However the debt limit showdown ends, one thing is clear: under pressure from Congressional Republicans, President Obama has moved rightward on budget policy, deepening a rift within his party heading into the next election. Entering a campaign that is shaping up as an epic clash over the parties’ divergent views on the size and role of the federal government, Republicans have changed the terms of the national debate. Mr. Obama, seeking to appeal to the broad swath of independent voters, has adopted the Republicans’ language and in some cases their policies, while signaling a willingness to break with liberals on some issues. That has some progressive members of Congress and liberal groups arguing that by not fighting for more stimulus spending, Mr. Obama could be left with an economy still producing so few jobs by Election Day that his re-election could be threatened. Besides turning off independents, Mr. Obama risks alienating Democratic voters already disappointed by his escalation of the war in Afghanistan and his failure to close the Guantánamo Bay prison, end the Bush-era tax cuts and enact a government-run health insurance system. “The activist liberal base will support Obama because they’re terrified of the right wing,” said Robert L. Borosage, co-director of the liberal group Campaign for America’s Future. But he said, “I believe that the voting base of the Democratic Party — young people, single women, African-Americans, Latinos — are going to be so discouraged by this economy and so dismayed unless the president starts to champion a jobs program and take on the Republican Congress that the ability of labor to turn out its vote, the ability of activists to mobilize that vote, is going to be dramatically reduced.”

### 2NC A2: Spending – Waste/Mismanagement

#### Popular despite wasteful spending concerns

**American Prospect, 12** (4/9, lexis)

The story is similar on infrastructure, another crucial foundation for prosperity. While China puts in thousands of miles of high-speed rail and builds the most advanced airports in the world, and while South Korea has achieved nearly universal broadband access, the United States spends less today on infrastructure as a percentage of GDP than it did in previous eras in which it faced much less economic competition. It lags behind other advanced countries both in how much it spends on infrastructure and the sophistication of its transportation systems. According to one recent study, the U.S. needs to spend $2 trillion just to repair maintain its deteriorating infrastructure. To spent as much on infrastructure as the average among countries in the European Union would require several trillion dollars in additional spending over the next decade. Public Expectations of Government What's also different about today is that Americans have expansive expectations of government. Although polls show that the public distrusts government, and believes that much public spending is wasteful, Americans strongly back the most expensive programs, Social Security and Medicare. Majorities of the public oppose drastic cuts to these programs. Medicaid, commonly seen as less popular, also commands strong support when Americans understand how large a share of spending on this program goes to support seniors in nursing homes. The public is enthusiastic about other areas of government spending as well. Large majorities support spending on education, veterans, food safety, air-traffic control, parks, and space exploration. In general, Americans also favor a strong military and national-security establishment. The areas of government that the public dislikes, most notably foreign aid, account for a very small fraction of government spending.

#### Outweighs and reverses perception of spending mismanagement

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Virginia Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-virginia.pdf>)

Like the rest of the country, Virginia’s state budget and economy face significant challenges. These challenges also create the opportunity – indeed the imperative – to revisit existing programs and ask if Virginia is really getting everything it can from them. Right now, voters do not think the current approach is working. Polling nationwide shows people are dissatisfied with the economy and believe the nation is on the wrong track. People do not trust their state with their money. Only 10% of voters think the government spends money wisely while fully 86% think their state does a fair or poor job. Moving forward, Americans do think there is a better way. In a recent survey by Hart Research Associates, 68% of those polled believe “now is the time for the state to invest in transportation because if done right these investments will create new jobs and attract new businesses.” Voters are clear about their hopes for their state, and Smart Growth America has practical solutions to help make that vision a reality. In the following pages we outline an innovative, yet common sense approach to transportation spending that cuts costs, creates jobs, attracts businesses, and clearly shows that the state is responding to the fiscal and economic crisis with strong leadership that is not satisfied with a system that makes fair or poor use of taxpayer dollars. The Need: If it continues on its current path, Virginia’s transportation system is on track to become highly expensive, uncompetitive, and unsafe. Virginia has invested heavily in transportation, but declining revenues and escalating debt service will reduce the state’s ability to maintain its facilities in a state of good repair. Carrying on business as usual will result in a deteriorated road network, inadequate transit network, and a six- to ten-fold increase in repair costs resulting from neglect and deferred maintenance. The Smart Solution: Virginia is at a crossroads. While there is still a sizable gap between revenue and the large wish list of projects, this gap can be closed if the state makes strategic decisions about how to get the highest return on its investment. By making fiscally responsible choices about the state’s transportation priorities, Virginia can not only save money and create jobs, but it can also help preserve the transportation system and create a more welcoming business climate on the mid- and long-term horizons. Spending more on repair and maintenance is a good investment: it saves the state money, saves citizens money, is a superior job creator, and is very popular among voters. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), every $1 spent to keep a road in good condition avoids $6-14 needed later to rebuild the same road once it has deteriorated. In addition, poor roads add an average of $335 to the annual cost of owning a car – in some cities an additional $740 more – due to damaged tires and suspensions and reduced fuel efficiency. Cont… Public transportation is popular with voters November 2010 National Poll by Hart Research Associates: 73% of those polled rated “the number of jobs created in the long term that would remain in [my] community” as the most important factor in developing the state transportation plan. 61% regardless of their party affiliation (and 57% of Independents) said they would feel more positively about a governor who favors a plan that “provides more choices such as buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail.” 64% said “buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail were a good or very good value for the cost.” March 2010 National Poll by Public Opinion Strategies and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates: 66% of respondents agreed they would like more transportation options available to them. 69% agreed their community would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

### Ext - Transportation Spending popular

#### Overwhelmingly popular – it’s a key issue and spending concerns don’t apply

**Madland, 12** (David, Center For American Progress, 3/22, <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/experts/MadlandDavid.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.

#### That’s true across all party lines – no backlash

**Halsey, 11** (Ashley, columnist @ Washington Post, Washington post, 2/14, lexis)

But among voters who responded to the poll, 71 percent said they want elected officials to put aside partisan differences and find a meeting point on transportation. "The American people across all party lines want to see government work toward common ground to actually create change and move issues forward," Turner said. "The results tell us that almost half of all Americans think our roads and transportation options are inadequate, a staggering number when you think about the fact that transportation is infused into almost every part of American life - from how we get to work, how we access services, how businesses make money, and how we value our homes."

#### Public loves it – supports increased spending

**Wytkind, 10**

Ed Wytkind, President, Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 10/27, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments

It’s clear that we’re going to need the Administration’s leadership if we’re going to do anything worth doing.

The funny thing is there isn’t much disagreement about the need for America to invest in our infrastructure. 19 out of 20 Americans are concerned about our nation’s infrastructure, and 84 percent support greater investment to address it, according to the report by the Treasury Department and the Council of Economic Advisers at the President’s meeting. Major elements of the business lobby agree with us and not with the Congressional naysayers. Why? Because businesses of all sizes understand that the economy won’t turn around and they won’t thrive without a first-class transportation system, and that current investment levels get a failing grade.

**Public support overwhelms spending concerns – they’d even support a tax increase**

**Prah, 9** (Pamela, Reporter @ Stateline, Stateline.org, 2/22, lexis)

A survey by national pollster Frank Luntz reinforced the message. He found that more of those responding to a poll were concerned about the openness of the process than the fairness of how funds were distributed, the number of jobs it created or even the safety of the projects. "The public wants to know exactly what you're doing and exactly what the measurement is," Luntz told dozens of governors at a morning meeting Saturday. The success of the stimulus package could have even larger implications, Luntz said. "If you deliver on this over the next few years, not only will you have great job approval numbers, you will single-handedly be able to restore confidence in government, at least at the state level." The debate over infrastructure spending, which dominated Saturday's session, largely turns on how to finance it in the long term. Luntz told the governors that eight in 10 Americans said they would be willing to pay a 1 percent increase in their federal income tax for infrastructure, providing the money was not wasted. Rendell used the findings to say "the American people are ready to spend more money" on infrastructure. The $100 billion for infrastructure in the economic stimulus bill is only about 5 percent of the nation's total need for transportation and other infrastructure, Rendell said.

#### Massively popular – ballot initiatives and surveys prove

**Lovaas, 10**

(Deron Lovaas, National Resource Defense Council, Federal Transportation Policy Director, 10/29, <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments>)

The group discussed ways of moving forward with a national agenda, something the President pressed for in a Labor Day speech as I wrote about here. An economic rationale was proffered by a new Treasury Department report released just a couple of hours ago. The report addresses demand- and supply-side considerations. On the demand side, it points out that there is widespread public support for new infrastructure investments doubtless driven in part by concerns over crumbling roads and bridges and evidenced by remarkably successful election results in recent years for transportation ballot initiatives (such as the one providing new revenue for the 30/10 program in L.A.) and national surveys. The analysis also strikes an ominous tone regarding our nation's competitiveness globally noting that we invest a mere two percent of GDP on infrastructure, which is half the level in 1960 and small compared to China's investment of 9 percent and Europe's of five percent (in the case of China this can be in part justified because that nation is at an earlier stage of development and investing more to "catch up" but no such reasoning appies to Europe).

### Ext – Job concerns o/w deficit fears

#### Jobs perception massively outweighs fiscal discipline concerns for voters

**Pew, 11** (Pew Research Center, 1/20, http://www.people-press.org/2011/01/20/about-the-surveys/)

The latest national survey by the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, conducted Jan. 5-9 among 1,503 adults, finds that concern about the budget deficit has increased in recent years. Currently, 64% view reducing the budget deficit as a top priority, up slightly from 60% a year ago, and 53% in 2009. Yet reducing the deficit continues to lag far behind the economy and jobs among the public’s priorities.

### A2: Spending Link – Independent voters don’t care

#### Independent swing voters don’t care about fiscal discipline

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

The number of Republicans rating the budget deficit as a top priority has spiked to 84% from 68% a year ago and just 42% five years ago. Meanwhile Republicans are placing far less emphasis on terrorism, which was their top priority in every year between 2002 and 2008. Today 72% rate it as a top priority, down from 83% a year ago and 93% five years ago. By contrast, the emphasis Democrats and independents give to terrorism and the budget deficit has changed far less.

### Ext – Key Dem Base

#### Picking fight with GOP base on economic policy and winning mobilizes dem base – vital to obamas chances

**Tomasky, 11**

Newsweek/Daily Beast special correspondent Michael Tomasky is also editor of Democracy: A Journal of Ideas.Newsweek, 6/26/11, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/06/26/2012-how-obama-can-mobilize-his-liberal-base.html>

It’s a solid inventory. But it’s countered by the undeniable reality that the country hasn’t noticeably moved in a more liberal direction (quite the opposite), and by the widely held perception among progressives that Obama will never wage fierce battle on behalf of liberal ideals. When I interviewed Justin Ruben, the executive director of MoveOn.org, whose 5 million members (many in swing states) must be revved up and mobilized if the president is to be reelected, he gave me four or five variants of the line “People need to feel like the president and the Democrats are really going to fight for their side.” Unfortunately, making tough, partisan economic arguments has never been the president’s strong suit. “Since the beginning of his candidacy in 2007, Barack has struggled to put together a sustained, winning economic argument,” said Simon Rosenberg of NDN, a Washington-based think tank. “With ‘Morning in America’ not really a viable option for 2012, he is going to have to draw brighter lines with the GOP, and particularly do much more to discredit their failed and reckless economic approach.” The base vote can still emerge in large numbers, but the dominant factor this time won’t be hope and change. Instead, the factors will be fear of the other side, state and local political conditions (think of how motivated Democrats are to regain control of their politics in Wisconsin), and demographic changes that are still redounding to the Democrats’ benefit. And because we elect presidents by states, the place to assess Obama’s prospects is on the ground. Wake County, N.C.; Arapahoe County, Colo.; Franklin County, Ohio—these are representative base Democratic counties. They are in swing states, which means the president will need a big vote in these places to offset a presumed high conservative turnout in other parts of these states. And they are counties that have only recently become solidly Democratic, because of demographic changes. “Obama’s majorities in these counties are not secure,” says Ruy Teixeira, coauthor of the 2002 book The Emerging Democratic Majority, which predicted the bluing of states like then-red Colorado. “He needs a full-bore mobilization effort in these counties to get his supporters out and develop the margins he needs to carry swing states like Ohio, Colorado, and North Carolina.” Cont… That’ll be about the strongest argument Obama can make to base voters: it could, and will, be a lot worse if you don’t vote for me. That’s true, and fear is usually a pretty good motivator in politics. But it still isn’t what people were hoping for, and it seems inevitable that some percentage of the most loyal Democrats will stay home. In these three counties and others like them, that percentage will be the difference between reelection and retirement.

#### Liberal government spending on economy and job growth initiatives boost Obama in key battleground states

**Teixeira and Halpin, 11**

Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, Center for American Progress, November, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/11/pdf/path_to_270_execsumm.pdf>

Given the findings in this paper, Obama’s recent steps to define the election on more progressive terms through a commitment to a new jobs and growth program and a deficit reduction plan based on “shared sacrifice” will likely aid the president politically. Public polling over the past year suggests that a sustained posture of defending the middle class, supporting popular government programs, and calling for a more equitable tax distribution will be popular among many key demographic groups necessary to win in the 12 battleground states analyzed here.

### Ext – Big Gov Criticisms Backfire

#### Strict opposition to spending or taxes backfires – alienates swing voters

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/1, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12442>)

Veteran Democratic pollster Stan Greenberg offers up an alternative view. Noting the polls of his own firm and plenty of others, Stan points to signs that, while the Democratic Party’s brand has it’s own issues with favorable-unfavorable and positive-negative gaps (different pollsters test these things in various ways), invariably, the GOP has higher unfavorables and negatives than favorables and positives. Likewise, this applies to comparisons of “Democrats in Congress” and “Republicans in Congress.” It would seem that, in the minds of independents (and to a lesser extent in those of others), Democrats have not covered themselves in glory. The GOP brand has taken on considerably more water. Greenberg’s theory is that it is not one thing but the combination of factors. In some states, notably in Wisconsin and Ohio, actions by Republican governors and state legislatures pushed way too far. They took positions and pushed policies that looked extreme to many non-ideological independent voters, sometimes rubbing moderate Republicans the wrong way as well. Then there is Washington, where Greenberg argues that Republicans -- particularly Budget Chairman Paul Ryan and his budget, nearly universally embraced by fellow party members in Congress -- come across as too ideological or too harsh. Finally, there was the overheated rhetoric in the 20 or 21 Republican presidential debates. It was a conversation clearly aimed at the party base but overheard by other voters, who found much of the talk more than a little exotic for their tastes. Each of the eight GOP presidential contenders, in an August debate sponsored by Fox News, said they would not go along with a budget proposal that included $10 in spending cuts for every $1 of tax increases. Positioning that far to the right is way too out there for most independent voters, who respond well to the suggestions of balanced approaches to deficit reduction. While I don’t buy into Greenberg’s argument of a potential Democratic wave, if any kind of partisan wave is likely to develop -- barring some cataclysmic political, military, or economic development at home or abroad -- it sure seems more likely to break in favor of the Democrats, as he's suggesting, as a result of a backlash against Republicans going too far to the right. I don’t yet see signs that the Republicans’ obsession with their conservative base has reached a tipping point that will create a Democratic wave. But if I were a Republican leader, I’d at least consider the possibility.

#### Spending opponents not key, they already hate Obama – and the issue only alienates more important swing groups

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/19, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12401>)

The messaging and signals emanating from Republican presidential candidates, as well as from elected officials in Washington and in state capitals, seem to be aimed at only conservative, white men. This is a group that once dominated the electorate but is now considerably smaller than a majority. The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press released a poll of 2,373 registered voters, culled from a larger group of 3,008 adults, interviewed April 4-15. Among all registered voters, President Obama led presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney by just 4 percentage points, 49 percent to 45 percent, down from a 12-point lead, 54 percent to 42 percent, a month ago. In the survey, respondents rated the importance of 18 issues and then indicated their preference between Obama and Romney. Not too surprisingly, Obama did best with those who rated the environment as very important; he led that group by 39 percentage points. He also won the folks who picked education as very important by 22 points, birth control by 19 points, and health care by 15 points. See a pattern here? Romney prevailed among those who picked the budget deficit as very important, winning them by 19 points, and among those who named Iran, by 14 points. Those kinds of issues are very different from birth control and health care. The relevance of all of this comes through when you look at key demographic breakouts from the trial heat between Obama and Romney. Overall, Obama led among women by 13 points: 53 percent to 40 percent. Romney was ahead among men by 6 points: 50 percent to 44 percent. Given that women generally make up 51 to 52 percent of the electorate, whenever Republican candidates lose women by more than they win among men, they can skip ordering the champagne for election night. In all but the most unusual cases, a Republican needs to win among men by a wider margin than a Democrat does among women. But it gets really interesting when you break the genders down by age: under 50 versus over 50. Among all women 50 and older, Obama beat Romney by 7 points, 50 percent to 43 percent. Among all women under 50, though, Obama prevailed by 18 points, 56 percent to 38 percent. That’s an 11-point difference in the president’s lead between the younger and older groups of women. Among men, Obama actually led among those under 50 by 1 percentage point: 47 percent to 46 percent. But Romney prevailed among men 50 and older by 11 percentage points, 53 percent to 42 percent. So, a 12-point difference in Obama’s standing between the younger and older men. When you make the same comparisons among just white voters, the contrast is even starker. Romney’s support came overwhelmingly from white men, a group he carried by 26 points, 60 percent to 34 percent. In comparison, the Republican had an advantage of just 5 points among white women, 49 percent to 44 percent. The age difference among white women was considerably less important than that among all women. Among white women 50 and older, Romney defeated Obama by 7 points, 50 percent to 43 percent. Among white women under 50, he won by 3 points, 48 percent to 45 percent, for only a 4-point difference between younger and older groups of women. Among white men, Romney won the under-50 cohort by 13 percentage points, 53 percent to 40 percent. Among white men 50 and older, he prevailed by 27 percentage points, 61 percent to 34 percent. That’s a 14-point difference. Taking all of this into consideration and then adding that Obama led by 40 points among Hispanic voters, 67 percent to 27 percent, and by 93 points among African-Americans, 95 percent to 2 percent, it’s clear that, assuming these groups turn out in numbers approaching 2008, it’s women under 50 who are the demographic that either will or won’t put Obama over the top in the general election. Democrats hope to make the case that Republicans have tailored their priorities for white men, particularly white men over 50, to such a degree that they seem to deliberately exclude women voters, especially younger women. Other polling shows real deterioration for Romney among independent women—most specifically, those under 50.

### Ext – GOP Base locked up

#### GOP Base enthusiasm is locked up and irreversible – moderates key

**Epstien, 12** (Reid, Columnist @ Politico, 5/17, lexis)

Romney can make the about-face on Clinton, GOP operative Rick Wilson said, because the combination of the primary's end and Obama's embrace of gay marriage have coalesced for him the conservative base. What's left to target is the political middle and voters who remember fondly the Clinton era. "Romney now has the Republican base done and done. Locked up, cooked, in the bag," Wilson said. "He is still soft a little bit with moderates. Bill Clinton is beloved by those folks. He's not seen as a Democratic partisan in the same way he was when he was president."

### A2: Spending/Big Gov Link divides dems

#### Criticizing Obama policies as big government liberal can’t divide dems – outreach to Clinton era democrats fail

**Epstien, 12** (Reid, Columnist @ Politico, 5/17, lexis)

 But veterans of the Clinton administration warn that Romney's love letters to the former president - who has appeared at fundraisers and in TV ads for Obama - could backfire with voters. "Maybe it's a good one-liner for today, though I'm not sure that the public doesn't see through it," said John Podesta, who was a White House chief of staff under Clinton and co-chaired Obama's transition team. "All it does is, in the long term, all it will do is elevate President Clinton's views of the economy." Clinton, Podesta noted, raised taxes in office, which administration veterans credit for boosting the '90s economy for which Romney claims to be nostalgic. "If he'd be for what Clinton was for, maybe that would help him," Podesta said. "If [voters] think back to those days, and if they look at what Romney is proposing, it's exactly the opposite of what Clinton did in office." Dee Dee Myers, a White House spokeswoman during Clinton's first term, said Romney will need to find a better messenger than himself to speak to Democrats disaffected by Obama. "I don't think Democrats or even Democratic-leaning independents turn to Mitt Romney on who is a real Democrat," Myers said. "Like so many things that Mitt Romney does, it just kinda misses. Like his humor, his singing - it's just kind of off the target." And Minyon Moore, who served as Clinton's political director and as a senior adviser for Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign, said there will be no audience among Democrats for Romney's entreaties. "If you don't have anything else to reach for, then you reach for something that appears to be easy to do," she said. "Pit one group against another. People are smarter than that."

#### Romney attempts to pick off Clinton Era democrats are hopeless

**Epstien, 12** (Reid, Columnist @ Politico, 5/17, lexis)

Romney's hope that Democrats and independents who supported Clinton will gravitate to his candidacy ignores the fact that Clinton is appearing at fundraisers for Obama and making a star turn in his TV advertisements, said Phil Singer, a former Hillary Clinton spokesman who served as her attack dog against Obama during the 2008 Democratic primaries. "He's going to have to come up with something better to make a case for his candidacy than trying to drive a wedge between two Democratic luminaries," he said. "It's a particularly ineffective tactic when the Bill Clinton-Barack Obama fundraising roadshow is taking place in real time."

### A2: Spending - Taxes/User Fees Link

#### Plan won’t increase gas tax or user fees – not normal means

**Grant, 12** (David, Staff Writer, CSM, Christian Science Monitor, 5/8, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/0508/Transportation-bill-not-yet-passed-already-blasted-by-critics>)

Bipartisan commissions have repeatedly suggested two crucial changes in how America pays for its infrastructure: A short-term increase in the gasoline tax to make sure US highway funding doesn’t go belly-up. A long-term plan for charging drivers directly for how many miles they drive. How much do you know about taxes? Take the quiz. Neither the House's basic 90-day extension of funding passed April 20, nor the Senate's more ambitious two-year plan passed March 14 addresses those suggestions. Until Congress is willing to consider such proposals, any transportation bill is merely papering over the cracks, say economic groups. “We’re at a point where we’re at the ‘searching under the couch cushions’ portion of finding transportation funding as opposed to dealing directly with the question of user fees,” says Janet Kavinoky, executive director for transportation and infrastructure at the US Chamber of Commerce.

#### Normal means is funding from general budget – increased gas tax or user fees will be punted far down road

**Rafey, 10** (William, Staff Writer, Harvard Political Review, 6/1, http://hpronline.org/united-states/how-to-pass-a-gas-tax/)

Recognizing that political barriers will make increasing the gas tax difficult, policymakers need to start thinking outside the box. One possibility, Sterner proposed, is the “fuel price escalator,” raising the tax gradually over the course of many years. Sterner said that this is “the only workable model.” By making the price increases less immediate, the fuel price escalator resolves some of the difficulty posed by an electoral system focused on short-term gain. This explains, in part, how the United Kingdom under Margaret Thatcher was able to move from a relatively low gas tax to one that charges over 300 percent of the retail price, the highest in Europe. Efficient use of revenue from the gas tax, Sterner said, is also important. The careful use of rebates can correct the regressive elements of the tax and can also make the increase in fuel prices more palatable to rural residents. Furthermore, the gas tax is essential for deficit reduction. “It’s becoming abundantly evident that we need the money,” Gale said. The current gas tax can no longer keep up with escalating road and highway spending; this year’s highway appropriations were made possible only by siphoning funds from the general budget, which, according to Lee, has never been done before. Lee noted, “You’re going to have to have a change in the system in the next five years,” because there is “no way” Congress can continue propping up the transportation budget with general funds.

#### Voters won’t backlash to the spending increase as long as its not funded with new taxes on them

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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%). 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 – Solves perception of wasteful spending/mismanagement

#### Plan restores public confidence in federal investments – even deficit hawks support

**Bradley, Ridge and Walker, 11**

(Bill, Former Senator, Tom, Former Director DHS, David, Former Governor, They lead a transportation solvency project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington Post, 2/27)

A better transportation system will enhance our economic and national security and will rebuild public trust in public investments. Many new members of Congress are rightly furious about wasteful spending. By squeezing every ounce of investment gain from our infrastructure dollar we can create a transportation program that both deficit hawks and program reform leaders can get behind.

### 2NC Turn Shield – Business Lobby

#### Donohue and chamber of commerce love plan

**Donohue, 11**

(Thomas, President US Chamber of Commerce, 9/8, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2011/0908/The-highway-to-jobs-via-better-infrastructure>)

The highway to jobs – via better infrastructure As Obama and Congress talk jobs, here's an appeal from the US Chamber of Commerce: Invest heavily in roads, air transport, and other infrastructure. The economy and jobs depend on it. Adopt innovative financing, including an infrastructure bank to leverage private investment. Throughout America’s history, feats in infrastructure, like the Interstate Highway System, have not only been symbols of national achievement but also conduits for commerce and keys to prosperity. Today, however, much of this foundation of the US economy is costly, cracked, and crumbling. Roads, rail, airports, and harbors need continual investment to keep pace with demand. Recent research by the US Chamber of Commerce discovered that underperforming transport infrastructure cost the US economy nearly $2 trillion in lost gross domestic product in 2008 and 2009. The chamber’s Transportation Performance Index showed that America’s transit system is not keeping up with growing demands and is failing to meet the needs of the business community and consumers. Most important, the research proved for the first time that there is a direct relationship between transportation infrastructure performance and GDP. The index findings also showed that if America invests wisely in infrastructure, it can become more reliable, predictable, and safe. By improving underperforming transport infrastructure, the United States could unlock nearly $1 trillion in economic potential. Making investments that tackle immediate challenges, like congestion, and that account for growing demand into the future, America would boost productivity and economic growth in the long run and support millions of jobs in the near term. Investment in infrastructure would also improve quality of life by reducing highway fatalities and accidents and easing traffic congestion that costs the public $115 billion a year in lost time and wasted fuel – $808 out of the pocket of every motorist. Such an investment would also allow the country to better protect the environment while increasing mobility. If America fails to adequately invest in transportation infrastructure, by 2020 it will lose $897 billion in economic growth. Businesses will see their transportation costs rise by $430 billion, and the average American household income will drop by more than $7,000. US exports will decline by $28 billion. Meanwhile, global competitors will surge past us with superior infrastructure that will attract jobs, businesses, and capital. So how can the US get its infrastructure to go from insufficient and declining to safe, competitive, and productive? An obvious place to start is for Congress to pass core bills for surface transportation, aviation, and water programs – at current funding levels. Congress must move forward with multiyear reauthorizations to restore the nation’s highways; modernize air traffic control and improve airports; and maintain American ports, harbors, dams, and levees. Doing so would enable communities to plan projects, hire employees, and prevent devastating layoffs of existing workers. Reauthorizing the Federal Aviation Administration alone would help keep 70,000 workers on the job.

#### that provides political cover with public– prevents spending backlash over transportation

**Keifer, 11** (Francine, Journalist @ CSM, 1/11, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Editorial-Board-Blog/2011/0111/The-clout-and-cover-of-Tom-Donohue>)

The clout and cover of Tom Donohue Unlike a politician, Thomas Donohue -- CEO of the US Chamber of Commerce -- doesn't have to worry about the next election. He can provide cover to politicians who might get scared off by tough decisions on the economy and spending. It's pointing out the obvious perhaps, but what's notable about America's No. 1 lobbyist for business – Thomas Donohue, CEO of the US Chamber of Commerce – is that he's not a politician This is particularly useful right now because the country faces tough economic and budget choices that could scare off political action. Unlike a pol, Mr. Donohue doesn't need to watch his backside or worry about the next election. Now, when the government has pretty much run out of stimulative options for the economy and is depending on the private sector to revive jobs, Donohue has maximum clout. He can use it to provide cover for those in Washington who need to make difficult policy decisions. Plain-spoken and fair-minded, Donohue talked about several of the tough choices ahead in his annual "State of American Business" address this morning. (The headline: He predicts 3.2 percent growth for the year; 2.4 to 2.6 million new jobs – more bullish than many forecasts but a prediction that's also loaded with caveats, such as rising oil prices.) In two areas in particular, he can provide a much needed push to Congress and the White House. One is rebuilding America's infrastructure. The other is cutting its federal deficits and debt. Note how both of these involve significant, painful costs: one is in build-out (investing in roads, rail, air, and so on); the other is in build-down (cutting government spending, i.e. services, which the public is sure to find painful). The country loses its competitive edge when it can't move goods and services, either physically or electronically. And yet lawmakers don't want to spend the money on infrastructure. They keep delaying important pieces of legislation, like reauthorizing the highway bill, because of the price tag. But this means states can't plan. It means projects don't get done. Jobs aren't created. No politician wants to hear this, but Donohue is willing to say it: User fees that fund these projects – such as the federal gas tax that hasn't been adjusted since 1993 – must be raised. If the government finally commits to a higher, steady source of funding, the private sector will be willing to join in on projects. But nothing will happen if Washington just keeps extending current funding a few months at a time, afraid to ask users to pay their fair share. Donohue talks frankly about reducing deficits and debt, too. It can't be done by nibbling around the edges. Anything that excludes reforming entitlements (Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security) "is doomed to fail," he said today. As experience shows, though, entitlement reform is a third rail in politics. Touch it, and you're zapped. But Donohue must be as specific with solutions here as he is in other areas. He would do Congress and the White House a big favor by touching the third rail with them, not just pointing them to it.

### Ext – Business support gives cover

#### GOP can’t run against it – its popular with key republican constituents and they don’t want to alienate big business

**Baltimore Sun, 10** (2/1, lexis)

Right now, states have 10,000 ready-to-go transportation projects valued at $79 billion waiting to be funded, according to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Funding them creates real, not theoretical, private-sector jobs, many of them in small companies. What kind of left-wing crazies can support this kind of capital investment? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce - and other conservative business groups - are usually first in line. That's because they see the value of better roads, bridges and mass transit in growing the economy. The jobs bill passed by the House - and endorsed by Mr. Obama in his State of the Union - includes such spending and is a good starting point. The Senate needs to make the $154 billion plan leaner and meaner, turning it into a straight public works bill that Republicans cannot so easily oppose - at least if Democrats can refrain from larding it with earmarks and wasteful pet projects. Elected leaders who are genuinely worried about the deficit recognize that the sooner the economy is firmly back on track, the sooner the government can both collect the taxes and trim the spending needed to bring the budget back in balance. Spending on infrastructure ensures that money is not just priming the pump but creating something of critical long-term value, too.

### Ext – Business lobby loves it

#### Overwhelming Business lobby support

**Baltimore Sun, 10** (2/1, lexis)

Right now, states have 10,000 ready-to-go transportation projects valued at $79 billion waiting to be funded, according to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Funding them creates real, not theoretical, private-sector jobs, many of them in small companies. What kind of left-wing crazies can support this kind of capital investment? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce - and other conservative business groups - are usually first in line. That's because they see the value of better roads, bridges and mass transit in growing the economy.

#### Business lobby loves it

**Wytkind, 10**

Ed Wytkind, President, Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 10/27, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments

It’s clear that we’re going to need the Administration’s leadership if we’re going to do anything worth doing. The funny thing is there isn’t much disagreement about the need for America to invest in our infrastructure. 19 out of 20 Americans are concerned about our nation’s infrastructure, and 84 percent support greater investment to address it, according to the report by the Treasury Department and the Council of Economic Advisers at the President’s meeting. Major elements of the business lobby agree with us and not with the Congressional naysayers. Why? Because businesses of all sizes understand that the economy won’t turn around and they won’t thrive without a first-class transportation system, and that current investment levels get a failing grade. In addition to the President’s $50 billion “down payment” on a long-term transportation funding plan (which should be enacted quickly), there are several key transportation bills and initiatives that flow naturally from the President’s plan. As we all know, the Federal Aviation Administration bill has been extended by Congress 15 times because a single corporate interest and its CEO didn’t like the House bill. Fortunately, the House and Senate are very close on a reconciled bill that boosts investment in airports and air traffic control, reduces airport congestion and delays, makes air travel safer and deals with key FAA operational and employee issues. The lame-duck session must not adjourn without completing this bill. The surface transportation bill has been delayed five times – it must be completed at a funding level of no less than half a trillion dollars. Estimates predict that this kind of robust bill would create six million jobs in six years. Transit systems and their workers are hurting – the Administration and Congress must move legislation this year that provides immediate operating assistance that stops the service and jobs cuts across America. In the absence of meaningful action, what is otherwise an industry poised for growth will instead go through a painful era of contraction. And making Amtrak the centerpiece of high speed rail and investing billions in our ports and freight rail systems must be priorities for today. With transportation investments, we kill two birds with one stone: good, middle-class jobs get created in a sector that is in dire need of substantial new investments.

#### Chamber of Commerce loves plan

**Grant, 12** (David, Columnist @ CSM, 5/21, <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/us-chamber-upset-congress-over-transportation-bill>)

US Chamber upset with Congress over transportation bill The Chamber of Commerce’s top brass has a message for Congress on transportation: You’re doing it wrong. “What we lack is anybody of any party willing to address the fundamental problem called money,” said Bruce Josten, the chamber’s executive vice president for government affairs, during a breakfast for reporters sponsored by the Monitor Monday. Mr. Josten and Chamber CEO Tom Donohue expressed exasperation at how Congress has attempted to fund long-term investments in America’s infrastructure and said congressional delay is costing jobs. Members of the House and Senate are currently attempting to put together a compromise bill to extend transportation funding before a 90-day funding fix lapses at the end of June. “Nothing happens in the states and in the communities when you’ve got a 90-day or a 120-day extension,” Mr. Donohue said. Governors and mayors “can’t write a contract [to build transportation infrastructure] in that amount of time, and jobs that could be had are not going to be had.”

### A2: Business lobby only supports GOP

#### It’s a key issue – builds business support regardless of party affiliation

**Daily Political, 12** (5/12, <http://www.dailypolitical.com/politics/u-s-politics/chamber-of-commerce-to-spend-in-record-numbers-on-2012-election.htm>)

Even though the group is viewed as pro-Republican they also do support fiscally conservative Democrats and focus their votes and positions that benefit the business community over party affiliation. Angstrom ended by saying “we will focus our efforts on a number of issues critical to the American recovery. These issues include Obamacare, American energy exploration, a common sense approach to government regulation, limiting frivolous lawsuits, travel and tourism and investments in transportation and infrastructure so our economy can move.”

## \*\*\*Obama Bad – Specific Links\*\*\*

### Airports/Aviation/FAA

#### Obama gets credit and swings key election districts – general turns don’t apply because aviation infrastructure is *uniquely popular*

**Bilotkach, 10**

Volodymyr, Department of Economics, University of California, Irvine, October, <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September)

The literature suggests three possible sources of political influence: the White House (President), the US Senate, and the Congressional Committees. We hypothesize that the impact of the White House should be the strongest in this particular case – recall that passing the economic stimulus legislation was one of Barack Obama’s priorities as a candidate. As for hypotheses related to the impact of the White House, we can suppose that ARRA grants might have been used to reward districts which showed support to Obama, as evidenced by the election results. An alternative explanation – grants could be used to sway voters in the districts where support for Obama was not sufficiently strong – is less plausible, as the grants have been appropriated after the election and almost four years before the next Presidential election is scheduled to take place. Cont… Conclusion about impact of the White House on the grant allocation process stems primarily from the Tobit regression results. These show positive association between the district level Presidential election results and the amount of funds allocated to the airport. We have suggested that such association is consistent with rewarding districts for their contribution to the election outcome. Recall that elsewhere in the literature impact of the White House on allocation of federal funds has been detected by Garrett and Sobel (2003). Note we have checked for the existence of separate effects for the districts in which Obama won, or districts with small Obama-McCain vote differential, and did not find any. We of course need to note that the association between the airport infrastructure grants and the Presidential election results does break down once we factor in adjacent districts; however, such a result does not necessarily weaken our conclusion, it only shows rewards have been targeted to the specific districts. Moreover, study of aviation related infrastructure offers an attractive environment for examining the more general issue of political factors behind the allocation of federal funds. Airports and airfields are ubiquitous, unlike, for instance, tornadoes or corn fields. Also, airports are generally viewed favorably by the public, unlike some other kinds of federally provided infrastructure (e.g., prisons). For this study, we make use of information on the airport infrastructure grants, appropriated under the ARRA of 2009. We supplement this data with airport characteristics, simple demographic measures, congressional district level results of November 2008 election (both Presidential and House), and Senate election results. Data analysis suggests the following general conclusions about the supposed impact of political factors on allocation of ARRA airport infrastructure grants. First, results of the presidential election appear to affect the amounts of grants, but do not have an impact on whether the airport receives the grant. Second, controlling for the State level composition of the Senate, we find that airports located in the States carried by a Republican at the latest Senate election show higher likelihood of obtaining the grant; the amounts involved are also higher. At the same time, airports located in States represented by two Democratic Party senators are also more likely to obtain the grants, other things equal. Third, we do not find strong evidence of impact of the House of Representatives election results or membership in Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Throughout the world, regulators have been reconsidering the role of the airports. Also, our understanding of the determinants of public infrastructure investment, and especially of the role of political factors, is far from complete. This study is one of the first attempts at looking into both issues together. We find that political factors matter. The next issue to be addressed – and the one which will require a more thorough investigation of these political factors – is what our results imply for such important public policy issues as airport regulation, privatization, and congestion.

#### Airport infrastructure investment boosts president in key swing states – perception of mass benefits

**Bilotkach, 10**

Volodymyr, Department of Economics, University of California, Irvine, October, <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September)

The federal government plays a crucial role in the infrastructure investment in the United States, including allocation of funds to the airports. Given that airports are perceived to bring substantial benefits to the respective communities, federally funded airport infrastructure projects are both sought after, welcomed, and should be beneficial to the politicians capable of securing the funds. Complicated structure of the American political system creates possibilities for strong influence of political factors on the process of allocation of infrastructure investment funds. Understanding the role of politics in this area is of no trivial importance, as currently perception of the airports’ role is being revised. An increasing number of countries have started viewing airports as the firms rather than the infrastructure objects. Privatization and deregulation of the airports is also becoming more common. It is believed that involvement of the private sector will bring about efficiency gains, and that privately run airports may be more willing and able to contribute to solving the congestion problem. This study offers the first look at the issue of impact of political factors on the aviation infrastructure investment in the USA. We take advantage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (more broadly known as the Stimulus) to examine contribution of political factors to allocation of the $1.1 billion worth of the airport grants included into the package. The Stimulus provides an excellent case for studying political economy of airport (and more generally, infrastructure) investment, at least as far as involvement of the federal government is concerned. The law was set up rather hastily – Barack Obama was elected President in November of 2008, inaugurated on January 20, 2009, and ARRA became law on February 17, 2009. The criteria for the airport infrastructure projects to be funded under the ARRA were rather vague 2 . We can therefore suspect that the airport infrastructure grants could have been used by the Administration, or the Congress as a mechanism to reward districts which brought more votes in the latest election. Additionally, members of the corresponding Congress Committees (in particular, of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure) might have used ARRA as an opportunity to bring more money to their districts. Empirical research on the impact of politics on transport infrastructure investment deals mostly with the European data. The studies examining US evidence are rare, and include McFadden (1976) and Knight (2004). The former study looks at determinants of highway project selection by the California Division of Highways, while the latter examines congressional voting on transportation projects. Our data analysis showed the association between the airport’s location in the Congressional District with the larger Obama-McCain vote differential in November 2008 Presidential election, and the amount of the ARRA grant received by the airport. At the same time, district level election results are poor predictors of whether the airport receives the grant; and estimation results are not entirely robust to taking election results from the adjacent districts into consideration. We also detect rather robust evidence of the impact of Senate on the grant allocation process. This paper contributes to two broad strains of literature. First, we extend the literature on public provision of infrastructure. Research in this area has been addressing the issues of both effects of the publicly provided infrastructure on private sector productivity, and the determinants of the infrastructure investment. The former literature (e.g., Aschauer, 1989; Holz-Eakin, 1994) is much richer than the latter. Studies of the determinants of public infrastructure investment include Cadot et al. (2006), Castells and Sole-Olle (2005), Kemmerling and Stephan (2002, 2008), Fridstrom and Elvik (1997), Bel and Fageda (2009). All the listed papers study infrastructure investment in Europe, and the latter has the most relevance to our paper, as it examines (and confirms the existence of) the impact of political factors on airport investment in Spain. On the US side, we find a lot of studies asserting the disproportionate power of the Senate 3 (e.g., Hoover and Pecorino, 2005) and Congressional Committees (e.g., Garrett et al., 2006) in allocation of the federal funds across the jurisdictions. Garrett and Sobel (2003) find that states which are politically important to the president will have a higher rate of the disaster declaration; the authors also find the election year effects on the amounts of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) disaster payments. The only studies of political determinants of transport infrastructure investment in the US are McFadden (1976) – an examination of project choices by California Division of Highways, finding limited impact of political determinants on the selection process; as well as Knight (2004), asserting that congressmen respond to common pool incentives when voting for transportation projects.

### Highway/roadway

#### Roadway infrastructure investments most highly perceived – massively boosts public confidence

**McGahan, 12**

Will, 4/2, National League of Cities, <http://citiesspeak.org/2012/04/02/the-state-of-the-cities-in-2012-focus-on-infrastructure-investment/>

Roadway improvements are the obvious first place you think when the topic of transportation infrastructure is brought up. Cities are of course making the necessary improvements there, but they are focusing their efforts on the bigger picture as well. Light rail is a transportation option that a number of communities are focusing on. Oklahoma City is starting construction this year to bring street cars back to the city by connecting the downtown area to the suburbs, while Pasadena is investing $735 million in extending their Gold Line after seeing a record number of riders. The city of Baltimore is making the effort to preserve its position as a bustling port. Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake said “We are preparing the port for growth by reinvesting in our roads and bridges that support freight movement.” For cities, transportation is not simply about the movement of goods and people. Quality transportation infrastructure is vital to the health and happiness of a community. In Eugene, OR Mayor Kitty Piercy spoke about the importance of updating transportation and land use plans to match the overarching goals of the city. Those goals include, “accessible and attractive transportation choices that reduce carbon emissions, set us on the path to the future, and continue to keep our road infrastructure safe and efficient for all modes to move people and goods.” In Pasadena, Mayor Bill Bogaard has set similar goals for his city. The land use and mobility elements of the general plan are being updated to “reflect community priorities such as sustainability, historic preservation, urban design and public participation.” Infrastructure man at Delaware rest stop on I-95. Let’s not pretend that infrastructure improvements aren’t a powerful economic driver as well. The time to improve infrastructure is now, with cheap goods and services. The city of Washington, DC, has leveraged $2.1 billion of investment into 3,000 construction jobs, and anticipates 6,000 permanent jobs upon the completion of fourteen major projects. Mick Cornett, Mayor of Oklahoma City, knows that even the sight of construction can have lasting effects. “When the dirt is flying, people realize that their local businesses and their governments are investing in their future. There may be no better way to visually fuel consumer confidence.” Most recently, Mayor of Chicago Rahm Emanuel announced the Building A New Chicago campaign, which will invest $7 billion over three years in infrastructure improvements, and will create 30,000 new jobs.

### HSR - Florida Link 1NC

#### ( ) Our Florida Independent voters link.

#### First – They’re key to Obama’s re-election, they’re undecided, and they hate anti-High Speed Rail policy.

**Smith ‘11**

ADAM C. SMITH, Times Political Editor St. Petersburg Times (Florida) – March 27, 2011 – lexis

A common myth about Florida's 2008 results is that Obama won mainly by firing up the Democratic base. He did that, but Republicans still had stronger turnout than Democrats, who turned out at about the same rate as in 2000. More than anything, Obama won by winning moderate and independent voters who invariably decide Florida races. The TV ad he ran over and over again was about cutting taxes for the middle class. Exit polls in 2008 found that Obama beat McCain by 7 percentage points among independent voters and 16 points among self-described moderates. "He won the state because he had a great ground game, which I think we will again, and because he appealed to the broad middle,'' said Steve Schale of Tallahassee, who ran Obama's Florida campaign. "If it's a neutral or decent electorate for us, there's no reason to think Barack Obama won't be plenty competitive." The last credible Florida poll was taken in January by Quinnipiac University. It found voters overall, and specifically independent voters, gave the president a split job approval rating, with 47 percent approving of his performance and 49 percent disapproving. Forty-eight percent said the president did not deserve another term, and 45 percent said he did. "He's been coming to the middle lately because he realizes the way he started out it would be tough for him to get re-elected,'' said Florida GOP chairman David Bitner. "The independent vote in Florida will be the one that determines Obama will not be serving another four years." Democrats can win the White House without Florida's electoral votes, but it's virtually impossible for Republicans. That's part of the reason why many pundits already are speculating about the Republican nominee tapping Rubio or Jeb Bush as his running mate, and why the nominating convention will be in Tampa. - - By some estimates, the election of Rick Scott may prove to be the best thing to happen to Obama in Florida. "Gov. Scott's early performance is such that Florida's very much in play,'' said Florida Democratic chairman Rod Smith, arguing that Scott's rejection of high-speed rail antagonized voters in the crucial I-4 corridor and that the arch-conservative agenda under way in Tallahassee is antagonizing even many Republicans. "Most people in Florida are kind of down the middle and if you swing too far one way or another you pay a price for it,'' said Smith. "This tea party iteration of the Republican Party is not Florida and it's not going to be successful in the long run."

#### Second – I-4 corridor voters are independents and love High-Speed Rail

**Chicago Daily Herald ‘11**

April 1, 2011 – lexis

But this is Florida, where the recently elected Gov. Rick Scott has rejected $2.4 billion in federal money for a $2.7 billion high-speed train connecting Tampa and Orlando. Scott offers several reasons for this move, though not necessarily the real one. The Republican insists that Florida taxpayers would have to subsidize the line's operations, even though a state-sponsored study says otherwise. He notes that Tampa-Orlando is a relatively short 84-mile trip, and because the train would make stops, the trip would take almost as long as driving. This is true, assuming Interstate 4 isn't clogged with traffic, which it often is. But the Tampa-Orlando run was to be just a first leg on a more ambitious bullet-train system. The bigger vision has trains turning right at Orlando and zooming down the crowded east coast to Miami. Tampa to Miami is 281 often tough road miles. This piecemeal thinking is indeed problematic, says Rush Loving, a railroad expert and author of "The Man Who Loved Trains.""The real market for the Tampa-Orlando run would have been from the airport to Disney World," he told me. That's not why you build bullet trains. "But there is a market from the Miami and Fort Lauderdale airports to Disney World." Consider my recent conversation with a helpful Thrifty car rental guy. Do you wish to buy a SunPass for the toll roads? he asked. No, I responded, I'll be driving on non-toll Interstate 95. Any other reason why I might need a SunPass? Well, he said, many drivers headed south to Miami on I-95 encounter such congestion that they switch to Florida's Turnpike, which is a toll road. Florida has been getting rid of humans who make change, so you need a SunPass at unmanned exits. OR you can go through the TOLL-BY-PLATE collection system, where a photo is taken of the license plate and a bill for that sum plus an administrative charge is sent to the rental company and added to your final tab. Suppose I were a jet-lagged tourist from Poland (or Portland). I'd think: What on earth is he talking about? I could visit the turnpike website and its "frequently asked questions," of which there are 26. One tells car renters who miss a toll, "Please contact the rental car company directly to report the missed toll and to learn their policy on toll violations." Is it now clear? OK, so why didn't Scott lunge for money that could have launched America's first bullet train and employed a bunch of jobless Floridians? Politics. Fast trains were to be President Obama's moon shot. Work on the Tampa-Orlando link was already so far along that it could have debuted in time for the 2012 election. The project is wildly popular in the independent-voter-rich I-4 corridor. Giving the people what they want might help Obama win Florida, so you can't do that. Meanwhile, the California High-Speed Rail Authority meets this week to pick projects on which to spend the $2.4 billion that Florida turned down. Scott's snub of this grant wrapped in golden ribbons has angered Floridians of all political persuasions. Just wait until the bullet trains start streaking across California.

### Ext – HSR Florida Link – popular

#### ( ) Florida voters support Federal funding of HSR

**Schultz ‘11**

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

A very public issue surrounding high-speed rail today is funding. Several states have declined the use of federal funds including Ohio, Wisconsin and most recently Florida (this survey was conducted before Florida declined funding). However, almost two thirds of Americans (64%) say they somewhat or strongly support using state funding for HSR and a similar number (62%) support using federal funds. The areas with the greatest support for high-speed rail funding include the California corridor where 70% support state funding being used and 73% support federal funding. 70% of both the Pacific North West and Gulf corridor residents also support state funding with more than 60% each also supporting federal funding. Additionally, more than two thirds of Florida residents support state and federal funding of high-speed rail, "a particularly poignant point", notes Schulz, as Florida recently declined federal HSR funding the state had actively sought. While those in states without a high-speed rail project still support state funding (61%), they are more likely to oppose federal funding for these projects (32%).

#### ( ) HSR popular in Florida

**St. Petersburg Times ’11**

(TIMES EDITORIALS section; Pg. 12A, June 29, 2011 -- lexis)

Scott has held up SunRail contracts and is expected to decide whether to let the project move forward by Friday. He is under considerable pressure to approve it from powerful Central Florida politicians such as Republican state House Speaker Dean Cannon of Winter Park and U.S. Rep. John Mica, the Republican chairman of the House Transportation Committee. But Scott ignored the pressure from the Obama administration and broad bipartisan support within Florida for high-speed rail. A governor who claims to act on philosophy rather than political concerns cannot have a firm but flexible backbone. The governor also could punt and contend he lacks the constitutional authority to kill a rail project that has been approved by the Legislature. But that's exactly what he did when he killed high-speed rail, and the Florida Supreme Court let him get away with it. The situation is not much different here. Either the state's chief executive believes he has the authority to act unilaterally in these spending decisions or he doesn't. Scott killed a high-speed rail project that would have been a model for the nation and declared he was acting on principle. Let's see if he sticks with his principles on a far less defensible commuter rail line or turns out to be another deal-cutting governor protecting his backside.

### Ext – HSR Florida Link – visible

#### ( ) HSR is a highly-visible project in Florida.

**Schultz ‘11**

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

President Obama announced in April 2009, and reconfirmed during his recent State of the Union address, his commitment to develop high-speed intercity passenger rail across the United States. High-speed rail is a type of passenger rail transport between major cities that operates at substantially faster speeds than current intercity passenger trains in the U.S. It is designed to provide fast, reliable, and convenient service, operates using electric power and often includes onboard amenities such as food and beverage service and Wi-fi access. The Harris Poll conducted an online survey among 2,566 adults between January 17 and 24, 2011 to gauge awareness, intention to use and position on funding for high-speed rail. At the time of the survey, there were ten proposed high-speed rail corridors across the United Statesª. To-date, projects in California and Florida have been the most visible.

### Ext – HSR Florida Link: I-4 Corridor Voters Key

#### ( ) I-4 corridor key to the election

**Fox News ‘11**

Fox News Radio November 22, 2011 – http://m.radio.foxnews.com/2011/11/22/aehq-florida-highway-of-voters/

It’s in the largest swing state in Presidential elections, and it may be the most important road in U.S. politics. It’s the I-4 highway across central Florida, from Tampa to Daytona Beach. 132 miles of all kinds of voters; old, young, rural, urban, but above all, independent voters who tend to vote for winners. And, the I-4 corridor helps determine which way Florida votes as a whole in those Presidential elections.

#### ( ) I-4 corridor key to the election

**Schale ‘10**

Steve Schale, Florida-based political strategist, Political Director, Florida Justice Association, January 23, 2010 – http://www.stevenschale.com/blog/2010/1/23/welcome-back-mr-president.html

So if Florida is the epicenter of Presidential politics, what is the epicenter of Florida? Simple: Tampa, the place where the President will pay a visit on Thursday. According to the Division of Elections, since 1948, the winner of Hillsborough County has won Florida all but one time (1960---that year, it voted for Kennedy, but Nixon won the state). And since 1992 (the point where POTUS elections in FL became reliably competitive), the Tampa media market as a whole has selected the winner. Certainly in 2008, the importance of the market wasn't lost on either the Obama or McCain campaigns. We stuck our campaign state headquarters right smack in the heart of the market and made St. Petersburg the first public Florida stop of then Senator Obama's general election effort. In fact, McCain and Obama both made four visits (and even more 'stops') to the market between August and Election Day, and sent their ticket-mate's there three times each. So what is it about this market? First, in terms of vote share, no market is bigger in Florida. Nearly a quarter of all votes cast in a Presidential election will come from the Tampa market. When you add the 20% that comes from the Orlando market, the importance of the I-4 corridor becomes obvious.

### Ext – HSR Florida Link: I-4 Corridor voters up for grabs

#### ( ) I-4 corridor is key and could swing in either direction

**Florida News Journal ‘11**

October 10, 2011 – http://www.thefloridanewsjournal.com/2011/10/10/mel-martinez-endorses-mitt-romney-republican-nomination-presidential-elections-helps-flor

Only three other states have more electoral votes which makes Florida a must win for any candidate. As usual, the "I-4 Corridor" is a battle ground for democratic and republic candidates alike, because it is a swing vote area filled with a large amount of independent voters. Tampa and Orlando have already played a large role in the 2012 race, with most candidates having already made several appearances in Orlando, and the Republican National Convention being held in Tampa in 2012. Without the I-4 Corridor, Florida tends to vote roughly half Republican and half Democrat.

### HSR – General Link

#### Voters across spectrum love HSR – perceive economic benefit and view as key issue

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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. 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

### HSR – A2: Spending Turn

#### ( ) Public supports Federal funding of HSR

**Schultz ‘11**

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

A very public issue surrounding high-speed rail today is funding. Several states have declined the use of federal funds including Ohio, Wisconsin and most recently Florida (this survey was conducted before Florida declined funding). However, almost two thirds of Americans (64%) say they somewhat or strongly support using state funding for HSR and a similar number (62%) support using federal funds. The areas with the greatest support for high-speed rail funding include the California corridor where 70% support state funding being used and 73% support federal funding. 70% of both the Pacific North West and Gulf corridor residents also support state funding with more than 60% each also supporting federal funding. Additionally, more than two thirds of Florida residents support state and federal funding of high-speed rail, "a particularly poignant point", notes Schulz, as Florida recently declined federal HSR funding the state had actively sought. While those in states without a high-speed rail project still support state funding (61%), they are more likely to oppose federal funding for these projects (32%).

### HSR – Obama Push

#### ( ) White House would have to get involved in High-Speed Rail policy

**Freemark ‘10**

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “After Two Years of Democratic Control in Washington, A Transportation Roundup” –

December 29th, 2010 -- http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/12/29/after-two-years-of-democratic-control-in-washington-a-transportation-roundup/)

Two years of Democratic Party power in Washington, then, meant quite a few improvements to the nation’s transportation policy-making, bringing to the fore projects that have been largely ignored by the government for decades. The Obama Administration and its allies in Congress have made clear their collective interest in funding projects that are founded on the idea that transportation can be an important element in the creation of livable cities. This represents a significant and positive change from past federal policy. But there is more work to be done. Republican control of the House of Representatives is unlikely to simplify the extension of many of the new programs undertaken over the past two years — from high-speed rail to TIGER. Though these programs have faced some controversy and should be made more transparent, they have been well-managed, largely fair in their distribution of grants, and, crucially, have spread funding to cities across the country, in both Red and Blue states. In order to assure their future, President Obama will have to articulate their positive effects nationwide and advance ways to fund them that appear bipartisan and consensus-worthy. Will he make the effort to do so when the nation has so many other pressing needs? Is there enough political support on either side of the aisle to maintain a major federal commitment to transport policies that do not revolve around the construction of highways?

#### Obama will push High Speed Rail irrespective of GOP opposition.

**Laing ‘12**

Keith Laing is a national political journalist who works for The Hill newspaper in Washington, D.C. At The Hill, Keith covers transportation policy in Congress and manages the paper’s Transportation Report blog. Prior to coming to The Hill, Keith worked for the News Service of Florida, where he tracked the Florida state legislature with a focus on transportation and energy issues. The Hill – May 30th – http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/230145-obama-administration-officials-to-speak-at-high-speed-rail-conference

The Obama administration has maintained its push for high-speed rail in the face of staunch opposition from Republicans in Congress and in state governments. The president called early in the first half of his tenure in office for a nationwide network of high-speed railways that he said would rival the reach of the interstate highway system, and he included $8 billion for construction in the 2009 economic stimulus.

### National Infrastructure Bank/P3 Investments

#### National Infrastructure bank and P3 investments massively popular – avoids spending and effectiveness concerns

**Halsey, 11** (Ashley, columnist @ Washington Post, Washington post, 2/14, lexis)

Upkeep of roads, bridges and transit systems is a high priority to an overwhelming margin of Americans, but by an even greater margin they don't want to pay more for it, according to a survey that will be released this week. With the Obama administration's budget due Monday, House Republicans embarked on an effort to reduce spending by $100 billion and a long-term transportation bill stalled in Congress, 78 percent of those surveyed say private investors should be tapped to rebuild the country's aging infrastructure. The poll was commissioned by the Rockefeller Foundation, which has funded a $66 million transportation initiative, and was conducted this month by Hart Associates. "Transportation infrastructure affects so many critical issues for the country - economy, social mobility and energy - and it drives our economic growth," said Nicholas Turner, a managing director of of the Rockefeller Foundation who runs the initiative. "Most people don't realize that transportation is the second-highest expense for most Americans and the highest for those with the lowest incomes. The promotion of accessible and equitable transportation policies is critical to providing affordable options to all Americans." The telephone poll of 1,001 registered voters came four months after a bipartisan panel of 80 transportation experts warned that the transportation system was deteriorating so rapidly that it would undermine U.S. ability to compete in a global economy. Headed by two former transportation secretaries - Norman Y. Minetahttp://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/23/AR2006062300579.html and Samuel K. Skinner - the group estimated that an additional $134 billion to $262 billion must be spent per year through 2035 to rebuild and improve the nation's roads, rail systems and air transportation. Their report said a major increase in the federal gas tax, which has remained unchanged since it went up to 18.4 cents per gallon in 1993, might be the most politically palatable way to boost revenue in the short term. In the long term, however, Americans should expect to pay for each mile they drive, the report said. The Rockefeller Foundationinfrastructure survey found that Americans don't support either as an option to raise revenues, or any other approach that would tax them directly. Seventy-one percent opposed a gas tax increase, 64 percent were against new tolls on existing roads and bridges, and 58 percent said no to paying for each mile they drive. While 66 percent said they thought spending on infrastructure is important, the same number of those surveyed said the government didn't spend transportation money efficiently. "People are willing to pay if they have faith they are getting quality," Turner said. "Uncertainty in the poll more reflects a frustration with bridges to nowhere from Congress. The answer is that with clear outcomes and better accountability, people want and support investments in transportation infrastructure." Almost as many said they would support President Obama's proposal to create a National Infrastructure Bank. The bank is seen as a way to insulate government investment from the political process, keeping the focus on the most important projects and encouraging investment from the private sector. Approaching transportation from a banker's perspective, advocates say, would emphasize making investments in projects that have demonstrable financial returns.

#### Voters love national infrastructure bank and P3 investments – resolves spending fears

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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%). 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%).

#### Voters love National Infrastructure bank and P3 investment – avoids spending and efficiency concern

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

Moreover, few believe that current government spending in this area is efficient and wise, and voters welcome a range of reforms in how transportation projects are financed. At the same time, as is the case with many spending-related issues today, voters are unwilling to personally pay for additional funding of national transportation projects. While wide support exists for encouraging more private investment, imposing penalties on over-budget projects, and establishing a National Infrastructure Bank, there is very little support for increasing the federal gas tax or increasing tolls on interstate highways and bridges.

#### Voters love it and spending turns don’t apply

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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).

### National Infrastructure Bank/P3 – Unions/business lobbies

#### Union and business lobbies love it – avoids perception of wasteful spending

**Kerry and Hutchison, 11** (John and Kay, US Senators, States News Service, 10/31, lexis)

Our legislation, which is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, creates a national infrastructure bank - a concept also supported by the AFL-CIO. This approach is an innovative way to leverage private-public partnerships and maximize public funding to address our urgent national and regional water, transportation and energy infrastructure needs - while protecting the taxpayer from wasteful spending.

### Public Transportation/Mass Transit

#### Public transportation funding uniquely popular and not perceived as wasteful spending

**S.G.A. ’11** (Smart Growth America, Virginia Report, Feb

<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/smart-transportation-virginia.pdf>)

Public transportation is popular with voters November 2010 National Poll by Hart Research Associates: 73% of those polled rated “the number of jobs created in the long term that would remain in [my] community” as the most important factor in developing the state transportation plan. 61% regardless of their party affiliation (and 57% of Independents) said they would feel more positively about a governor who favors a plan that “provides more choices such as buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail.” 64% said “buses, carpools, light rail, van service, and commuter rail were a good or very good value for the cost.” March 2010 National Poll by Public Opinion Strategies and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates: 66% of respondents agreed they would like more transportation options available to them. 69% agreed their community would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

#### Overwhelming public support for mass transportation funding – independent voters and dem base love it but GOP doesn’t backlash

**Pew, 8** (Pew Research Center, 3/6, http://www.people-press.org/2008/03/06/public-sends-mixed-signals-on-energy-policy/)

As in recent years, specific policies that address both energy and the environment draw overwhelming support. Nine-in-ten Americans favor requiring better auto fuel efficiency standards, while substantial majorities also support increased federal funding for alternative energy (81%) and mass transportation (72%). Cont… Other energy policies are more divisive. Somewhat more independents (76%) and Democrats (73%) than Republicans (65%) favor increased funding for mass transit, including subway, rail and bus systems. Increased funding for mass transit also wins greater support from people living in urban (73%) and suburban areas (74%) than among those living in rural areas (62%).

#### Voters love it – perception of spending waste is *because* lack of focus on public transportation

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure.

#### Voters love public transportation investments – it’s a top priority

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

 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.

#### Overwhelming bipartisan public support for public transportation infrastructure

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

Even with a highly polarized electorate that remains steadfast in its belief that things in the nation are off on the wrong track there is wide agreement—across the partisan spectrum—that leaders in Washington should be seeking common ground. Nowhere is this more true than legislation related to the country’s transportation infrastructure. Indeed, two in three voters say that making improvements in infrastructure is very important, and most voters say that in its current state the nation’s transportation system is barely adequate. Voters seek better and safer roads and more public transportation options, widely agreeing that the United States would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

## \*\*\*Obama Good Links\*\*\*

### 1NC election link to run in-conjunction with States/Delegation

#### Funding Transportation infrastructure unpopular with the public – fear of waste and don’t see the upside.

**Orski ‘12**

Ken Orski is editor and publisher of Innovation NewsBriefs, an influential and widely read transportation newsletter, now in its 20th year of publication. Orski has worked professionally in the field of transportation for close to 40 years. He served as Associate Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration under President Nixon and President Ford. He is a magna cum laude graduate of Harvard College and holds a J.D. degree from Harvard Law School. NewGeography – 02/05/2012 – 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 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.

### 2NC Wasteful spending link wall

#### Transportation funding is distinct from other wasteful spending – triggers unique public backlash unique –

#### a) key symbolism

**Pittsburgh Post Gazette, 9** (5/18)

"I think that transparency is a good thing. Some of the biggest abuses in the process [in the past] were transportation projects," said Mr. Altmire, D-McCandless, citing the infamous "Bridge to Nowhere," a $223 million earmark in the last highway bill for a project in Alaska that came to symbolize wasteful pork barrel spending.

#### b) most visible earmarking

**Natter, ‘8** (Ari, Columnist @ Bloomberg news, Ranking Member Transportation Committee, Pacific Shipper, 11/3, lexis)

Perhaps more than any national campaign in recent history, the major candidates have staked out very clear and decidedly different stances on transportation infrastructure investment. McCain has made criticism of earmarks something of a crusade in his campaign, and says he wants to send more decisions on spending priorities to the states. "I believe that a higher share of the taxes collected at the gas pump should go back to the state where those taxes were paid," the Arizona Republican told the American Automobile Association in an interview with AAA newsletter, "and I've co-sponsored legislation that would allow states to keep almost all of their gas tax revenues for their own transportation projects without interference from Washington." "We've got a problem," Mortimer Downey, a former deputy secretary of transportation in the Clinton administration and an adviser to the Obama campaign, told a public forum in Washington last week on transportation policy. "Infrastructure needs more investment. It is important, it is crumbling, and other countries are doing more than we are. We've got national issues we need to deal with, and transportation is the critical tool for doing that." He said the Obama camp has "a vision" for the next highway bill. "It should be a much better bill than the last couple. It shouldn't have so many earmarks in it," Downey said. At the same forum, Douglas Holtz-Eakin, chief economic adviser to the McCain campaign, said the spending priorities are critical. "There is no area where earmarking has been more visible than in highway bills. We have to get more bang for the buck." James Burnley, a former DOT secretary under two Republican presidents who also has advised the McCain campaign, said in an interview that if McCain is elected, "You will have two additional issues; one, he has said he is against increasing any taxes; second, he is deadly serious when he says he is not going to accept earmarks, so I think you would have the ultimate historic constitutional clash about the earmarking issue." Downey notes the earmark approach "is going to be a very tough diet to get off of," and comments from transportation backers in Congress suggest just how strong the opposition to a McCain plan would be. "If John McCain wants to say earmarks to build bridges on the I-5 so trucks don't have to detour across the Cascade Mountains are pork, well then he's an idiot," Rep. Peter DeFazio, D-Ore., said at an American Road and Transportation Builders Association conference in September. "If John McCain is elected, we are going to have a diminutive surface transportation bill," DeFazio said last month. "McCain's attitude on infrastructure is like that of the public's, that it's just a bunch of boondoggle pork barrel bridges to nowhere," said Robert Dunphy, a senior resident fellow at the Urban Land Institute.

#### thats electoral suicide – no perception of economic benefit and fiscal discipline is top issue for key independent voters

**Schoen, 10**

Douglas, Schoen, who served as a pollster for President Bill Clinton, is author of "Declaring Independence: The Beginning of the End of the Two-Party System.", NY Daily News, 7/11, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2010-07-11/news/29438716\_1\_fiscal-discipline-swing-voters-president-obama

What Bam can learn from Bill: President Clinton's ex pollster tells Obama how to win independents The news for President Obama is bad. Very bad. This week's Gallup tracking poll indicates that public support for Obama has fallen to a record low - with his job approval rating dropping to 45% among all voters and 38% among Independents. With ratings this low, the President and his party will almost certainly be unable to avoid devastating losses in the fall midterm elections. The only hope is a fundamental midcourse correction. What then should the President do? The independent swing voters who hold the fate of the Democratic Party in their hands are looking for candidates and parties that champion fiscal discipline, limited government, deficit reduction and a free market, pro-growth agenda. They respect leadership that bucks the Washington establishment and the special interests. Above all else, these swing voters will not tolerate any lack of focus on the most pressing economic concerns: reigniting the economy and creating jobs while simultaneously slashing the deficit and exhibiting fiscal discipline. Some say these are mutually exclusive objectives. They are not. I should know. When I first met with former President Bill Clinton privately in late 1994, jobs and the deficit were major concerns. In the aftermath of that year's devastating mid-term elections when the Republicans gained control of Congress for the first time since 1954, I emphasized that unless Clinton simultaneously stressed fiscal discipline and economic growth, he simply could not be reelected in 1996. By adopting a bold new agenda that included a balanced budget, frank acknowledgment of the limits of government, welfare reform, as well as the protection of key social programs, we were able to win a decisive victory over former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole in 1996. Without that fundamental repositioning, Clinton would almost certainly have lost. While the circumstances are different, the electorate now wants the same things that it wanted back then. The American people, exhausted and demoralized by a sluggish economy, recognize that the stimulus package, as currently crafted and implemented, has at best produced short-term results through subsidization of the public sector. And they are increasingly uneasy about rising deficits, which remain the independent voter's touchstone. The left-wing economists urging Obama to ignore the latter concern and pour more taxpayer money into the economy now, regardless of the impact on the deficits, are prescribing electoral suicide.

### Ext – Wasteful Spending Link

#### Triggers election backlash - Public opposition growing and GOP base hates it

**Reinhardt, 12**

William, Founder Public Works Financing, Engineering News Record, 2/27, lexis

Peter Ruane, CEO of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, calls Washington a «fact-free zone.» The firewall that for 56 years has protected the federal Highway Trust Fund from being used for deficit reduction is in grave danger of being breached. «We're going to be fighting for every penny,» he says. 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. 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. The best hope is for public and private planners, designers, builders and operators of these facilities to convince a skeptical public that it is getting the services it pays for at a fair price and without political favoritism. Build local support for good projects. A good place to start is for the infrastructure technocracy to take back its industry from the political operatives who promise subsidy but deliver mainly invoices. ?

#### That spurs massive fiscal backlash - it’s a hot button election issue

**Moore, 10** (Robert, Columnist @ Gannett News, Gannett News, 7/14)

Hundreds of millions of dollars in unspent transportation earmarks would be returned to the federal treasury under a bill introduced Wednesday. The bill drew praise from two government waste watchdog groups, which cited it as an example of long-overdue reform. "Long-term economic growth and recovery can't happen unless we cut wasteful government spending and tackle our exploding deficit," said the bill's sponsor, Rep. Betsy Markey, D-Colo. "These old earmarks are a waste of taxpayer money and cutting them just makes sense." The unexpended earmarks in some cases go back more than two decades and range in amounts from 2 cents to $26.8 million. Earmarks are specific directives from Congress on how an appropriation should be spent. Current law allows the Transportation Department to allocate some unspent transportation earmarks to other projects. Markey's bill would require that all unspent money be returned to the treasury and used to reduce the national debt, now at about $13.2 trillion. Markey's office included a list of projects totaling $713.2 million that could be affected. If all that money were returned to the treasury, it would reduce the debt by about five-thousandths of a percent. "This is good stuff. This is the kind of thing we like to see from members of Congress, that they're taking this seriously," said David Williams, vice president of policy for Citizens Against Government Waste. Erich Zimmerman, a senior policy analyst for Taxpayers for Common Sense, sounded a similar note. "Cutting more than $700 million in unneeded and unnecessary transportation earmarks is as good a place as any to start," he said. "This should serve as a cautionary tale as Congress begins to cobble together the next highway bill and ensure that we don't return to the wasteful days of the past. Too often, an earmark is a tiny down payment on a project that a state cannot afford and has not prioritized," Zimmerman said. Williams said lawmakers have known for years about the unspent transportation earmarks but haven't done anything about it. "I suspect that we're in such a political climate where government spending, especially during an election year, is such a hot-button issue, and everybody wants to be seen as a fiscal conservative," he said.

#### 2010 election proves

**Crawley, 10** (John, Journalist @ Reuters, 11/10, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/11/08/us-infrastructure-congress-idUSTRE6A749F20101108>)

John Mica, who is expected to chair the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, told Reuters in a post-election interview that he would conduct a close review of how money was spent from the 2009 economic stimulus package approved by the Democratic-controlled Congress. He also plans to reevaluate grant programs that bypassed congressional review. The new look at spending comes after voters last week questioned Obama infrastructure priorities in electing Republican governors who campaigned against what they considered unworkable transportation spending. To start, Mica will focus on more than $10 billion in high-speed rail awards and a $1.5 billion transportation construction financing under the so-called TIGER grant program in which funds were sent directly to states on the merit of proposed projects. "We had unelected officials sitting behind closed doors making decisions without any hearings or without any elected officials being consulted. There was no rational explanation," Mica said. "I'm going to have a full review of that." TIGER grants have been oversubscribed and state capitals want them extended, but there is no commitment from Congress to do that. Some of the money could come back to the federal government, according to Mica, who also said that he would look at how to expedite funding in other cases. Mica's scrutiny of high-speed rail projects and other construction spending is shared by some critical Republicans at the state level. Republican gubernatorial candidates who won their races in Ohio, Florida and Wisconsin last week campaigned against high speed rail development, an Obama transportation priority.

### Ext – Public Opposes

#### Transportation spending unpopular – bipartisan public opposition and support decreasing

**Kull, ‘5** (Stephen, Principal Investigator, Program on International Policy Attitudes, 3/5, http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/DefenseSpending/FedBudget\_Mar05/FedBudget\_Mar05\_rpt.pdf)

When presented most of the major items in the discretionary federal budget and given the opportunity to modify it, Americans make some dramatic changes. The largest cut by far is to defense spending, which is reduced by nearly one-third, followed by spending on Iraq and Afghanistan, transportation and justice. The largest increases are to reductions in the deficit, various forms of social spending and spending on the environment. Nearly all respondents were able to complete the exercise. And overall, there were many changes made to the proposed budget. The budget items that were most deeply cut were defense spending, the Iraq supplemental, transportation, and federal administration of justice. The budget items that were increased the most were allocations to reduce the budget deficit and spending on education, conserving and developing renewable energy, job training and employment, and medical research. A more detailed analysis follows. There were also domestic spending items that majorities chose to reduce. Transportation was cut $12.6 billion, from $69.4 billion to $56.8 billion (an 18% cut), with 58% making cuts. The federal administration of justice went from $41.1 billion to $32.4 billion (a 21% cut), with 56% making cuts. Space science and research was reduced slightly from $24.7 billion to $23.5 billion (5%), with 53% making cuts. Partisan Variations For 16 out of 18 budget areas, the average changes that were made by Republicans and Democrats went in the same direction relative to the Administration’s proposed budget. There were only slight differences in their allocations for seven of the items: energy and renewable resources, homeland security, transportation, veterans’ benefits, space and science research, medical research, and the federal administration of justice. The remaining items, though, do show noteworthy trends. The category of job training and employmentrelated services has gotten increasingly sharp average increases over the last decade—96% in 1996, 128% in 2000, and a startling 263% in 2005. Perhaps this expresses a growing concern about the impact of globalization and international trade on the capacity of the US work force to adapt and retain its standard of living. For reasons that are unclear, willingness to fund the federal administration of justice has steadily dropped, shifting from an average 10% increase in 1996, to a 12% cut in 2000, to a 21% cut in the 2005 exercise. Willingness to spend on transportation relative to other needs has shown a long-term decline. In 1996 it was increased 40% on average; in 2000, it was kept nearly flat (2% increase); and in 2005, it was cut by 18%.

#### Public opposes federal spending on transportation

**Kull, ‘5** (Stephen, Principal Investigator, Program on International Policy Attitudes, 3/5, <http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/DefenseSpending/FedBudget_Mar05/FedBudget_Mar05_pr.pdf>

A new poll finds that the American public would significantly alter the Bush administration’s recently proposed federal budget. Presented a breakdown of the major areas of the proposed discretionary budget and given the opportunity to redistribute it, respondents made major changes. The most dramatic changes were deep cuts in defense spending, a significant reallocation toward deficit reduction, and increases in spending on education, job training, reducing reliance on oil, and veterans. These changes were favored by both Republicans and Democrats, though the changes were generally greater for Democrats. Sixty-one percent of respondents redirected some funds to reducing the budget deficit, with the mean respondent reallocating $36 billion (Democrats $39.4 billion, Republicans $29.6 billion), though they were not told anything about the size of the deficit. Defense spending received the deepest cut, being cut on average 31%—equivalent to $133.8 billion—with 65% of respondents cutting. The second largest area to be cut was the supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan, which suffered an average cut of $29.6 billion or 35%, with two out of three respondents cutting. Also cut were transportation (cut $12.6 billion or 18%), federal administration of justice ($8.7 billion or 21%), and space research and science ($1.2 billion or 5%). Majorities of 53-58% of respondents favored cuts in each of these cases.

#### Voters perceive as wasteful spending and fuels deficit concerns

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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.

### 2NC GOP Base link

#### GOP Base hates plan – GOP spin and media coverage ensures high visibility to hurt obama

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO, Soul of America, 1/25, <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

As much as I’d like to disagree, I think you are correct. The Tea Party GOP is determined not to show any more infrastructure success under President Obama at this time. Team Obama realized this fact, so they didn’t name Transportation funding in his SOTU comment “Split the savings from Defense drawdown to rebuild America and pay down the Debt.” Team Obama deliberately withheld that contentious point so the GOP could not pounce on it in post-SOTU media coverage this week.

### Ext – GOP Base link

#### Plan mobilizes gop base and fiscal conservatives – they hate it

**Lawder, 12** (David, Journalist @ Reuters, Reuters, 6/8, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/usa-infrastructure-boehner-idINL1E8H7AH320120607>)

Boehner also has had a difficult time getting his own caucus to support a transportation bill -- even one with Keystone and new oil drilling rights included -- because of its costs. Many fiscal conservatives backed by the Tea Party movement will not support a multibillion spending bill at a time of high budget deficits

### A2: GOP Voters Support Transportation Spending

#### GOP Voters don’t support

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

No issue divides partisans more than the importance of environmental protection – 58% of Democrats say it is a top priority, compared with just 27% of Republicans. Of the 22 items tested, environmental protection is one of the lowest GOP priorities, along with such issues as improving transportation infrastructure and campaign finance reform. Dealing with the nation’s energy problems, by contrast, is of equal importance to both Republicans (55% top priority) and Democrats (57%), though other recent surveys suggest that partisans have very different solutions in mind.

### 2NC Funding Mechanism Link

#### Funding collapses theoretical support – becomes key election issue regardless of how its paid for

**Berstein Research, 12** (Sanford C. Bernstein is widely recognized as Wall Street’s premier sell-side research firm. Our research is sought out by leading investment managers around the world, and we are annually ranked at the very top of acknowledged arbiters. In independent surveys of major institutional clients, Bernstein's research is ranked #1 for overall quality, industry knowledge, most trusted, best detailed financial analysis, major company studies, most useful valuation frameworks, best original research, and most willing to challenge management. In Institutional Investor’s 2010 annual client survey, the leading survey by which analysts in our industry are evaluated, 100% of our U.S. Analysts were recognized as among the best in their respective fields -- more than any other firm on Wall Street, 2/3, <http://www.fraternalalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Washington-Research-2012-Preview-Transportation-Funding.pdf>)

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.

#### Forces gas Tax Hikes – causes massive public backlash on key issue

**Grant, 12** (David, Staff Writer, CSM, Christian Science Monitor, 5/8, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/0508/Transportation-bill-not-yet-passed-already-blasted-by-critics>)

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.

#### Dem funding mechanisms still spun as tax increases

**Berstein Research, 12** (Sanford C. Bernstein is widely recognized as Wall Street’s premier sell-side research firm. Our research is sought out by leading investment managers around the world, and we are annually ranked at the very top of acknowledged arbiters. In independent surveys of major institutional clients, Bernstein's research is ranked #1 for overall quality, industry knowledge, most trusted, best detailed financial analysis, major company studies, most useful valuation frameworks, best original research, and most willing to challenge management. In Institutional Investor’s 2010 annual client survey, the leading survey by which analysts in our industry are evaluated, 100% of our U.S. Analysts were recognized as among the best in their respective fields -- more than any other firm on Wall Street, 2/3, <http://www.fraternalalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Washington-Research-2012-Preview-Transportation-Funding.pdf>)

The Senate Package: The "Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 st Century (MAP-21)" Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee Chairwoman Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and ranking member James Inhofe (R-OK) were early out of the gates last year expressing bipartisan support for their approach, which seeks to do the minimum to keep pace with inflation for the next two years while avoiding the need for another HTF bailout along the lines of the $35 billion of general fund taxpayer dollars injected since 2008. Three committees have now approved their portions of the bill: EPW and Senate Commerce (highway safety) late last year and Senate Banking (mass transit) on Thursday. A fourth, the Finance Committee, has yet to act, which is a crucial step because Finance is the only panel with authority to raise the $13 billion needed to keep the HTF afloat through 2013 (unless Senate Democrats had a change of heart and decided to go the medical malpractice route, which goes through a different committee). Finance has been meeting for weeks on a hodgepodge of funding offsets, which we are told range from eliminating the ability of paper companies to amend prior tax returns to claim the $1.01 per gallon cellulosic biofuels credit for the "black liquor" fuel they produce to reclaiming or denying passports of U.S. citizens accused of owing back taxes. Senate Republicans oppose most of these items as tax increases and are instead backing oil and gas drilling revenues and spending cuts, including from the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program and canceling unspent stimulus funds. Thus the Finance Committee may end up with a partisan bill, which lessens the chances for winning 60 votes on the floor – which could throw the whole enterprise into doubt. The underlying Senate bill provisions would:

#### GOP funding mechanisms undermines obama’s support with environmentalists

**CBS News, 12** (5/14, http://ryofillingstation.com/pdfs/RYO%20FEDERAL%20News%20Clips%2005.14.12.pdf)

Democrats denied their motivation was producing fodder for campaigns. But they accused House Republicans of doing just that with a highway bill that requires construction of the Keystone XL oil pipeline from Canada to the Texas Gulf Coast, which Obama and many Democrats have opposed for environmental reasons. "We ought to quit taking jabs at one another to score political points," said Rep. Nick Rahall, D-W.Va. The tactic has been given the nickname "poison pill" because it sometimes causes the demise of the legislation to which the provision is attached.

#### That shreds him with his base

**Fitzgerald 12** (Thomas, Columnist @ Philadelphia Enquirer, Daily Herald, 2/18, l/n)

Obama has also grabbed opportunities to reassure key elements of the Democratic base. He recently refused permission for the proposed Keystone XL oil pipeline from Canada to Texas, cheering environmentalists; pushed for more federal student loans and lower college tuition, issues popular with the young voters who were vital to his 2008 election; and has taken a more confrontational approach toward GOP leaders in Congress.

### Ext – Won’t Pay For It

#### Voters won’t pay for it – causes massive backlash

**Berstein Research, 12** (Sanford C. Bernstein is widely recognized as Wall Street’s premier sell-side research firm. Our research is sought out by leading investment managers around the world, and we are annually ranked at the very top of acknowledged arbiters. In independent surveys of major institutional clients, Bernstein's research is ranked #1 for overall quality, industry knowledge, most trusted, best detailed financial analysis, major company studies, most useful valuation frameworks, best original research, and most willing to challenge management. In Institutional Investor’s 2010 annual client survey, the leading survey by which analysts in our industry are evaluated, 100% of our U.S. Analysts were recognized as among the best in their respective fields -- more than any other firm on Wall Street, 2/3, <http://www.fraternalalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Washington-Research-2012-Preview-Transportation-Funding.pdf>)

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. And that's the crux of the issue: the political will simply is not there to raise taxes in a broad-based fashion that would keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent, let alone allow the kind of spending the CBO estimates are necessary to maintain the highway system's current performance – about $57 billion per year, or more than 40% above current levels. As we'll explore in this piece (and as we discussed in our October 7, 2011 Research Call), the parties cannot agree on how to raise the necessary funds to pay for a 21 st century transportation system.

#### Support only theoretical – spending opposition outweighs in practice, and voters prefer private investment

**Halsey, 11** (Ashley, columnist @ Washington Post, Washington post, 2/14, lexis)

Upkeep of roads, bridges and transit systems is a high priority to an overwhelming margin of Americans, but by an even greater margin they don't want to pay more for it, according to a survey that will be released this week. With the Obama administration's budget due Monday, House Republicans embarked on an effort to reduce spending by $100 billion and a long-term transportation bill stalled in Congress, 78 percent of those surveyed say private investors should be tapped to rebuild the country's aging infrastructure. The poll was commissioned by the Rockefeller Foundation, which has funded a $66 million transportation initiative, and was conducted this month by Hart Associates. "Transportation infrastructure affects so many critical issues for the country - economy, social mobility and energy - and it drives our economic growth," said Nicholas Turner, a managing director of of the Rockefeller Foundation who runs the initiative. "Most people don't realize that transportation is the second-highest expense for most Americans and the highest for those with the lowest incomes. The promotion of accessible and equitable transportation policies is critical to providing affordable options to all Americans." The telephone poll of 1,001 registered voters came four months after a bipartisan panel of 80 transportation experts warned that the transportation system was deteriorating so rapidly that it would undermine U.S. ability to compete in a global economy. Headed by two former transportation secretaries - Norman Y. Minetahttp://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/23/AR2006062300579.html and Samuel K. Skinner - the group estimated that an additional $134 billion to $262 billion must be spent per year through 2035 to rebuild and improve the nation's roads, rail systems and air transportation. Their report said a major increase in the federal gas tax, which has remained unchanged since it went up to 18.4 cents per gallon in 1993, might be the most politically palatable way to boost revenue in the short term. In the long term, however, Americans should expect to pay for each mile they drive, the report said. The Rockefeller Foundationinfrastructure survey found that Americans don't support either as an option to raise revenues, or any other approach that would tax them directly. Seventy-one percent opposed a gas tax increase, 64 percent were against new tolls on existing roads and bridges, and 58 percent said no to paying for each mile they drive. While 66 percent said they thought spending on infrastructure is important, the same number of those surveyed said the government didn't spend transportation money efficiently. "People are willing to pay if they have faith they are getting quality," Turner said. "Uncertainty in the poll more reflects a frustration with bridges to nowhere from Congress. The answer is that with clear outcomes and better accountability, people want and support investments in transportation infrastructure."

#### Spending opposition and efficiency concerns swamp theoretical support

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

Moreover, few believe that current government spending in this area is efficient and wise, and voters welcome a range of reforms in how transportation projects are financed. At the same time, as is the case with many spending-related issues today, voters are unwilling to personally pay for additional funding of national transportation projects. While wide support exists for encouraging more private investment, imposing penalties on over-budget projects, and establishing a National Infrastructure Bank, there is very little support for increasing the federal gas tax or increasing tolls on interstate highways and bridges.

#### Voters strongly opposed to paying for it – swamps theoretical support

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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 – plan = gas tax hike

#### Plan forces gas tax hike and increased user fees – ensures massive public backlash

**Detroit News, 8** (5/20, lexis)

 Fixing roads, bridges will mean gas tax hike Here's a proposal not likely to win a popularity contest: With gasoline touching the $4-per-gallon mark, why not tack on another 30 to 50 cents or so to finally answer our responsibility to the national and state infrastructures? We know it's crazy to think either state or federal lawmakers will vote to raise fuel taxes when motorists already threaten revolt over the 40 percent increase in pump prices during the past year. But that doesn't change the fact that roads and bridges are disintegrating in Michigan and across the nation. The interstate highway system is more than 60 years old, and the nation has never spent the money necessary to properly maintain it. Because of decades of neglect, keeping up with repairs and building needed new capacity will cost an estimated $320 billion a year. Currently, the 18-cent federal gasoline tax raises roughly $85 billion. The only way to cover the gap between what's needed and what's available is to raise the gasoline tax. Adding another quarter to 40 cents to the 18-cent-per-gallon federal gasoline tax and nine cents to the 36-cent per gallon state tax would raise much of the needed revenue. Of course, it would also help if highway funds were used more efficiently. The public will for paying more taxes is understandably weak, in large part due to boondoggle projects such as the Bridge to Nowhere in Alaska and the Big Dig in Boston. The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission just issued a report that urgently recommends more spending on infrastructure. It's a bipartisan group, and it was charged with assessing the need and the revenue required to meet it. Its conclusion, in a nutshell, is that "significant new funding ... will be needed." The commission's definition of "significant" is $225 billion a year, raised from a variety of sources, for the next 50 years. Notably, it also suggests "depoliticizing" decisions on project funding, meaning removing them from the realm of congressional earmarks. Higher gasoline taxes would bear much of the burden for raising the funds, but the commission also urges more toll roads and bridges, "congestion pricing" during peak driving times in urban areas, a freight fee and a rail ticket tax.

### Ext – gas tax = political suicide

#### That’s political suicide – swamps all turns

**Rafey, 10** (William, Staff Writer, Harvard Political Review, 6/1, http://hpronline.org/united-states/how-to-pass-a-gas-tax/)

In 1993, President Bill Clinton pushed the last bill through Congress to increase the gas tax. Even this, however, was watered-down reform; the tax was not indexed to inflation and increased the price of gas by only 4.3 cents per gallon. The modesty of the increase should not be surprising: since 1993, no prominent American politician has seriously supported a major increase in the gas tax. Virtually everyone agrees that supporting the gas tax is political suicide. As Michael Cragg, an energy consultant at The Brattle Group, told the HPR, “It’s hard to see in this political environment how you’d get a gas tax passed.” A similar consensus exists among economists, but on a different issue. According to a study in the Journal of Economic Literature, the vast majority of economists support a gas tax in order to make the private cost of driving a car reflect its actual social costs: global warming, air pollution, traffic congestion, and highway maintenance. Economists from across the political spectrum—Freakonomics author Steven Levitt, Nobel laureate and New York Times columnist Paul Krugman, and even the chairman of George W. Bush’s Council of Economic Advisors, N. Gregory Mankiw—have come out in support of raising the gas tax. How can a policy make so much economic sense and garner so little political support? Significant obstacles, including the anti-tax movement, vested interests in low energy prices, regional differences, and America’s short election cycle, have historically made the gas tax unpopular and unfeasible. Our energy future and climate security depend on either tweaking the tax to make it more politically palatable, or exploring creative alternatives. The Anti-Tax Establishment Perhaps the most fundamental reason why a higher gas tax is so controversial is because it hits everybody, and hits them in a very public way. William Gale, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-director of the Tax Policy Center, told the HPR that the anti-tax movement “will seize on every tax,” and the gas tax is an easy target. Represented by vocal advocacy groups such as Americans for Tax Reform and the various Tea Parties, the anti-tax movement “does not make a distinction between distortionary and distortionary-correcting taxes,” Gale said. “They just hate all taxes,” he continued, “and every attempt at an increase in taxes becomes an opportunity for [their] political gain.” Looking closer at the particulars of the gas tax raises an equally problematic obstacle: the culture of low energy prices. According to Henry Lee, director of the Environment and Natural Resources Program at Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, America’s energy policy has been governed by a single goal for the last 40 years. “Americans for almost two generations have lived under the idea of cheap energy,” he explained, making it almost impossible to pass laws involving price increases. At this point, such laws could seem almost un-American. Democratic Divisions The gas tax also raises a thorny question of fairness. Rural inhabitants, who drive farther and more often than do urban residents, would face steeper costs if the federal gas tax went up. Politicians that represent rural districts are simply responding to their constituents’ concerns by opposing the gas tax. Gale identified this “urban-rural divide” as one of the two most salient obstacles to the gas tax, in addition to the anti-tax movement. Recognizing these regional disparities raises questions about institutional problems in American democracy. To say, as many do, that lack of progress on the gas tax is part of a Big Oil conspiracy ignores the ways in which representative democracy can often forestall consensus. America’s short, two-year election cycle is a major barrier to passing a higher gas tax. Politicians tend to ignore proposals that involve an immediate, perceivable cost and provide less tangible, long-term benefits. Thomas Sterner, former president of the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, told the HPR that this is the “big problem” of gas tax politics. In countries with short electoral cycles of two to four years, attempts to increase the gas tax “will only cause protests,” Sterner said. It can be very difficult to promote farsighted, technocratic solutions in a political environment defined by short-term gratification.

### Ext – GOP mechanism = anti-environment

#### GOP mechanism would cut clean energy and expand oil drilling

**Berstein Research, 12** (Sanford C. Bernstein is widely recognized as Wall Street’s premier sell-side research firm. Our research is sought out by leading investment managers around the world, and we are annually ranked at the very top of acknowledged arbiters. In independent surveys of major institutional clients, Bernstein's research is ranked #1 for overall quality, industry knowledge, most trusted, best detailed financial analysis, major company studies, most useful valuation frameworks, best original research, and most willing to challenge management. In Institutional Investor’s 2010 annual client survey, the leading survey by which analysts in our industry are evaluated, 100% of our U.S. Analysts were recognized as among the best in their respective fields -- more than any other firm on Wall Street, 2/3, <http://www.fraternalalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Washington-Research-2012-Preview-Transportation-Funding.pdf>)

Obama last year proposed a massive $556 billion six-year bill but left it up to Congress to propose how to pay for it. This year Obama is arguing for simply claiming about half the $800 billion in "savings" from spending less in Iraq and Afghanistan to fund the transportation programs. That's not going to fly with the GOP – but its great politics to talk about using money initially expected to go overseas "for a little nation-building at home," as Obama said in his State of the Union address. Republicans have said they are willing to pay for the bill with spending cuts to clean energy programs, oil drilling revenues, and proposals such as caps on medical malpractice awards that bear little relation to the underlying issue of transportation financing – and which stand little chance of becoming law while Democrats control the Senate and White House. That's why we think, unlike with the FAA bill, there's a better-than-even chance partisan gridlock will in fact play out and stymie a long-term fix for ground transportation funding, and the highway and transit programs will limp along past the 2012 elections with a temporary extension. The lame duck session is expected to be a busy one, so we can't rule out the possibility of a deal – particularly because Chairman Mica (who may face term limits and have to step down, unless granted a waiver) and Chairwoman Boxer (who faces the real possibility that Republicans take the Senate and write a different bill) would have to start the process all over again even if they hold on to their positions, as pending legislation simply dies once the 112 th Congress adjourns. Come 2013, they'd have to start from scratch with either an emboldened President Obama ready to do big things in his second and final term in office (arguably better from a transportation funding standpoint) or a GOP President facing a mandate to cut spending overall yet boost defense funding above current projections and closer to the historically-high (in the post-World War II era) levels of the past five years. Though an unlikely scenario, given the need and desire on the part of Boehner and other Republicans (and frankly Obama as well) to secure a major legislative accomplishment before the elections, we also can't rule out the possibility of a long-term deal this spring or fall.

### 2NC Turn Shield – no perceived benefits/need

#### They hate plan – don’t perceive job benefits

**Bergsten, 9**

FRED BERGSTEN, Director, Peterson Institute for International Economics, International Economy, 3/22, lexis)

The problem the President will be facing is that Americans do not like government spending and investment, even when it is desperately needed. Our huge trade deficit, for example, is largely composed of consumer goods from Asia and energy, but the public is skeptical of a shift toward spending on public infrastructure that would alter the equation and create more jobs in America. That is why power grids, roads, parks, and public transportation in Europe are dramatically more modern better maintained than they are here. More spending on public facilities and less on imported cars, clothes, and household bric-a-brac would reduce our trade deficit and increase employment here, but the President's grades will be good only if the public begins to believe this.

#### No Political upside – public doesn’t think its important or perceive job upside

**Freemark, 12**

Yonah Freemark is an independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, from which he graduated in May 2008 with a BA in architecture. He writes about transportation and land use issues for The Transport Politic and The Infrastructurist, 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

In the context of the presidential race, Mr. Obama’s decision not to continue his previously strong advocacy of more and more transportation funding suggests that the campaign sees the issue as politically irrelevant. If the Administration made an effort last year to convince Americans of the importance of improving infrastructure, there seems to have been fewer positive results in terms of popular perceptions than hoped for. Perhaps the rebuffs from Republican governors on high-speed rail took their toll; perhaps the few recovery projects that entered construction were not visible enough (or at least their federal funding was not obvious enough); perhaps the truth of the matter is that people truly care more about issues like unemployment and health care than they do for public transit and roads.

#### That’s true for all key voting demographics

**Pew, 11** (Pew Research Center, 1/20, http://www.people-press.org/2011/01/20/about-the-surveys/)

Improving the nation’s roads, bridges, and transportation does not rank as a particularly high priority for Democrats, Republicans or independents. Still, Democrats are more likely to see this as important (41% top priority vs. 30% of independents, 26% of Republicans. This is the case for dealing with obesity as well.

### 2NC Turn Shield – Perceived Ineffective

#### ( ) Media Turn Shield – Aff is reported to public as unpopular earmark or another bureaucratic failure.

**A.G.C. ‘11**

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

Adding to Americans’ frustration, most of what they learn about the federal government’s role in transportation and other infrastructure investments comes from media coverage of the proliferation of earmarks. Imagine the frustration most motorists and other taxpayers must feel when learning that the money they are paying into the Highway Trust Fund is being used to fund projects in far away parts of the country not because of need, but because some politician sits on a committee. It is hard to find fault with a commuter who asks “why should I pay more in gas taxes” while stuck in traffic on an old and aging bridge on their way to work in Cincinnati, even as residents of Alaska get a new and seemingly unneeded bridge. While earmarks still account for a relatively small portion of the total amount invested in transportation projects nationwide, they have become a significant and debilitating problem when it comes to flood control, levy and lock and dam projects funded by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps and Bureau of Reclamation both conduct comprehensive reviews with merit-based criteria and public participation, and usually require local cost-sharing. Yet the Congressional practice of earmarking Corps and Bureau funds for projects favored by certain elected officials means that many vital projects languish, despite the fact they have already been vetted and are needed to protect communities or facilitate maritime commerce. These earmarks have done little to reassure taxpayers of the federal government’s ability to make wise infrastructure investment decisions. Even when their money isn’t being diverted to earmarked projects or unrelated programs, many taxpayers have become jaded by a federal regulatory process that takes years to make basic decisions about whether new projects can proceed. Worse, that inefficient regulatory process also adds tremendous costs in delays and new paperwork requirements. The review process has become so out of control that the average highway project, for example, now takes 13 years to go from concept to completion. Some water and flood protection projects can take up to 20 years to complete, meanwhile, primarily because of the substantial regulatory burdens and the slow pace of funding.

#### ( ) History Turn shield. Specific turns don’t matter – public opposes new programs based on failed history of Federal involvement

**A.G.C. ‘11**

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

While we clearly would like Congress and the Administration to act on each of the reform recommendations we have provided, what is even more important is that they fundamentally rethink our current and in many ways deeply flawed approach to infrastructure investments. Even if we weren’t on the brink of a new era of federal austerity, the fact is that our federal infrastructure programs have become so convoluted, unfocused and/or ineffective that public support for funding them has declined precipitously. That a nation obsessed with traffic and commuting patterns would chronically resist federal gas tax increases is a clear indication that most Americans no longer believe that the people who built the Interstate system can make it better.

### Ext – Perceived Ineffective

#### Perception of prior failures and lack of performance measures ensure mass voter backlash

**Corless, 10**

(James Corless, Campaign Director, Transportation for America, 10/28, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments)

According to polls, many voters this year are angry and lack confidence in how Washington is spending our money. As Skinner and Mineta point out, we have been forced to bail out our nation’s Highway Trust Fund for several years because our revenue stream hasn’t aligned with infrastructure needs. We have also continued to spend federal transportation dollars without any performance measures or accountability. Both must be addressed and would be if we follow through on the recommendations of Skinner and Mineta, as well as President Obama’s blueprint.

#### ( ) Public has lost faith in the process used in Federal infrastructure projects.

**A.G.C. ‘11**

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

Many taxpayers have lost confidence in the federal government’s ability to invest their infrastructure dollars wisely because those investment decisions have become increasingly politicized. Frustration with funding shortfalls and the current approach to selecting projects has increased because the number of earmarked projects has grown exponentially, often placing political priorities above maintenance and capacity needs. Worse, since many earmarks only cover a small portion of the cost of projects, these earmarks actually reduce the total amount of money officials can use to finance construction projects while the earmarked funds sit unused. In other words, many earmarks are an ineffective way to build federally-funded infrastructure projects. Congress and the Administration must instead establish a system that allows federal, state and local officials to accurately assess and address documented infrastructure priorities.

#### Voters oppose infrastructure spending – they don’t trust the government to do it well

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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

### 2NC Turn Shield – Credit/Blame trick

#### Obama gets blame for “wasteful spending” but doesn’t get credit for local economic gains in key swing states– link only one way – especially in Virginia and Ohio

**Skelley, 12**

Geoffrey Skelley, Political Analyst, U.Va. Center for Politics, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/unemployment-update-who-gets-the-credit/>

So far, the Obama campaign has run ads promoting the president’s handling of the economy, such as spots that tout the auto industry bailout and mention increased job growth. But are voters buying the pitch and giving Obama credit? That’s up for debate, especially with Republican governors in key swing states, such as Virginia and Ohio, competing with the president for the public’s applause. In Virginia, in what can mainly be described as a campaign to improve his chances of being Romney’s running mate, Gov. Bob McDonnell’s (R) Opportunity Virginia PAC has run an ad highlighting Virginia’s economic improvement during McDonnell’s tenure. The spot notes that Virginia has its lowest unemployment rate in three years and the lowest in the Southeast. As our chart shows, Virginia’s 5.6% figure is at least 1% better than any other Southern state. Federal spending, particularly defense expenditures, is a big reason why, of course — a point often left unmade in a state whose politicians regularly launch broadsides against “wasteful spending by Washington.” Meanwhile, Ohio and much of the Rust Belt have seen stirrings of economic improvement. But the president has not necessarily received a significant bump from this news. A recent Quinnipiac poll found that Ohioans who think the Buckeye State’s economy has improved give Gov. John Kasich (R) credit for the change by a 68% to 22% margin over President Obama. Voters who think the economy is worse also blame the sitting governor more than the president, 49% to 27%. Considering Ohio’s unemployment rate has gone from 8.8% in April 2011 to 7.4% last month, both incumbents can brag about the change. But it is far more important for Obama, who is on the ballot this November while Kasich isn’t up for reelection until 2014. Strategically, the Obama campaign wants to convince voters that the economy is in fact improving. Tactically, this has meant running ads in key swing states that generally promote Obama’s economic stewardship. Yet the campaign might be losing an opportunity if it doesn’t take greater ownership of positive state-specific numbers. Obama’s generic television ads might do more than simply target all the swing states as a bloc. Instead, he could focus on each state separately. If a state’s unemployment rate has improved over the past year, then the president’s campaign could run general election ads that trumpet the success. Ohio and especially Virginia are ideal for such advertising. In politics, a president gets the blame for anything bad that happens on his watch. Conversely, he gets the credit for anything good that unfolds during his term — that is, if he doesn’t let others take the credit from him. To this point, President Obama has failed to take advantage of the improved jobs numbers in some competitive states with unemployment lower than the national average. In this close election, Obama has little margin for error.

### 2NC Turn Shield – flawed studies

#### Your ev is based on flawed studies – public support for “transportation infrastructure spending” doesn’t extend to specific policies

**Hemingway, 12** (Mark, Editor @ Weekly Standard, 2/27, lexis)

This may come as a shock to many pollsters and much of the press corps, but public opinion is a little more complicated than randomly calling 1,000 Americans, asking them a dubiously worded question about a complex political issue, and reporting the aggregate results.Fortunately, at least one prominent assayer of public opinion has taken a good look at this state of affairs and is screaming, Pollster, heal thyself! Scott Rasmussen looks at America's dire fiscal predicament through the lens of polling, and does so based on a simple, neglected insight: Polling voters about broad political sentiments is very different from polling them about specific policy solutions. Sure, voters say they're in favor of more spending on transportation infrastructure; but ask them whether taxpayers should continue, say, subsidizing Amtrak and a large majority is opposed.In The People's Money, Rasmussen takes a look at survey data on competing solutions to our fiscal crisis. With respect to Medicare, for example, he kicks the tires on various proposals: shoring up the trust fund, raising the payroll tax, allowing the purchase of health insurance across state lines. In the end, Rasmussen finds that, contra Obamacare, voters' preferred Medicare solutions have certain commonalities: They embrace the idea of competition: competition among states and competition among insurance companies. And the solution is to shift power away from politicians and bureaucrats so that individuals can have more control over their own lives.Rasmussen repeats this exercise, addressing the full complement of problems Washington has thrust upon us, from the tax code to defense spending. And he handles the policy details in a way that can be clearly comprehended by citizens newly recruited to the budget wars while still leaving grizzled policy nerds plenty to chew on. While details may vary, Rasmussen finds that, regardless of the issue, voters pretty consistently come down on the side of less spending and less government.While this approach is novel and informative, it does have its limitations. Obviously, there are reasons why a constitutional republic is preferable to assessing voter sentiment on every law that comes down from Capitol Hill. And Rasmussen generally does a good job of walking the fine line between explaining the bigger polling picture and relying on mobocracy for guidance. Still, at times, the approach feels a little misguided especially in the chapter on the defense budget. Understanding that voters want fewer American soldiers deployed overseas is worth considering. But if the consequences aren't made clear, what does such a wish really amount to?If The People's Money demonstrates that voters want to rein in spending and expand their personal freedom, why isn't that happening? Because the public doesn't always get its way. Indeed, a National Journal survey of political insiders indicates 59 percent believe the people don't know enough about the issues facing Washington to form wise opinions about what should be done. And those insiders have clout.Rasmussen doesn't remain neutral in the debate between the people and the political class: He flatly states that voters are the solution, not the problem, and declares he's with the 73 percent of American voters who trust the American people more than America's political leaders. He observes that the reason preferred small-government solutions aren't being enacted is that they cut the political class out of the lucrative loop they've created for themselves. The willingness of voters to tackle the big issues means that the only thing standing in the way of solving the budget crisis is a Political Class committed to defending the status quo, writes Rasmussen. Will voters take on the political class? They're more likely to if they read this book

### 2NC Turn Shield – Repairs/New Infrastructure distinction

#### Voters only support spending on infrastructure *maintenance* – they hate spending on new items

**Rockefeller Foundation, 11** (Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller

Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

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. Given this attitude, it is unsurprising that the public supports a number of measures that would change the way in which transportation dollars are spent. Indeed, two-thirds or more of respondents favor nine of the 10 reforms tested in the survey, with the highest levels of support for holding government accountable for collecting data and certifying that all projects are delivered on time and fit into an overall national plan (90% favor), and allowing local regions to have a greater say in how transportation dollars are used in their area (90% favor), and having a “fix it first” policy that focuses on maintaining existing transportation systems before building new ones (86% favor). The only reform that does not engender majority support is developing a pilot program in which several areas replace the gas tax with a user fee based on the number of miles driven—40% favor this, while 50% oppose it.

### 2NC Spending lx o/w transportation\*

#### Its not just the GOP base – fiscal discipline concerns massively outweigh transportation for dem and independent voters

**Pew, 11** (Pew Research Center, 1/20, http://www.people-press.org/2011/01/20/about-the-surveys/)

Reducing the budget deficit, or national debt, rated as a top policy priority during the 1990s, declined in importance in the early part of this decade, and has made a comeback in recent years. In January 2002, four months after the 9/11 attacks, just 35% said that reducing the budget deficit should be a top policy priority for President Bush and Congress. By the beginning of Bush’s second term, in January 2005, 56% said that reducing the budget deficit should be a top priority. In January 2009, shortly before Obama took office, 53% rated the deficit as a top priority. That increased to 60% last year and 64% in the new survey. Currently, about as many rate the deficit as a top priority as did so in December 1994 (65%), at the end of Bill Clinton’s second year in office. Deficit an Out-of-Power Concern? Typically, members of the party that does not hold the White House view reducing the deficit as a more important priority than do members of the president’s party. This pattern was particularly evident during the Bush administration. From 2002 to 2008, substantially more Democrats than Republicans rated reducing the budget deficit as a top priority. On several occasions during the Clinton administration, more Republicans than Democrats said that reducing the deficit – or paying off the national debt — was a top priority. In the new survey, 68% of Republicans and 61% of Democrats see reducing the budget deficit as a top policy priority (this difference is not statistically significant). While deficit reduction ranks fifth among Republicans, it is the 9th-ranking priority for Democrats. Crime Declines as Public Priority With declining crime rates, the proportion saying that reducing crime should be a top national priority has fallen dramatically. The percentage rating crime as a major priority fell nearly 30 points – from 76% to 47%– between 2001 and 2003. But these percentages subsequently increased – to 53% in 2004 and 2005, and 62% in 2006 and 2007. Since January 2007, the proportion saying that crime should be a top priority for the president and Congress has fallen by 18 points to 44%. Compared with a decade ago, there has been an across-the-board decline in the percentage viewing crime as a major priority. However, as was the case in 2001, poor people and less-educated people are far more likely to rate crime as a top policy priority than are better educated and more affluent people. More than half of those with no more than a high school education (58%) and those with family incomes of less than $30,000 (54%) say that reducing crime should be a top priority. That compares with just 27% of college graduates and an identical percentage of those with family incomes of $75,000 or more. Notably, these gaps were about as wide in 2001, when overall concern over crime was much greater. Persistent Partisan Differences over Priorities Roughly four-in-ten Democrats (41%) say that dealing with global warming should be a top priority for the president and Congress, compared with 29% of independents and just 10% of Republicans. The wide partisan gap over the importance of dealing with global warming is not new – it was approximately as large in 2010 and 2009. Democrats also are far more likely to view reducing health care costs (28-point partisan gap), dealing with the problems of the poor (26 points), protecting the environment (24 points), and improving the educational system (23 points) as top priorities than are Republicans. These differences also are in line with previous policy priority surveys. Improving the nation’s roads, bridges, and transportation does not rank as a particularly high priority for Democrats, Republicans or independents. Still, Democrats are more likely to see this as important (41% top priority vs. 30% of independents, 26% of Republicans. This is the case for dealing with obesity as well.

#### We’ll introduce this chart to prove our link outweighs – fiscal discipline concerns massively outweigh support for transportation funding among dem and independent voters – it’s a top priority

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

 Rep Dem Ind diff

% considering each as a "top priority" % % %

Protecting the environment 27 58 40 -31

Improving educational system 51 79 60 -28

Dealing with problems of the poor 39 66 46 -27

Dealing with global warming 11 38 21 -27

Improving roads, bridges, transportation 16 42 27 -26

Reducing military spending 16 39 26 -23

Reducing health care costs 49 71 56 -22

Making tax system more fair 50 67 61 -17

Securing Medicare 56 71 55 -15

Improving job situation 77 89 81 -12

Reducing crime 47 55 45 -8

Dealing with global trade 35 42 36 -7

Reforming campaign finance 25 31 28 -6

Dealing with nation's energy problem 55 57 46 -2

Securing Social Security 71 73 64 -2

Defending against terrorism 72 71 66 + 1

Strengthening nation's economy 90 86 84 + 4

Reducing the influence of lobbyists 42 38 43 + 4

Strengthening the military 46 37 36 + 9

Dealing with moral breakdown 53 42 40 + 11

Dealing with illegal immigration 48 36 37 + 12

Reducing budget deficit 84 66 62 + 18

### Fiscal Discipline key – general

#### Fiscal discipline is key issue for voters and gop base – fastest growing public priority

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

The new poll finds that the federal budget deficit stands out as the fastest growing policy priority for Americans, largely because of growing Republican concerns about the issue. In the national survey, conducted Jan. 11-16 among 1,502 adults, 69% rate reducing the budget deficit as a top priority – the most in any of the Pew Research Center’s annual policy priority updates going back to 1994. The number of Republicans rating the budget deficit as a top priority has spiked to 84% from 68% a year ago and just 42% five years ago. Meanwhile Republicans are placing far less emphasis on terrorism, which was their top priority in every year between 2002 and 2008. Today 72% rate it as a top priority, down from 83% a year ago and 93% five years ago. By contrast, the emphasis Democrats and independents give to terrorism and the budget deficit has changed far less.

#### Spending is key issue – top voter priority

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

Concern about the nation’s budget deficit, on the other hand, has been increasing in recent years. Currently, 69% say reducing the deficit is a top priority. In January 2009, only about half (53%) rated this as a top priority. The proportion citing the deficit as a top priority is now on par with the number that said this in December 1994 (65%), during Bill Clinton’s second year in office. Reducing the deficit or paying off the national debt became less of a priority in the late 1990s as the nation – and the federal government – benefited from a strong economy. Concern was also modest in the early years of the Bush administration, especially in the immediate aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks. But concern about deficits has increased steadily since 2009.

### Fiscal Discipline key – GOP Base

#### It’s the vital issue for GOP base -

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

A Spike in GOP Deficit Concerns More than eight-in-ten Republicans (84%) say reducing the federal budget deficit is a top priority, up 16 points since last January and the highest percentage in a Pew Research Center survey. During the Bush administration, at most only about half of Republicans viewed reducing the budget deficit as a top policy priority. In January 2009, shortly before George W. Bush left office, 51% of Republicans rated reducing the deficit as a top priority. That percentage jumped 17 points (to 68%) by January 2011 and has increased by about the same amount (16 points) in the last year alone.

#### Unifies conservatives and mobilizes GOP base

**Walsh, 12**

Kenneth, Chief White House Correspondent, US News and World Report, USNews.com, 5/30, lexis

2. Unify conservatives. GOP strategists say Romney still has not shown some on the right that he is truly one of them. Many see him as a "moderate from Massachusetts," as his GOP rivals labeled him during the primaries based on his record as governor of the Democrat-leaning state of Massachusetts. Political scientist Bill Galston of the Brookings Institution, says one theme that would unify conservatives and not alienate independents is a blunt and often-repeated pledge to make government smaller, more efficient, and attuned to everyday people. This is something, ironically, that President Bill Clinton did when he declared that the era of "big government" was over. It went over very well. Galston is a former senior White House adviser to Clinton.

### Fiscal Discipline key – independent/swing voters

#### Our link outweighs for swing voters - Fiscal discipline is top issue for independent swing voters and they don’t trust federal investments so there’s no perception of benefit

**NSOR, 10** (North Star Opinion Research, Resurgent Republic, Dr. Whit Ayres, president of North Star Opinion Research, co-founded Resurgent Republic with former RNC Chair Ed Gillespie and Impacto Group CEO Leslie Sanchez. North Star partners with Resurgent Republic to conduct surveys and focus groups on popular issues and trends that help shape public debate over the proper role of government, 7/7, <http://www.resurgentrepublic.com/summaries/independents-support-conservative-policies-in-health-care-energy-and-fiscal-issues>)

With Independent voters siding overwhelmingly with Republican voters again in our latest survey, conservative and market-oriented policies now consistently trump the liberal and government-oriented policies pursued by President Obama and the Democrats in Congress. In three key policy areas – health care, energy, and fiscal issues – conservative policies are more popular than liberal ones. Voters agree that offshore drilling should continue by a 56 to 37 percent margin, including a 56 to 36 percent margin among Independents and a 71 to 24 percent margin among Republicans. (Democrats oppose any new offshore wells by a 50 to 44 percent margin). This survey also finds that predictions of increased support for the health care bill once voters learned more about it have proved inaccurate. Voters support an argument urging repeal of the new health care reform law by a 53 to 41 percent margin, even when juxtaposed against a strong populist message that “we should stand up to the insurance companies, not give in to them.” Independents agree that the health care law should be repealed by a 52 to 39 percent margin, compared to a 77 to 21 percent margin among Republicans. Democrats oppose repealing the law by a 61 to 33 percent margin. Fiscal issues, starting with the passage of the stimulus package last spring, are at the vanguard of Independent dissatisfaction with Congress, and this survey shows Independents continue to oppose new spending and support corporate and capital gains tax cuts. In fact, voters overall agree that “we should freeze total federal spending at 2010 levels for the next five years,” by a 54 to 38 percent margin, even against a counterargument that “freezing total federal spending at 2010 levels for five years is irresponsible. That would require either not paying guaranteed benefits like Social Security and Medicare, or making drastic cuts in the defense budget.” Independents agree that we should freeze federal spending for five years by a 52 to 35 percent margin.

#### Our link outweighs perception of economic benefits for swing voters

**NSOR, 11** (North Star Opinion Research, Resurgent Republic, Dr. Whit Ayres, president of North Star Opinion Research, co-founded Resurgent Republic with former RNC Chair Ed Gillespie and Impacto Group CEO Leslie Sanchez. North Star partners with Resurgent Republic to conduct surveys and focus groups on popular issues and trends that help shape public debate over the proper role of government, 11/8, <http://www.resurgentrepublic.com/summaries/independents-support-conservative-policies-in-health-care-energy-and-fiscal-issues>)

As shown repeatedly in past Resurgent Republic surveys, a majority of Americans continues to believe that the federal government should be "spending less to reduce the deficit" rather than "spending more to help the economy recover." Voters overall want the federal government to spend less by 54 to 40 percent, including Republicans by 78 to 20 percent and Independents by 58 to 35 percent. Only Democrats want to spend more, by 63 to 30 percent.

#### Our link outweighs for independent swing voters -

**NSOR, 10** (North Star Opinion Research, Resurgent Republic, Dr. Whit Ayres, president of North Star Opinion Research, co-founded Resurgent Republic with former RNC Chair Ed Gillespie and Impacto Group CEO Leslie Sanchez. North Star partners with Resurgent Republic to conduct surveys and focus groups on popular issues and trends that help shape public debate over the proper role of government, 7/7, <http://www.resurgentrepublic.com/summaries/independents-support-conservative-policies-in-health-care-energy-and-fiscal-issues>)

Fiscal Issues 1. Likely voters say the federal government should freeze spending for five years. Even when voters are given a counterargument that a spending freeze would mean deciding between cutting benefits or defense spending, they agree that a spending freeze is a good idea by a 54 to 38 percent margin, including a 52 to 35 percent margin among Independents. Congressman A says freezing total federal spending at 2010 levels for five years is irresponsible. That would require either not paying guaranteed benefits like Social Security and Medicare, or making drastic cuts in the defense budget. Congressman B says we should freeze total federal spending at 2010 levels for the next five years. By funding only the top priorities, we will get the budget deficit back under control, and stop bankrupting the country and mortgaging our children's future. 2. Voter concern about deficits is also evident in support for a balanced budget amendment and a constitutional convention to pass a balanced budget amendment. These voters agree by a 54 to 37 percent margin that we should adopt a balanced budget amendment because “it is the only way we will instill some fiscal discipline in politicians and stop them from bankrupting the country,” despite a counterargument that a balanced budget “could force draconian cuts in Medicare and national defense, and hurt the government’s ability to respond to emergencies like 9-11.” Voters also agree that state legislatures should call for a convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment by a 46 to 39 percent margin, and agree that we should require a super majority of two-thirds to approve new spending by a 57 to 36 percent margin. 3. Voters support extending the capital gains tax cut and cutting corporate taxes. By a 54 to 40 percent margin, voters agree that we should “keep the capital gains tax rate at 15 percent where it is today. Raising capital gains taxes now would hurt economic growth at a time when the economy desperately needs to create more jobs,” over the argument that letting the “Bush tax cuts on capital gains expire…would raise the tax rate on capital gains from 15 to 20 percent, which would provide critically needed revenue, and ensure that the rich pay their fair share.” Voters agree that “we should cut the corporate income tax rate from 40 to 25 percent to stimulate job growth in the private sector” over “cutting corporate taxes is a giveaway to the rich which would increase the deficit at the worst possible time” by a 50 to 43 percent margin. 4. In contrast to focus group findings, voters indicate some questions about the shrinking tax base. Our research has found mixed responses to questions focused on the fact that the highest earning 53 percent of Americans pay all income taxes, while nearly half pay none. In focus groups, voters were skeptical that was the case, even when presented with information that tax credits eliminate the tax liabilities for many tax filers. This survey framed the issue more in terms of fairness: Congressman A says it is good for the country if the poorest half of Americans pays no income taxes. Those who can best afford to pay should carry most of the burden of funding the federal government. Congressman B says it is bad for the country if half the population pays all the income taxes and half pays nothing. Every American citizen should contribute at least something to support the federal government. In that context, voters agree that it is bad for the country if half the population pays all the income taxes by a 65 to 28 percent margin. Education 1. Voters have a middle-of-the-road attitude when it comes to education, with arguments on either side splitting the electorate. For example, voters agree that the federal government should not set national education standards by a narrow 49 to 47 percent margin, (51 to 44 percent among Independents) given these statements: Congressman A says we need national education standards that are tougher than those in other countries. Only with national standards will we be able to ensure a world-class education for our students. Congressman B says federal government has no business setting national education standards. Education is a state and local responsibility, and the states are best able to meet the needs of their own students. 2. Voters narrowly agree that federal education dollars should be spent exclusively on public schools, that teacher pay should not be tied to teacher performance, and that all teachers should be required to complete teacher training classes. Voters agree that federal education dollars should be spent exclusively in public schools by a 50 to 47 percent margin when presented with these arguments: Congressman A says federal education dollars should go exclusively to public schools. We should not take funding away from struggling public schools to subsidize private education. Congressman B says federal education dollars should follow the student when parents move them from failing public schools. Federal money should support the best possible education for a child, whether public, private, or parochial. Voters also oppose tying teacher pay to performance by a 51 to 42 percent margin (47 to 45 percent among Independents), “given the many factors that affect student achievement like the home environment.” Finally, the argument against alternative certification draws majority support, 55 to 40 percent, when presented with these arguments: Congressman A says we need the best trained people teaching in our public schools. Just because someone knows a lot about a field does not mean they will be an effective teacher. All teachers should be required to complete teacher training classes. Congressman B says we should recruit our most talented people to teach in public schools. Many mid-career professionals could make superb teachers, and it makes no sense to require them to take a full curriculum of teacher training classes. Conclusion Voters seem not only to be rejecting big government policies in response to the actions of the Obama Administration and the Democratic Congress, but also seem ready to embrace conservative policies. That movement is driven by Independents, who have been moving away from liberal policy choices for more than a year. The Obama Administration’s policy choices have created very fertile ground for conservative alternatives this fall.

### Fiscal Discipline Key – Dem Voters

#### Key issue for dem voters – top priority

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

Democrats’ concerns over the deficit also have risen in recent years, though less sharply than Republicans’. Currently, 66% of Democrats say reducing the budget deficit should be a top priority for the president and Congress, up from 52% in January 2009.

### Fiscal Discipline Key – ohio/florida

#### Perception of wasteful spending alienates key voters in ohio and florida

**Jasinowski, 12**

(Jerry Jasinowski, an economist and author, served as President of the National Association of Manufacturers for 14 years and later The Manufacturing Institute, Political Machine, 6/8, lexis)

Second, the attempt to recall Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, in which the Democrats invested tremendous time and resources, was a flop. Walker won decisively. Organized labor is probably the largest and most influential sector in the Democratic alliance, and public sector unions are the most influential sector of organized labor. But labor took a whipping. It is now clear that many voters believe public sector employees are better off than private sector employees and wield too much influence. The vote in Wisconsin suggests most voters are receptive to the Republican message that public sector unions need to be reined in and budget deficits reduced. This will spread to other states like Ohio and Florida.

### Fiscal Discipline Key – Virginia

#### That outweighs – it’s the key issue for Virginia voters and swings the election – southern virginia hates federal spending and perceives no benefit and northern virginia fears it will result in automatic cuts

**Fuller et al, 12** (Stephen, Center For Regional Analysis @ George Mason, Tom Hudson and Darren Gersh, Nightly Business Report Correspondents, Nightly Business Report, 6/6, lexis)

HUDSON: JPMC, JPMorgan (NYSE:JPM) Chase. Curry blamed the bank`s loss on weak risk management practices in JPMorgan`s chief investment office. Today`s hearing comes as regulators work to finalize the Volcker rule, which would prevent banks from making risky bets for their own profits. But the comptroller said it`s not clear whether that rule would have prevented this loss. President Obama is in California tonight while Mitt Romney is in Texas, both attending campaign fundraisers. We take a look at the key swing state of Virginia tonight, as we continue our look at the election, jobs and the economy. The unemployment rate in Virginia is just 5.6 percent, well below the national rate. That makes the state competitive for President Obama, but as Darren Gersh reports, that is only half the story. GERSH: There are really two Virginias. Northern Virginia is Barack Obama`s Virginia: urban, diverse, high tech and highly educated. As home to the Pentagon, Virginia receives more Federal spending than any other state and three out of every four of those dollars ends up here in northern Virginia. That may explain why students in the area are willing to give the president the benefit of the doubt. PATRICK ALLEN, STUDENT, NOVA: Given the state of the United States and the economy that he came in with, he`s done a wonderful job so far. It wouldn`t have been easy to turn this around no matter who was elected. GERSH: But the president isn`t taking votes here for granted. Since he was elected, he`s visited Northern Virginia Community College campuses five times. And even here, with all the Federal spending and an unemployment rate around 4 percent, his handling of the economy is a tough sell. FEIVEN ZIGITA, GRADUATE, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY: Everyone that I`ve known in my class that have graduated, they are working like unpaid internships, which is kind of like feeling like an indentured servant. GERSH: The president may be popular here, but for students, the thrill is gone. JENNIFER SAYASITHSENA, ASSISTANT PROF., NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE: Now they are really reevaluating, I think, how they are going to vote in the fall, whether they`ll continue to participate. GERSH: Get away from a college campus and head further south and you`ll find more long-time Virginians and they aren`t happy with what sounds like presidential excuses on the economy. BARBARA TIVNAN, REAL ESTATE BROKER: I think he thinks he`s done a much better job than he really has. GERSH: In the other Virginia, small town, southern Virginia, Federal spending and jobs are harder to come by. STEPHEN FULLER, CENTER FOR REGIONAL ANALYSIS, GEORGE MASON UNIV.: And they don`t like government particularly. They don`t think government helps them. They don`t understand how dependent the state has been on government money. GERSH: For Mitt Romney, that discontent with Washington spending is an opportunity. So too, is the fear of losing Federal spending. Defense spending is critical to the Virginia economy and the threat of automatic spending cuts scheduled for early next year could worry voters this fall. FULLER: It might point to the failure of leadership on the executive branch. It shouldn`t have let this happen. And so you throw the guy out who let it happen, thinking that maybe the new guy will be better. GERSH: The president will have a tough time keeping his job in November, if he can`t keep at least one of Virginia`s economies happy. Darren Gersh, NBR, Arlington, Virginia.

#### Fiscal restraint is specifically top issue for Virginia voters - Wasteful spending perception swings the vote

**Pershing, 12**

(Ben Pershing, author of Capitol Briefing, joined washingtonpost.com from the Capitol Hill newspaper Roll Call, where he worked for a decade, serving as Deputy Editor, Washington Post, 5/9, lexis)

In the 13 months since Kaine entered the race, the two campaigns have combined to raise and spend millions of dollars, outside groups have poured cash into television ads and Allen has reinforced his position as the Republican front-runner against a handful of challengers. Yet none of those developments has budged the basic narrative - two titans of Virginia politics battling to a draw in a state widely viewed as swing territory, both in the Senate and presidential contests. Kaine, who served as President Obama's handpicked Democratic National Committee chairman, might benefit from the fact that Obama holds a seven-point lead over former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney, the presumed Republican nominee, in Virginia and will drive turnout among liberals and African Americans. Yet the new poll includes some negative trends for Kaine: Registered voters are now equally divided in their impression of him, with 41 percent apiece viewing the Democrat favorably and unfavorably. A year ago, Kaine's rating was 2 to 1 positive, at 57 to 28 percent. Kaine's decline could be the partial result of negative ads that have aired against him in the state and efforts by Republicans to link him to health-care reform, the stimulus package and other controversial Obama administration policies. Although his popularity is down across the board, Kaine actually suffered the steepest fall among people planning to support Obama in November. His favorability rating dropped 20 percentage points among that group, even though Kaine has not broken with Obama on any high-profile issues recently. The percentage of non-white respondents viewing Kaine unfavorably climbed 17 points, and his decline in popularity has been pronounced among lower-income voters and those without college degrees. But the overall portion of registered voters saying they planned to cast their ballot for Kaine hasn't moved a bit, including among Obama supporters, indicating that backers of the president aren't planning to abandon the Senate candidate in November. Stuart Rothenberg, editor of the nonpartisan Rothenberg Political Report, said he had long assumed that for Allen to win, the Republican nominee would need to capture Virginia, while Kaine could potentially scrape out a victory even if Obama lost narrowly. So Rothenberg was taken aback by the fact that Kaine runs behind Obama in the new poll. "It doesn't make a lot of sense to me," he said. "It's a surprise, and, frankly, it's counterintuitive." Arthur Diggs, an African American college professor and Air Force veteran from Virginia Beach, said he planned to vote the straight Democratic ticket this fall. But Diggs said there was no particular reason for him to support Kaine "other than the fact that he leans toward Obama." "He's the lesser of two evils," Diggs, 63, said. "If it was somebody else [as the Democratic nominee], I would probably vote for them." Allen's rating is also now under 50 percent with voters, though with a smaller slide. His favorability has dipped from 52 to 47 percent in a year, and his unfavorability has inched up from 28 to 31 percent. Allen's campaign has focused on presenting him as a fiscal conservative who will halt the burgeoning deficits of the Obama administration, while emphasizing Virginia's strong economic performance during the Republican's gubernatorial tenure. But Kaine has sought to remind voters of Allen's record as a senator, when he voted to raise the debt ceiling and for tax and spending policies that boosted the deficit. Of more immediate importance, the new poll shows Allen is in a dominant position ahead of his June 12 Republican primary. Among likely primary voters, Allen gets 62 percent, Del. Robert G. Marshall (Prince William) gets 12 percent, former Virginia Tea Party Patriots head Jamie Radtke receives 5 percent and Chesapeake minister E.W. Jackson brings up the rear at 3 percent. Though all three opponents have accused Allen of being insufficiently conservative, the former governor has no obvious weakness on his right flank. A big majority of self-identified conservatives call him "about right" ideologically, and he takes 68 percent of their votes in the primary. Allen's foes have been hurt by their lack of statewide name recognition - 57 percent of all respondents say they didn't know enough about Marshall to form an impression of him, while 66 percent say the same of Radtke. The four Republicans held a primary debate recently in Roanoke and have two more scheduled this month. In the general election matchup, Allen and Kaine enjoy massive support from their respective parties, while among independent voters, Kaine gets 46 percent to Allen's 45 percent. Kaine leads among moderates, 53 to 38 percent. And the Democrat is up 84 percent to 8 percent among African American voters, a commanding lead that still doesn't quite match Obama's 97 to 1 percent advantage over Romney. Like Obama, Kaine has a solid lead in the suburbs closest to Washington, but the race is far closer in the rapidly growing exurban counties. The poll shows a clear gender gap: Allen has an eight-point edge among male registered voters, while women lean toward Kaine by seven. Kaine has the advantage among better-educated voters, but the two candidates are running close to even among lower- and upper-income Virginians. Asked which issues were most important to their choice in the Senate contest, voters most often highlight the economy, health care and the federal budget deficit. Allen leads among those who named the economy, the deficit and taxes as their primary issues. Kaine has the edge among voters most concerned about education. Kaine and Allen run about evenly among those emphasizing health care, an issue that Republicans have sought to use against Kaine.

#### Opposition to wasteful spending even stronger in Virginia than nationally - it’s a key election issue

**Fram, 12** (Alan, Columnist @ Salon.com, Detroit Free Press, 3/7, lexis)

TOP ISSUES: The economy is the No. 1 issue for voters in every Super Tuesday state polled, according to exit polls. The economy was the top issue for almost 6 in 10 voters in Massachusetts and most voters in Vermont. That was also true in southern and more conservative states, though more there expressed concern about the deficit. In Tennessee, Oklahoma and Virginia, more than 3 in 10 called the federal budget deficit their top issue. Four in 10 voters in Tennessee said they were angry with the way the federal government is working.

### Fiscal Discipline Key – Pennsylvania

#### Voter opposition to perception of wasteful big government spending uniquely powerful in Pennsylvania – could swing

**Hutchinson, 12**

Earl Ofari Hutchinson is an author and political analyst. He is a weekly co-host of the Al Sharpton Show on American Urban Radio Network. He is the author of How Obama Governed: The Year of Crisis and Challenge. He is an associate editor of New America Media. He is host of the weekly Hutchinson Report Newsmaker Hour heard weekly on the nationally network broadcast Hutchinson Newsmaker Network, Political Machine, 5/8, lexis

Ohio is hardly a special case. An equally strong hint that defecting white Democrats could pose a danger for Obama came in Pennsylvania's primary in 2008. A huge percent of Pennsylvania voters are blue collar, anti-big government, socially conservative, pro-defense, and intently patriotic, and there's a tormenting history of a racial polarization in the state. If Obama had not decisively won the state's two big, racially diverse cities primarily with black and youth votes, Clinton would have trounced Obama by an even wider margin than she did. The same percent of white Democrats as in Ohio told exit poll interviewers that they would not back Obama. Race was the prime reason. Clinton racked up victories in the West Virginia, Kentucky and South Dakota primaries. Again, a significant percent of white Democrats said they would not back Obama, and the reason was race and many made no effort to hide it.

#### Pennsylvania could swing – Obama can’t win without it

**Itkowitz, 12**

Colby Itkowitz, Washington Bureau, Morning Call, 5/5, <http://articles.mcall.com/2012-05-05/news/mc-pennsylvania-swing-state-presidential-20120505_1_pennsylvania-voters-obama-campaign-presidential-battlefield>

Pennsylvania's status could change in an instant, of course, and Romney will be poised to pounce if the opportunity warrants. But for now, the state sets up as more Obama's to lose than Romney's to win, considering the state has about one million more registered Democrats than Republicans. And presidential elections tend to bring out voters. Four years ago, John McCain's campaign took a risk on investing heavily in Pennsylvania. Bob Heckman, a senior McCain strategist, said the team thought it could reach culturally conservative Democrats in western Pennsylvania or woo women with Sarah Palin on the ticket. "We felt we had to roll the dice and make a gamble early on a take-away state, one state that ought to be in the 'D' column that we can take away from Obama to make up for any states that he could take away from us," said Heckman, a Washington-based Republican consultant. McCain lost Pennsylvania to Obama by more than 10 percentage points. "Sometimes facts are facts," Heckman said. "Pennsylvania in presidential races tends to be a Democratic state." Still, Heckman and other Republicans insist it could be different this time. Romney is better financed than McCain, and other Republican candidates have since swept the state: Tom Corbett won the governor's mansion and Pat Toomey won a U.S. Senate seat. Discontent over a fragile economy is the albatross around Obama's neck that could make him vulnerable. Some are baffled by the suggestion that Pennsylvania might not be a major player in November. T.J. Rooney, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Democratic Party in 2008, described it as a "head scratcher." "I'm just not one of those people who believe for a second this state is locked down," Rooney said. "I just don't understand it, to be quite honest. I haven't seen any poll that suggests this state is out of reach." Larry Ceisler, a longtime Democratic operative in Philadelphia, echoed that, saying the Obama campaign and its surrogates will need to work hard to defend the state. "I believe Romney can win Pennsylvania and I didn't think that a few weeks ago," Ceisler said. Quinnipiac University, based in Connecticut, includes Pennsylvania (along with Ohio and Florida) in its periodic "swing state" poll. Still, early television ad buys — the most expensive and targeted campaign tool — have not been made in Pennsylvania. Last week the SuperPAC supporting Romney, Restore Our Future, bought television ad time in nine so-called "swing states," but not in Pennsylvania. Also last week, the Obama campaign began airing an attack spot on Romney in Ohio, Virginia and Iowa. Previously, Obama's team had placed ad buys in Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Ohio, Nevada and Virginia. Other SuperPACs have taken the same tack. The conservative Americans For Prosperity and American Crossroads have run ads in six to eight battlegrounds, but not Pennsylvania. The pro-Obama SuperPAC Priorities USA Action, aired ads in April in Ohio, Virginia, Florida and Iowa. Sean Trende, senior elections analyst for Real Clear Politics, which aggregates political news and polls, said in recent times Pennsylvania has tended to be a few points more Democratic than the nation overall. It makes sense that groups would make their early investments in states truly up for grabs, he said. For Romney, winning Pennsylvania would be "icing" — not a state Romney is looking at to get the 270 electoral votes needed to win the presidency, Trende said. On the flip side, "if Obama is fighting over Pennsylvania," Trende said, "it probably means he's losing the election." State Republican Party Chairman Rob Gleason said he is prepared for "hand-to-hand combat" in the Lehigh Valley and Philadelphia suburbs, where voters tend to swing. He described himself as positive, yet realistic. When Romney was in Harrisburg for a fundraiser, Gleason told him they would win Pennsylvania. He said Romney responded, "Really?" "I don't think anyone thinks we can carry Pennsylvania, I don't think even Romney thinks we can win Pennsylvania; they're not counting on it, but they'll play here," Gleason said. "We're not asleep at the switch. We've been working on this for four years. This is the big one." A Quinnipiac "swing state" poll of Pennsylvania, Florida and Ohio voters confirmed last week that Romney is better poised to take Ohio or Florida. The poll shows that Obama is leading Romney by eight points in Pennsylvania, and is favored by key demographic groups: women, youth and independent voters. In Florida and Ohio, Obama and Romney are statistically tied. If the polls tightens, the math could change quickly as Nov. 6 nears. Obama must win Pennsylvania to stay in office — no Democrat since Harry Truman in 1948 has won the presidency without Pennsylvania — and Romney will watch for any opening.

### Wasteful Spending key - general

#### Lack of public confidence guts perception of benefits – plan viewed as wasteful spending and dooms obama

**Galston, 11**

William Galston is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a contributing editor for The New Republic, 9/24, http://www.tnr.com/article/the-vital-center/95296/democrats-ideology-republicans-independents

Another Gallup finding that should alert Democrats is the ongoing collapse of public confidence in government. A survey released earlier this week found that Americans now believe that the federal government wastes 51 cents of every dollar it spends, the highest estimate ever recorded. Twenty-five years ago, that figure stood at only 38 cents. While estimates of waste at the state and local level remain lower than for the federal level, they have also risen by double digits in recent decades. Overall, it’s hard to avoid concluding that the ideological playing-field heading into 2012 is tilted against Democrats. This reality only deepens the strategic dilemma the White House now confronts. The conventional strategy for an incumbent is to secure the base before the general public gets fully engaged and then reach out to the swing voters whose decisions spell the difference between victory and defeat. By contrast, the Obama team spent most of 2011 in what turned out to be a failed effort to win over the Independent voters who deserted Democrats in droves last November, in the process alienating substantial portions of the base. To rekindle the allegiance and enthusiasm of core supporters, the president now finds himself having to draw sharp ideological lines, risking further erosion among Independents and even moderate Democrats. Tellingly, a number of at-risk Democratic senators up for reelection in 2012 have already refused to go along with key elements of the president’s recent proposals. Granted, ideology isn’t everything. Political scientists have long observed that Americans are more liberal on particulars than they are in general—ideologically conservative but operationally liberal. (Surveys have shown majority support for most individual elements of the president’s jobs and budget packages.) And the Republicans could undermine their chances by nominating a presidential candidate who is simply too hard-edged conservative for moderates and Independents to stomach. In the face of widespread skepticism and disillusion, it will be an uphill battle for Democrats to persuade key voting blocks that government can really make their lives better. But if they fail, the public will continue to equate public spending with waste, the anti-government message will continue to resonate, and Democrats will be in dire straits when heading into what is shaping up as a pivotal election.

### Wasteful spending key – Moderate Dems

#### Perception of new wasteful big government spending locks down white working class male voters for Romney – they’re in play now and determine outcome in vital swing states

**Epstien, 12** (Reid, Columnist @ Politico, 5/17, lexis)

Seeking to attract Democrats and independents who supported the last Democratic president, Romney has taken to lavishing praise at every turn on Clinton's boom-era '90s policies while contrasting them unfavorably with President Barack Obama's old-school, Big Government ways. The tactic is designed to drive a wedge between the group of Democrats who supported Obama during the epic 2008 primary battle between Obama and Hillary Clinton: the white, working-class voters who hold the key to many swing states, like Ohio, Pennsylvania and Michigan. It's also a simple way for Romneyland to poke a stick in the eye of Team Obama, using one of its most prominent surrogates but a man who has had a complicated personal history with Obama. According to 2008 exit polls, Obama won self-described moderates by 21 points but lost white voters who made less than $50,000 by 4 percentage points. The same group of Bill Clinton Democrats could be Obama's Achilles' heel in 2012 as he fights to win them back. Romney is leading among white, working-class men in polls - though the president is leading among women - while POLITICO's latest battleground poll showed Romney leading by 10 points among independents. Republican strategists argue that Romney's sudden affinity for Clinton comes at an opportune moment for the likely GOP presidential nominee. The Republican has a chance to argue that Obama is more liberal than some voters on key issues like same-sex marriage, deficit spending and health care reform. Laying claim to the Clinton legacy also allows Romney to move to the center after being forced to tack right in the GOP primary. Chip Saltsman, who ran Mike Huckabee's 2008 campaign, said Romney is making a play for moderate voters in states like North Carolina and Virginia who may be turned off by Obama's embrace of same-sex marriage. "Those voters are in play right now, and as we've seen, the polls flux and ebb and flow. Both campaigns are trying to figure out how to lock them down," Saltsman said.

#### Perception of new wasteful big government programs aid Romneys attempts to divide dems and pick off Centrists

**Epstien, 12** (Reid, Columnist @ Politico, 5/17, lexis)

Starting last week in Michigan, Romney began trying to divide those who favor Obama and those who backed Bill Clinton. Not only, he argues, is Obama a kind of paleo-Democrat divorced from Clinton's New Democrat policies, Romney has suggested there is a more personal schism between the presidents. A senior Romney adviser said the campaign sought to use Clinton's name to drive a wedge between centrist and liberal Democrats in the November general election. "It's useful to point out what people already believe about Obama," Romney strategist Stuart Stevens told POLITICO. "That he's an old-school liberal who is to the left of the country and relying on old, failed solutions." "Almost a generation ago, Bill Clinton announced that the era of Big Government was over," Romney said Tuesday in Des Moines, Iowa. "Even a former [George McGovern] campaign worker like President Clinton was signaling to his own party that Democrats should no longer try to govern by proposing a new program for every problem. President Obama tucked away the Clinton doctrine in his large drawer of discarded ideas, along with transparency and bipartisanship. It's enough to make you wonder if maybe it was a personal beef with the Clintons, but probably, it runs much deeper." One longtime Romney adviser characterized the language as an effort to remind Chicago that Romney is ready to do battle.

#### Perception of wasteful big government programs guts dem unity and alienates key swing voters in vital battleground states

**Frontrunner, 12** (5/18, lexis)

Peter Baker writes in the New York Times (5/18, Baker, Subscription Publication, 1.23M) that Mitt Romney and President Obama lavishing praise on icons of the opposing party is "about scoring points against the opponent in an increasingly fiery election year." Romney has recently cited former President Bill Clinton's willingness to break "with his party's traditional big-government orthodoxy," while Obama has cited former President Ronald Reagan "for agreement that millionaires should not pay lower tax rates than the middle class." Baker says that from "Romney's perspective, it does not hurt to remind centrist Democrats of the past tensions and disagreements between Mr. Obama and the Clintons" and that when "Obama invokes the spirit of Mr. Reagan, it is to argue that the Republican Party of Mr. Romney has drifted far away from its popular roots."

### Big Government Link O/W

#### Perception of big government is voters #1 fear – splits dems, alienates swing voters and mobilizes GOP base

**Mendes, 11**

(Elisabeth, writer for Gallop Management Journal, Gallup, 12/12, http://www.gallup.com/poll/151490/Fear-Big-Government-Near-Record-Level.aspx)

In U.S., Fear of Big Government at Near-Record Level Democrats lead increase in concerns about big government Americans' concerns about the threat of big government continue to dwarf those about big business and big labor, and by an even larger margin now than in March 2009. The 64% of Americans who say big government will be the biggest threat to the country is just one percentage point shy of the record high, while the 26% who say big business is down from the 32% recorded during the recession. Relatively few name big labor as the greatest threat. Historically, Americans have always been more concerned about big government than big business or big labor in response to this trend question dating back to 1965. Concerns about big business surged to a high of 38% in 2002, after the large-scale accounting scandals at Enron and WorldCom. An all-time-high 65% of Americans named big government as the greatest threat in 1999 and 2000. Worries about big labor have declined significantly over the years, from a high of 29% in 1965 to the 8% to 11% range over the past decade and a half. Democrats Lead Increase in Concern About Big Government Almost half of Democrats now say big government is the biggest threat to the nation, more than say so about big business, and far more than were concerned about big government in March 2009. The 32% of Democrats concerned about big government at that time -- shortly after President Obama took office -- was down significantly from a reading in 2006, when George W. Bush was president. By contrast, 82% of Republicans and 64% of independents today view big government as the biggest threat, slightly higher percentages than Gallup found in 2009.

### Ext – Big Government Link O/W

#### Fear of big government is top issue for voters

**Mendes, 11**

(Elisabeth, writer for Gallop Management Journal, Gallup, 12/12, http://www.gallup.com/poll/151490/Fear-Big-Government-Near-Record-Level.aspx)

Americans' concerns about the threat of big government are near record-high levels. The Occupy Wall Street movement, focused on "fighting back against the corrosive power of major banks and multinational corporations," has drawn much attention and a large following. Still, the majority of Americans do not view big business as the greatest threat to the country when asked to choose among big business, big government, and big labor. In fact, Americans' concerns about big business have declined significantly since 2009. Additionally, while Occupy Wall Street isn't necessarily affiliated with a particular party, its anti-big business message may not be resonating with majorities in any party. Republicans, independents, and now close to half of Democrats are more concerned about the threat of big government than that coming from big business.

### A2: Local Economic Targeting Link Turn

#### National economic factors key – local economics don’t matter

**Bernstein, 12**

Jonathan Bernstein is a political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post, Star Tribune, 6/9, <http://m.startribune.com/opinion/?id=158323795&c=y>)

But much of what we think we know about these key states, which switch party allegiances with some frequency, has been knocked down by political science research - and sometimes, by recent history. Here are a few misperceptions about these in-demand states. 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 three 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. Granted, political junkies like me won't be able to stop themselves from peeking at what the Des Moines Register thinks is happening in the Hawkeye State. But if we're smart, we'll look at the national polls to find out what's really going on. 2. A vice presidential candidate should appeal to key groups in swing states. We hear this every election cycle. The National Journal's latest Veepstakes rankings, for example, say that former Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty makes sense as a possible running mate for Mitt Romney because "in an election that could be decided by Rustbelt battlegrounds, it couldn't hurt to have a guy capable of matching VP Biden's blue-collar appeal." This sort of thinking is probably what led to John McCain's selection of Sarah Palin in 2008; his campaign thought she would neutralize Barack Obama's advantage among female voters. And supposedly, Joe Biden was picked to help Obama with white working-class voters in the swing states of Ohio and Pennsylvania. The problem is that there's no evidence that vice presidential candidates have that kind of impact. The exception, research has found, is that a popular running mate might help by a couple of points in his or her home state. But even if a candidate knows what the swing states are, it's a lot harder to figure out where, exactly, the campaign could most use that two-point boost. And home-state popularity isn't transferable. So whatever folks in Duluth or St. Paul might think of Pawlenty, he might not appeal to voters in Dayton. 3. Ignore the national economy, and focus on swing-state economies. 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, Fla., 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 non-local factors, such as the national media."

### Highway/Surface Transportation Links

#### Highway/Surface Transportation Funding Uniquely unpopular – public has lost all confidence

**A.G.C. ‘11**

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

Just because our federal infrastructure investments have delivered tremendous national benefits, that doesn’t mean many current federal infrastructure programs aren’t in need of a change. On the contrary, there is little doubt that our current federal approach to investing in infrastructure is flawed. Indeed, many of those flaws undermine and devalue federal infrastructure investments, helping reinforce public skepticism in the government’s ability to efficiently and effectively meet basic needs. Nowhere are those flaws more glaringly apparent than with our current approach to surface transportation funding. The once-focused federal program that was the envy of the world for building the Interstate Highway System has fallen out of favor with the public and many policy analysts. Yet since the completion of the original Interstate Highway System, there has been no clear role or purpose for the federal transportation program. As a result, politicians have used an ever-greater share of Highway Trust Fund revenue to pay for programs that have little or nothing to do with transportation priorities, or even with transportation at all in some cases. Depending on who is counting, today there are over 100 different federal programs funded by the Highway Trust Fund, including programs to protect historic covered bridges, encourage students to walk to school and to build local bike lanes. While these may all be worthwhile, it is hard to understand why any of those initiatives serve a national objective and should be funded from a Trust Fund financed primarily by highway users that was intended to pay for construction and maintenance of a national highway system. As a result of these continued diversions of Highway Trust Fund revenue, today only about 68 percent of Trust Fund dollars goes to construction and maintenance of highways. This is problematic for many reasons. First, these diversions from the primary purpose of the Trust Fund have turned the gas tax and its other funding sources from user fees into taxes. A user fee is something people pay to use a system, with the understanding that those fees will be reinvested into the system. A tax is something you pay so the government has the revenue needed to fund a host of programs. For much of its existence, the gas tax and other highway user fees were a way for drivers to pay for maintenance and upkeep of the highway system. Today it is a way for them to pay some money into the highway system and a lot of money into programs that do little or nothing to benefit them or the highways they use. As a result of these diversions, the size of the federal surface transportation program continues to grow at rates far greater than increases in highway maintenance and expansion. So even as motorists read about hundreds of billions of dollars going into the Highway Trust Fund, they see comparatively little new capacity or maintenance work underway. Americans are savvy consumers. They know when they are getting a good deal, and they know when they aren’t. And what used to be a good deal – paying a modest gas tax to finance access to the world’s most efficient highway system – is now a bad deal – paying a modest gas tax to finance, among other things, fitness and recreational facilities, covered bridges and other unrelated programs that a small number of politicians favor. It is no coincidence that the gas tax now rates among the least popular of all forms of revenue collection in the U.S.

### HSR Links

#### Massively unpopular – perceived as wasteful and ineffective – key issue for voters – 2010 elections prove

**Crawley, 10** (John, Journalist @ Reuters, 11/10, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/11/08/us-infrastructure-congress-idUSTRE6A749F20101108>)

John Mica, who is expected to chair the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, told Reuters in a post-election interview that he would conduct a close review of how money was spent from the 2009 economic stimulus package approved by the Democratic-controlled Congress. He also plans to reevaluate grant programs that bypassed congressional review. The new look at spending comes after voters last week questioned Obama infrastructure priorities in electing Republican governors who campaigned against what they considered unworkable transportation spending. To start, Mica will focus on more than $10 billion in high-speed rail awards and a $1.5 billion transportation construction financing under the so-called TIGER grant program in which funds were sent directly to states on the merit of proposed projects. "We had unelected officials sitting behind closed doors making decisions without any hearings or without any elected officials being consulted. There was no rational explanation," Mica said. "I'm going to have a full review of that." TIGER grants have been oversubscribed and state capitals want them extended, but there is no commitment from Congress to do that. Some of the money could come back to the federal government, according to Mica, who also said that he would look at how to expedite funding in other cases. Mica's scrutiny of high-speed rail projects and other construction spending is shared by some critical Republicans at the state level. Republican gubernatorial candidates who won their races in Ohio, Florida and Wisconsin last week campaigned against high speed rail development, an Obama transportation priority.

#### Public doesn’t perceive benefits – viewed as expensive tax spending

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO Soul of America, <http://soulofamerica.com/interact/soulofamerica-travel-blog/interstate-hsr-network/>)

Unfortunately, vote trading for Interstate HSR is harder to come by due to public’s lack of knowledge about HSR benefits. Its easy for the average Joe to think, “Not My Tax Dollar”, when don’t know that existing taxes can pay for it and that its cheaper than more of the stays quo. Turns out, powerful forces have undermined public knowledge about HSR benefits for decades. Lets take a look back to see how we arrived at this sticky situation.

#### Opposition lobbies control public perception and media spin

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO Soul of America, <http://soulofamerica.com/interact/soulofamerica-travel-blog/interstate-hsr-network/>)

By then, powerful lobbies had formed representing auto, airline, oil and freight rail industries who wanted to increase highway funding, expand regional flights, increase oil consumption and limit regulation of freight rail routes. To continue monopolizing transportation investment for highways and aviation and prevent new freight rail regulation, the four industries handsomely funded three think tanks to shoot down the HSR option and minimize Rail Transit funding. Using a continuous stream of reports, Cato, Reason and Heritage think tanks misled news media. In turn, TV and radio soundbites, and most newspapers misinformed the public. Without a well-informed public understanding HSR benefits-to-costs and then having a majority demand it, the resolve of Congress and President Carter weakened. Though Amtrak’s threadbare funding of slow routes continued, they never funded a single HSR project.

#### Public opposition growing – high cost perception

**Nunes, 11** (Devin, House Rep, Cong Doc and Publications, 12/15, lexis)

Washington, Dec 15 - Today Congressman Devin Nunes testified before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which held an important oversight hearing on the skyrocketing cost of California high-speed rail. "The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure gave opponents of California high-speed rail a unique opportunity to tell members why they oppose this growingly unpopular project," said Congressman Nunes. "We need to look for better options to high- speed rail, such as freight rail and other transportation projects that are more beneficial to California and don't bankrupt our state. Chairman Mica should be praised for showing considerable leadership in holding this hearing."

#### Perception of inept implementation ensure public opposition – Overwhelms theoretical support and Obama loses spin game

**Orski, 12**

Ken Orski, Publisher, Innovation Briefs, 1/19, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2011/10/paying-for-roads-with-drilling.php?comments=expandall#comments

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. Hearing Highlights Missteps in Administration's High-Speed Rail Program December 6, 2011 Washington, DC – Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Members and witnesses outlined growing concerns with the Obama Administration’s high-speed rail program. Although sold by the Administration as a high-speed rail program, over $10 billion in funding has been scattered to projects across the country under the program, with the very real possibility that no high-speed rail service will result. “Since the passage of the Stimulus, the President’s high-speed rail program has gone completely in the wrong direction,” said Committee Chairman John L. Mica (R-FL). “Before the Stimulus, I worked to include language to create a blueprint for the development of U.S. high-speed rail in the 2008 Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act. And I was optimistic when the President made developing high-speed rail a priority and included $8 billion in funding in the Stimulus. “Unfortunately, the vast majority of the projects selected by the Administration are not high-speed at all. This bait-and switch gives high-speed rail in the U.S. a bad name,” Mica continued. “In March 2011/2010, GAO reported the Administration’s project selection process lacked transparency, and we don’t fully understand why projects were chosen. We’re funding slow-speed projects all over the country, most of them for Amtrak, that will not result in high-speed service. $3.6 billion – more than one-third of the $10.1 billion that has gone to projects – was turned back by states. The one project funded that offered the most hope for achieving high-speed, the California project, appears to be in disarray. In fact, the Committee will hold a hearing specifically to review this project next week. “We need one high-speed rail success, and our country’s best opportunity to achieve high-speed rail is in the Northeast Corridor,” Mica concluded. “Now that federal funding for this program has been stopped, we have an opportunity to learn from those mistakes and make the needed changes to develop at least one truly successful high-speed rail corridor in this country.” “I support high-speed rail where it makes sense, but the President’s vision of providing 80% of Americans with access to high-speed rail service is unnecessary and isn’t going to happen,” said Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-PA). “Instead of finding one place to do high-speed rail, and do it right, the Administration has spread the money too thinly all over the country. Because of this misguided approach, we’re not getting any high-speed rail. The only result will be a wasted opportunity. “I urge this Administration to reevaluate what it’s doing with this program, and to move its high-speed rail efforts in a new direction,” Shuster added. “We can develop high-speed rail in this country, but only where it makes sense. And nowhere makes more sense than the Northeast Corridor.” Witnesses testifying at today’s hearing included Ken Orski, a former federal transportation official and transportation policy consultant. Orski highlighted the Administration’s missteps in implementing its purported plan to develop high-speed rail in the United States. “The Administration’s first misstep, in my judgment, has been to falsely represent its program as ‘high-speed rail,’ thus, conjuring up an image of bullet trains cruising at 200 mph, just as they do in Western Europe and the Far East,” Orski stated in prepared testimony. “It further raised false expectations by claiming that ‘within 25 years 80 percent of Americans will have access to high-speed rail.’ In reality the Administration’s high-speed rail program will do no such thing. A close examination of the grant announcements shows that, with one exception, the program consists of a collection of planning, engineering and construction grants that seek incremental improvements in existing facilities of Class One freight railroads in selected corridors used by Amtrak trains.”

### PPP Funding Links

#### Mass public opposition to P3 funding – multiple reasons

**Utt, 12** (Ronald, Transportation Policy Expert @ Heritage Foundation, States News Service, 1/13)

Thus, despite the successes beginning with Denver's E-470 tollway in 1989, P3s are still a minor part of the surface transportation landscape. Opposition to tolling, opposition to private profits from operating public infrastructure, and concern over foreign investment in government assets in the U.S. have generated political opposition in some states. These challenges need to be overcome before the P3 concept can become a significant supplement to taxpayer funding.

## \*\*\*Internals - General\*\*\*

### Link Booster – Tiny Shifts Matter

#### Even tiny swings have huge impact – determine the outcome

**Abramowitz, 6/7/12**

Alan I. Abramowitz, Senior Columnist, Center for politics, 6/7/12 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/>

With five months to go until Election Day 2012, all indications are that the presidential race between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney is going to go down to the wire and that the outcome will ultimately be decided by voters in 10-15 battleground states in which neither candidate has a decisive advantage. These findings raise an important question for the Obama and Romney campaigns. In deciding how to allocate money and other resources, how much emphasis should they give to mobilizing potential supporters versus persuading undecided voters? The answer to this question depends on the characteristics and political attitudes of two key groups of voters in the battleground states: unregistered supporters and undecided registered voters. In order to compare the potential payoffs of a strategy emphasizing mobilization compared with a strategy emphasizing persuasion, I analyzed data from a March 20-26 Gallup Poll in 12 key battleground states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. This was the most recent battleground state polling data available for analysis. A total of 1,046 adults were interviewed on landline and cellular telephones, including 871 registered voters. Swing voters: Unhappy with Obama but unenthusiastic about voting One important finding from Gallup’s March swing state poll is that there were relatively few swing voters in these swing states. Among registered voters, 49% supported Barack Obama and another 1% indicated that they leaned toward Obama, while 41% supported Mitt Romney and another 2% leaned toward Romney. The March 20-26 survey was conducted at a time when Mitt Romney was still battling with Rick Santorum for the Republican nomination. Now that Romney has locked up the GOP nomination, Obama’s lead in these battleground states may very well be smaller. What is striking, however, is that as early as March, relatively few registered voters were unwilling to state a preference in a Romney-Obama contest. Even combining leaners with the undecided, swing voters made up less than 10% of the electorate in these 12 states. Still, with the race between Obama and Romney expected to be very close, even a small group of swing voters could decide the outcome. So who are these swing voters? To answer this question, I compared the characteristics and political attitudes of swing voters (those who were undecided or only leaning toward a candidate) with the characteristics and attitudes of voters who were supporting either Obama or Romney. The results are displayed in Table 1.

### Ext – Small Shifts Matter

#### Small swings matter – its super close and next couple months key

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/what-does-president-obama%E2%80%99s-may-approval-rating-tell-us-about-his-reelection-chances/>)

Whether we base our prediction on President Obama’s 47% approval rating in the Gallup Poll in early May or a more sophisticated forecasting model incorporating economic conditions and the “time for change” factor, it appears likely that we are headed for a very close election in November. Both models make Obama a slight favorite to win a second term. However, the final outcome will depend on the actual performance of the economy and the public’s evaluation of the president’s job performance in the months ahead. Those interested in assessing where the presidential race stands should focus on these two indicators rather than the day-to-day events of the campaign, which tend to dominate media coverage of the election.

#### Its super tight – could go either way now

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/17, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12510>)

But it’s the 58.8 percent chance of Obama winning that interests me today, because that prediction stands in stark contrast to what most pollsters, Democrats and Republicans alike, whom I talked with privately, believe. The number crunchers who conduct and analyze polls, and others who study these things closely, see a lot of metrics pointing to a very close contest that could go either way. They don’t see an election in which either Obama, or Mitt Romney, is likely to have an almost six-in-10 chance of winning. Take the polls, for example. The averages of all major national polls show the race as extremely close. Pollster.com gives Obama a 1.2-percentage-point lead over Romney, 46.3 percent to 45.1 percent. Realclearpolitics.com pegs Obama’s lead at 2 points, 47 percent to 45 percent. Gallup’s seven-day tracking poll puts the president’s lead at 1 point, 46 percent to 45 percent. Undecided voters, particularly, often break away from well-known, well-defined incumbents (the “what you see is what you get” rule for those in office). Does this really translate into a strong advantage for the president? Obama’s job-approval ratings are often “upside down” in pollster parlance, with disapprovals running higher than approvals in both Pollster.com (46.9 percent approve; 48.4 percent disapprove) and Realclearpolitics (48 percent approve; 48.5 percent disapprove). Gallup also shows 47 percent approve and disapprove numbers for the week of May 7-13. Is that really a decisive edge? In terms of the Electoral College, seven states—Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia—are likely to be extremely close. New Hampshire might also be tight. (I am increasingly skeptical that Obama can win North Carolina.) I pay a lot of attention to the top-dollar surveys by the Obama and Romney campaigns—and, for that matter, what highly regarded pollsters doing surveys for various senatorial and gubernatorial candidates and for ballot initiatives in the states say. I don’t put a lot of stock in the dime-store polls, which bloggers and Internet armchair analysts so avidly follow (ask them about calling cell phones; that separates the top-notch pollsters from the cut-rate crowd). Don’t get me wrong: I’m not predicting that Obama will lose. I’m only pointing out that the discrepancy is real between what the pros on the sidelines and those in the press box are seeing, versus those with the view from the cheap seats. Just sayin’.

### Obama push = normal means

#### Normal means is Obama push – only way plan can pass

**Wytkind, 10**

Ed Wytkind, President, Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 10/27, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments

But today’s political stalemate is unlike any we’ve seen in recent history. The knee-jerk reactions to the Columbus Day meeting from a handful of congressional leaders – while not a surprise to anyone – were an illustration of a chronic problem in Washington that has derailed action on critically needed bills to invest billions in our nation’s surface, aviation and maritime transportation system. It’s clear that we’re going to need the Administration’s leadership if we’re going to do anything worth doing.

#### Past experience and Obama priorities prove

**Van Beek, 10**

Steve Van Beek, Chief of Policy and Strategy and Director, LeighFisher, 10/28, <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments>

President Obama has devoted more White House attention to transportation policy than we have seen from the White House in 50 years. In addition, the Miller Center report, well summarized by Greg Principato, is only the latest report by an esteemed group of transportation leaders documenting the problems of our current policies and recommending solutions to fix them. Few disagree with the notions that our current policies are failing us and than we need a new national transportation policy. Indeed, the stack of good policy reports sitting on my bookshelf is easily over a foot high. Whether we are considering the surface or the FAA authorization--or policies governing maritime, rail, livability or any other issue of transportation policy--the problem is not knowing what we need to do, the problem is doing it. While we have advocates and analysts of various stripes on this blog, I would bet that 90% of the participants would agree on 85% of what needs to be done on transportation policy. Sure, vested interests and advocates will be as they always are, results focused. Depending on where they sit, they will be concerned about their company's bottom line, the interests of members in their organization or association and/or the case they advocate. Thus, while the industry will continue to debate parts of the authorizations, ultimately those issues will be resolved as they always are--in committee, on the House and Senate floors, and through the bicameral reconcilation process. The problem is not finding a magic formula for policy, or practicing alchemy to find the necessary resources to enact the policy, but the task is figuring out the politics. What we need is the collective will and leadership to enact long-term authorizations and policies. How do we move the process forward? Based on past experience, we need the Obama Administration to lay out detailed policy and funding plans (or at the very least set boundaries for what it is prepared to accept) and we need committee and party leaderships that are willing to work together in a bipartisan manner to find solutions. Fortunately, this highly charged electoral season will soon be in the rearview mirror. Then our elected representatives need to do what we elect them to do: legislate.

#### ( ) Their premise is backwards – Obama knows transportation faces opposition, but DOES get involved in pushing.

**Freemark ‘12**

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic –Feb 14th – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/14/the-presidents-budget-full-of-ambition-short-on-congressional-support/

The executive branch’s proposed spending for FY 2013 would greatly expand spending on transit and intercity rail, but it faces a hostile Congress. It brings good news, however, for five California rail projects and new light rail lines for Charlotte, Honolulu, and Portland. The White House has introduced a budget — and a reauthorization proposal — that would significantly increase investment in transportation infrastructure over the next six years. Though the legislation as currently designed will not be passed into law because of reluctance from Congress, the Obama Administration’s continued efforts to expand funding for sustainable mobility options are to be praised. Over the course of the next six years, the Administration proposes significant expansions in transit and rail spending, increasing those programs from 22.9% of the overall DOT budget for surface transportation in fiscal year 2013 (and 21% in actual spending in FY 2011) to 35.7% of the budget in FY 2018. See table below. Though expenditures on highways would increase significantly as well, it would be in public transportation modes that the real expansion would be made. Significant spending on intercity rail — almost $50 billion over six years — as well as new transit capital projects ($21 billion) and state of good repair (SOGR, at $32 billion) would be the most important contributions of the program. In addition to revenues from the fuel tax (which no one seems willing to advocate increasing), the White House proposes to pay for its transportation bill by reducing the size of the Overseas Contingency Operations fund, which is used to support armed operations abroad. Because of the decision to pull out of Iraq and Afghanistan, the amount of money needed for this purpose is lessened, and thus the possibility of expanding spending on transportation. Most of the President’s proposal is unlikely to see the light of day in the House of Representatives, controlled by Republicans newly hostile to the idea of using Highway Trust Fund revenues to pay for transit projects. Yet their proposal would create a $78 billion funding shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund over the next ten years according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office. That’s with $0 committed to transit! The Administration proposal, on the other hand, is fully funded (or at least accounted for\*) and would transform the Highway Trust Fund into the much more reasonably titled Transportation Trust Fund; the priorities of each piece of legislation are very clear. The defection of several House Republicans away from their own party’s transportation bill suggests that the legislation may not even get out of their chamber. At this point, the Senate’s bipartisan, mostly status-quo-extending two-year transportation reauthorization bill is now the most likely of all three proposals to be official government policy by the end of the spring. But even it faces the strong possibility of being ditched in favor of a simple extension of the existing bill, which will expire on March 31 according to the current law. Nonetheless, the Obama Administration’s plans for this expansion in transit funding, which mirror similar proposals from previous years, are a reminder of the ambitions for improved transportation that are possible in this country but continue to be derailed by political forces hostile to the idea of investing in the nation’s infrastructure. This is a serious proposal to significantly improve the state of the nation’s rail and bus systems — if we choose to take it.

#### ( ) Obama will draw himself into transportation legislation – he wants to show election contrast.

**Freemark ‘11**

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 8th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/02/08/the-white-house-stakes-its-political-capital-on-a-massive-intercity-rail-plan/)

Whatever the immediate success of the President’s proposal, Mr. Obama is making evident his plan to promote himself as the candidate for a renewed America, one in which the future is won through public investment in essential infrastructure. This represents a very real contrast to the political posturing of his Republican opponents, who have been staking their political cause on being opposed to government spending of almost any type. Mr. Biden concluded his speech with the following: “If we do not take this step now, if we do not seize the future, you tell me how America is going to have the opportunity to lead the world economy in the 21st Century like we did in the 20th. We cannot settle. We are determined to lead again. And this is the beginning of our effort to, once again, lead the future.”

#### ( ) Normal means forces Presidential involvement in some aspect of the negotiation. Given GOP composition in Congress, some White House wrangling must take place. They can’t sever this – it makes debate less educational and they become a moving target. It’s a voter – we could never win.

### Obama gets credit

#### Obama gets involved and disproportionately targets funds to key political states

**Bilotkach, 10**

Volodymyr, Department of Economics, University of California, Irvine, October, <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September)

The federal government plays a crucial role in the infrastructure investment in the United States, including allocation of funds to the airports. Given that airports are perceived to bring substantial benefits to the respective communities, federally funded airport infrastructure projects are both sought after, welcomed, and should be beneficial to the politicians capable of securing the funds. Complicated structure of the American political system creates possibilities for strong influence of political factors on the process of allocation of infrastructure investment funds. Understanding the role of politics in this area is of no trivial importance, as currently perception of the airports’ role is being revised. An increasing number of countries have started viewing airports as the firms rather than the infrastructure objects. Privatization and deregulation of the airports is also becoming more common. It is believed that involvement of the private sector will bring about efficiency gains, and that privately run airports may be more willing and able to contribute to solving the congestion problem. This study offers the first look at the issue of impact of political factors on the aviation infrastructure investment in the USA. We take advantage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (more broadly known as the Stimulus) to examine contribution of political factors to allocation of the $1.1 billion worth of the airport grants included into the package. The Stimulus provides an excellent case for studying political economy of airport (and more generally, infrastructure) investment, at least as far as involvement of the federal government is concerned. The law was set up rather hastily – Barack Obama was elected President in November of 2008, inaugurated on January 20, 2009, and ARRA became law on February 17, 2009. The criteria for the airport infrastructure projects to be funded under the ARRA were rather vague 2 . We can therefore suspect that the airport infrastructure grants could have been used by the Administration, or the Congress as a mechanism to reward districts which brought more votes in the latest election. Additionally, members of the corresponding Congress Committees (in particular, of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure) might have used ARRA as an opportunity to bring more money to their districts. Empirical research on the impact of politics on transport infrastructure investment deals mostly with the European data. The studies examining US evidence are rare, and include McFadden (1976) and Knight (2004). The former study looks at determinants of highway project selection by the California Division of Highways, while the latter examines congressional voting on transportation projects. Our data analysis showed the association between the airport’s location in the Congressional District with the larger Obama-McCain vote differential in November 2008 Presidential election, and the amount of the ARRA grant received by the airport. At the same time, district level election results are poor predictors of whether the airport receives the grant; and estimation results are not entirely robust to taking election results from the adjacent districts into consideration. We also detect rather robust evidence of the impact of Senate on the grant allocation process. This paper contributes to two broad strains of literature. First, we extend the literature on public provision of infrastructure. Research in this area has been addressing the issues of both effects of the publicly provided infrastructure on private sector productivity, and the determinants of the infrastructure investment. The former literature (e.g., Aschauer, 1989; Holz-Eakin, 1994) is much richer than the latter. Studies of the determinants of public infrastructure investment include Cadot et al. (2006), Castells and Sole-Olle (2005), Kemmerling and Stephan (2002, 2008), Fridstrom and Elvik (1997), Bel and Fageda (2009). All the listed papers study infrastructure investment in Europe, and the latter has the most relevance to our paper, as it examines (and confirms the existence of) the impact of political factors on airport investment in Spain. On the US side, we find a lot of studies asserting the disproportionate power of the Senate 3 (e.g., Hoover and Pecorino, 2005) and Congressional Committees (e.g., Garrett et al., 2006) in allocation of the federal funds across the jurisdictions. Garrett and Sobel (2003) find that states which are politically important to the president will have a higher rate of the disaster declaration; the authors also find the election year effects on the amounts of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) disaster payments. The only studies of political determinants of transport infrastructure investment in the US are McFadden (1976) – an examination of project choices by California Division of Highways, finding limited impact of political determinants on the selection process; as well as Knight (2004), asserting that congressmen respond to common pool incentives when voting for transportation projects.

#### Obama will play the largest role and voters love it

**Bilotkach, 10**

Volodymyr, Department of Economics, University of California, Irvine, October, <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September)

The literature suggests three possible sources of political influence: the White House (President), the US Senate, and the Congressional Committees. We hypothesize that the impact of the White House should be the strongest in this particular case – recall that passing the economic stimulus legislation was one of Barack Obama’s priorities as a candidate. As for hypotheses related to the impact of the White House, we can suppose that ARRA grants might have been used to reward districts which showed support to Obama, as evidenced by the election results. An alternative explanation – grants could be used to sway voters in the districts where support for Obama was not sufficiently strong – is less plausible, as the grants have been appropriated after the election and almost four years before the next Presidential election is scheduled to take place. Cont… Moreover, study of aviation related infrastructure offers an attractive environment for examining the more general issue of political factors behind the allocation of federal funds. Airports and airfields are ubiquitous, unlike, for instance, tornadoes or corn fields. Also, airports are generally viewed favorably by the public, unlike some other kinds of federally provided infrastructure (e.g., prisons). For this study, we make use of information on the airport infrastructure grants, appropriated under the ARRA of 2009. We supplement this data with airport characteristics, simple demographic measures, congressional district level results of November 2008 election (both Presidential and House), and Senate election results. Data analysis suggests the following general conclusions about the supposed impact of political factors on allocation of ARRA airport infrastructure grants. First, results of the presidential election appear to affect the amounts of grants, but do not have an impact on whether the airport receives the grant. Second, controlling for the State level composition of the Senate, we find that airports located in the States carried by a Republican at the latest Senate election show higher likelihood of obtaining the grant; the amounts involved are also higher. At the same time, airports located in States represented by two Democratic Party senators are also more likely to obtain the grants, other things equal. Third, we do not find strong evidence of impact of the House of Representatives election results or membership in Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Throughout the world, regulators have been reconsidering the role of the airports. Also, our understanding of the determinants of public infrastructure investment, and especially of the role of political factors, is far from complete. This study is one of the first attempts at looking into both issues together. We find that political factors matter. The next issue to be addressed – and the one which will require a more thorough investigation of these political factors – is what our results imply for such important public policy issues as airport regulation, privatization, and congestion.

### Obama = Credit/Blame

#### Obama gets credit and blame among independent voters -

**NSOR, 11** (North Star Opinion Research, Resurgent Republic, Dr. Whit Ayres, president of North Star Opinion Research, co-founded Resurgent Republic with former RNC Chair Ed Gillespie and Impacto Group CEO Leslie Sanchez. North Star partners with Resurgent Republic to conduct surveys and focus groups on popular issues and trends that help shape public debate over the proper role of government, 11/8, <http://www.resurgentrepublic.com/research/voters-believe-america-is-worse-off-than-when-obama-took-office>)

Resurgent Republic conducted a survey of 1000 American voters October 30 through November 2, 2011, with full results available here. Following are key highlights pertaining to President Obama’s perception among Independent voters: If President Obama's reelection campaign is a referendum on the incumbent, as are almost all reelection campaigns, then he remains in deep trouble a year out from the election, because Independents believe the country is worse off than when he was inaugurated. Cont… Republicans and Independents think Barack Obama and the Democrats control Washington, while Democrats think Republicans in Congress are in control. In yet another indicator of the low esteem with which Washington is held in the country, each party views the other one as in control. Republicans view Obama and the Democrats as controlling Washington by 67 to 15 percent, while Democrats view Republicans as in control by 55 to 26 percent. Independents split more evenly, but still view Obama/Democrats in control by 39 to 34 percent.

#### ( ) White House gets blame for everything

**Teitelman ‘11**

Robert Teitelman is editor in chief of The Deal. In 2003, Min Magazine chose him as one of the “21 Most Intriguing People” in media and in 2008 B2B Magazine selected him as for a “Media Business Innovator Award.” Mr. Teitelman also worked as a writer and editor for Forbes and Financial World. In addition, he is the author of two books, Profits of Science: The American Marriage of Business and Technology and Gene Dreams: Wall Street, Academia and the Rise of Biotechnology, both published by Basic Books. He is a graduate of the College of William & Mary, with masters degrees in international affairs and journalism from Columbia University. The Deal – August 1, 2011 -- lexis

The debt ceiling looks like it will be raised, though who knows? The House Republicans believe they have won -- they at least are spinning that furiously, which presents the unlikely sight of a blackmailer crowing about his successful operation, joined by a variety of seething left-of-center pundits -- and with the scent of Obama blood in the water, maybe they'll hold out for even greater cuts or a deal that protects defense spending. Generally, as the media emerges in full-throated roar, Obama is being declared the big loser from both sides of the aisle; see http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/01/opinion/the-diminished-president.html?ref=todayspaper|Ross Douthat and http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/01/opinion/the-president-surrenders-on-debt-ceiling.html?\_r=1&ref=global|Paul Krugman in today's New York Times. Perhaps. Obama's polls have been falling, probably because the president these days gets blamed for everything from a bad economy to Mississippi flooding to lousy student test scores, as if he's less a political leader and more a medicine man. We elect shamans, not people. Perhaps he did play this all wrong; in politics, substance -- "reality" that we've heard so much about these days -- means little. Obama's big mistake, at the end of the day, was his belief that he could occupy a center in a viciously polarized arena. As the columns and blogs suggest this morning, we've got a deal, but we've also got a nasty political problem. From an electoral perspective -- and part of that political problem is that we can't seem to forget, for even a moment, the permanent campaign -- Obama is already being declared a loser in 2012. We'll see. The electoral issue, particularly in a presidential campaign, is what's more important: deficit reduction (with all the affiliated issues: tax hikes or entitlement cuts) or the blackmail problem, which is to say, the Congress problem. How big is the center these days? How will that center recall these events -- and the possibility that we may see more hostage taking in years ahead? The debt ceiling struggle was a long and ugly tussle, managing to confirm the conventional wisdom of Washington inaction, bloviation, stalemate and failure. It was wildly irresponsible, dangerous and absurd. It shook people up. Several weeks ago, the Times' Thomas Friedman saw the crisis as an opportunity for a "radical center" to emerge, independent of both increasingly toothless, in terms of discipline, parties. I'm skeptical of the formation of an actual center party but not of center bloc. Today, in the blitz of punditry and spin, the center seems to have vanished. But electorally, it does feel as if there's stirring discontent with the highly ideological approach to politics from both parties. That, of course, may be wishful thinking. &nbsp;I take it as good news -- I'm undoubtedly grasping at straws here -- that the commentary today has a thread of reflection about the deeper governance problems. In The New York Times, Jacob Hacker and Oona Hathaway http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/01/opinion/our-unbalanced-democracy.html?ref=global|offer a bracing perspective on a Congress that has increasingly over time eluded accountability, distorting the relationship with the executive. "The debate has threatened to play out as a destructive but all too familiar two-step, revealing how dysfunctional the relationship between Congress and the president has become. The two-step begins with a Congress that is hamstrung and incapable of effective action. The president then decides he has little alternative but to strike out on his own, regardless of what the Constitution says. Congress, unable or unwilling to defend its role, resorts instead to carping at 'his' program, 'his' war or 'his' economy -- while denying any responsibility for the mess it helped create." This helps explain the ease of which Republicans have walked away from the wild spending of the George W. Bush years. &nbsp;In fact, all this feels familiar, both the congressional fecklessness -- remember the plague of earmarks -- and the accrual of presidential power in the form of executive orders, signing powers and Bushian arguments of pre-eminent executive power in warmaking, eavesdropping or torture. Everyone understands the barriers to congressional action: supermajority requirements, like the Senate's filibuster rule, and, as Hacker and Hathaway argue, legislative my-way-or-the-highway mechanisms, like a debt ceiling or a balanced budget amendment. But there are far more problems than those. Campaigns have grown more and more expensive, and PACs and corporate donors have become more and more essential. Lobbyists proliferate. Congress has evolved a system to avoid the big issues while keeping a flow of benefits going to their supporters and constituents. Party discipline has broken down, replaced by fundraising prowess. The demands of the permanent campaign are such that it demands a kind of branding for candidates: clear, simple, straightforward, ideological and mostly idiotic. Compromise, complexity and dealmaking become deeply suspect to an electorate that believes they've been sold down the river. Paradoxically, the creation of permanent campaigns fosters the opportunity to challenge from the extreme -- particularly in the House. Hard times makes this likelier.Brad DeLonghttp://delong.typepad.com/sdj/2011/07/are-we-shifting-toward-a-parliamentary-system.html| touches on some of this, but then takes it to another place. He writes today, "One possibility is that Cantor and Boehner have figured out something that has been inherent in the system since FDR but that few people recognized. Perhaps the president is now the ultimate status quo player in the government: Whatever goes wrong the public takes to be his fault and his responsibility. If anything goes badly wrong his political adversaries pick up the pieces and are strengthened. In that case, whenever the desires of the president conflict with the desires of the speaker of the House, the president has little leverage. Any speaker who does not fear disaster can roll any president. In this future, any bill that a speaker insists is must-pass gets attached to a debt-ceiling increase, and -- unless there are people in the Senate equally willing to risk disaster, which is unlikely because senators are status-quo players too -- so becomes law. It's like a parliamentary system, with the debt-ceiling votes filling the role of votes of confidence."Much of this makes eminent sense, though I'm not convinced that we're heading toward a parliamentary system; there's simply no way to discipline the members in any way except at the polls. But what it does point out is how weak the forces of the status quo can be when arrayed against the extremes. That's the real worry here.

### Obama Popularity Key

#### Obama Popularity key and can still swing

**Cook, 12 (**Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/12, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12364>)

When a president runs for reelection, his job-approval ratings are more significant than the trial heats. Voters who approve of the job a president is doing are very likely to vote to reelect him. Voters who disapprove are very likely to support the president’s opponent. Obama’s job ratings have ranged in recent weeks from as low as 44 percent to as high as 50 percent. The RealClearPolitics average and the Huffington Post/Pollster.com trend estimate show Obama’s approval rating at 48 percent and his disapproval score at 47 percent.

#### Only obama’s approval rating matters – Romney is irrelevant

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 3/29, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12313

When you look back at Barack Obama’s 7-point victory over John McCain in 2008, think of a four-legged stool. Obama needed each leg to support his candidacy. One leg was independent voters (29 percent of the vote); they chose Obama over McCain by 8 percentage points, 52 percent to 44 percent. The second leg was young voters, ages 18-29 (18 percent of vote); they broke for Obama by 34 percentage points, 66 percent to 32 percent. The third leg was Latinos (9 percent); they favored Obama by 36 points, 67 percent to 31 percent. And, finally, African-Americans (18 percent) backed Obama by 91 percentage points, 95 percent to 4 percent. To win reelection, Obama doesn’t need to match those performances, unless he dramatically underperforms with other demographic groups. But he needs to get relatively close to them to build a sufficient popular-vote cushion to assemble 270 electoral votes. Let’s focus for now on just one leg of the stool, the young voters. Visit any college campus today, and you are likely to sense a lack of passion and energy for Obama. It’s far from clear that he can reproduce the unusually strong turnout among younger voters that he sparked in 2008 or match the 66 percent performance level he achieved then. The data back up the doubts. Gallup tracking surveys in January and February recorded Obama’s job-approval rating at 52 percent and 54 percent, respectively, among 18-to-29-year-olds. The polling suggests he would win the majority of the youth vote, but not anything close to 66 percent. As with other key voter groups, Obama’s numbers with young Americans are better than they were last fall, when his approval ratings among that sector were typically in the mid-to-high 40s. The pattern is a common theme across so many voter groups: Obama is doing better, but his gains aren’t enough to put him close to 2008 levels. You may have noticed that I tend to focus on job-approval numbers rather than trial-heat figures from candidate matchups. Historically, when you have a president seeking reelection, the approval ratings for that incumbent are better measures of voter support than the trial-heat figures. When an incumbent is running, the election is usually a referendum on that person rather than a choice between two people.

#### Obama Popularity key – but can still shift

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/>)

Although we are getting to the point where these national polls are at least worth a passing glance, it is still also worth paying attention to Mr. Obama’s approval rating. These have a history of predicting electoral outcomes at least as closely as head-to-head polls in the early stages of the race, especially for incumbent presidents. Mr. Obama’s approval ratings have not moved all that much. For the last month or two, they have been essentially even. Right now, in the RealClearPolitics average, 48.3 percent of Americans approve of the job that Mr. Obama is doing, and 48.6 percent disapprove. A president can get re-elected with numbers like those. Obviously, he can also lose. But the fact that Mr. Obama’s approval ratings are close to even means that it should not be surprising that the numbers in his matchup against Mr. Romney are getting closer to even, too. I am not a purist who says that candidates and campaigns make no difference. That said, the most reliable benchmark in the past of when presidential results deviate from those predicted by approval ratings is when one of the candidates has a relatively “extreme” ideology, like Barry M. Goldwater or George S. McGovern. Mr. Romney does not qualify as an extremist by the various measures we can look at that attempt to quantify this objectively — neither does he qualify as a moderate. Instead, he is a “generic Republican,” who might run fairly close to the outcomes predicted by Mr. Obama’s approval ratings. Mr. Romney also went through a period where his favorability ratings were quite poor. However, they have since improved to about even, possibly because his job has been less complicated since the effective end of the Republican primary campaign. It is not uncommon for favorability ratings to shift over the course of a campaign, particularly once the primaries end.

### A2: Too Soon

#### Now is key to the election -- voters make up their minds several months out and once a trend sets, it will determine the winner

**Malone, 6/7/12**

Jim Malone, “Romney Rising, Obama Slipping,” Voice of America News, 6-7-2012 (http://blogs.voanews.com/2012-election/2012/06/07/romney-rising-obama-slipping/)

So yes, five months is a long time for the voters to decide.  But recent presidential election history shows that many voters begin to make up their minds at this point in the election cycle, and that relatively few minds can be changed between now and Election Day. If it’s true that the cement is beginning to set, the Obama White House may not have a lot of time to change the dynamics of a race that shapes up as a straight up or down vote on how this president has handled the national economy.

#### Not too early – historical data disproves

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/what-does-president-obama%E2%80%99s-may-approval-rating-tell-us-about-his-reelection-chances/>)

According to a Gallup Poll analysis of recent polling data on the mood of the American public, President Obama appears to face a difficult road to winning a second term in November. The specific indicators of the national mood included in Gallup’s analysis were economic confidence, the percentage of Americans citing the economy as the country’s most important problem, satisfaction with the state of the nation and approval of the president’s job performance. While all of these indicators have shown some improvement in the past year, according to Gallup they all remain at levels that suggest trouble for the incumbent. For example, only 24% of Americans said that they were satisfied with the direction of the country and 66% cited the economy as the most important problem facing the nation. There is little evidence about how indicators like satisfaction with the direction of the country or perceptions of the most important problem facing the nation affect the outcomes of presidential elections. However, there is strong evidence that an incumbent president’s approval rating, even several months before Election Day, has a strong relationship to the eventual outcome of the election.

#### Early voting is a game changer- pushes every deadline forward and makes early organization and fundraising critical- Romney is especially adept means now is key for Obama

**Slate, 3-12**-2012 <http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/victory_lab/2012/03/mitt_romney_s_early_voting_mastery_his_rivals_never_stood_a_chance_.html>

The political media may have welcomed the closing of polls on recent evenings in Florida, Michigan, Arizona, and Ohio with an air of suspense, but the members of Mitt Romney’s team knew they already had more votes than their opponents. In the case of Florida, Romney’s advisers believed Newt Gingrich would need an extraordinary Election Day performance to catch up; in Arizona, they were certain it was mathematically impossible for either Gingrich or Rick Santorum to do so. Even a late surge or Romney’s own collapse was unlikely to redraw the outcome. “You want to get as many people to vote absentee-ballot as you can—it saves money and banks votes,” says Rich Beeson, Romney’s political director. “So no matter what happens in the last week you have votes in the bank they can’t take away.” Once-meaningful distinctions between early voting, voting-by-mail, and absentee ballots are being erased as 32 states now offer voters the chance to cast their ballot before Election Day without a justifying excuse (as traditional absentee balloting required). It probably amounts to the most radical change to American voting culture since the abolition of poll taxes. In 2008, one-third of Americans are believed to have voted by a method other than showing up in person at a polling place on the first Tuesday in November, some doing so as early as September. Romney’s canny and competent handling of these varied early-voting processes this year has helped him accumulate a seemingly insurmountable lead in delegates. He is running the only modern, professional campaign against a field of amateurs gasping to keep up, and nowhere is that advantage more evident than in his mastery of early votingWhen state authorities searched for ways to update their election procedures after the chaos of the 2000 recount, many decided to expand the window for voting. Political scientists, campaign consultants, and election administrators speculated about who stood to benefit most. Those who said such reforms would boost democratic participation cited an economic logic: Reducing the inconveniences involved in voting would, in effect, lower its cost and make it appealing to more people. A decade later, there is scant evidence that new opportunities to vote have significantly affected the electorate: The limited research in the area suggests that those who are already predisposed to vote—and make up their minds well in advance—are the most likely to seize on the lower costs to cast a ballot on their own schedule. But early voting has changed electoral economics. In effect, candidates have to administer Election Day operations for a period as long as two months. In general elections, those costs are often saddled by party organizations that can share the benefits across multiple candidates. In primaries, campaigns are on their own, and the expansion of early voting reinforces existing advantages for campaigns that are rich, skilled, and experienced. “It looks like the better organized campaign does better,” says Christopher B. Mann, a former Democratic campaign consultant and party official who ran early-vote programs and now studies them as a University of Miami political scientist. “If you look at the primaries, it’s largely to Romney’s advantage because he has the funding, the infrastructure, and the sophistication to take advantages of things in a way the other candidates couldn’t.”

#### Small swings matter – its super close and next couple months key

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/what-does-president-obama%E2%80%99s-may-approval-rating-tell-us-about-his-reelection-chances/>)

Whether we base our prediction on President Obama’s 47% approval rating in the Gallup Poll in early May or a more sophisticated forecasting model incorporating economic conditions and the “time for change” factor, it appears likely that we are headed for a very close election in November. Both models make Obama a slight favorite to win a second term. However, the final outcome will depend on the actual performance of the economy and the public’s evaluation of the president’s job performance in the months ahead. Those interested in assessing where the presidential race stands should focus on these two indicators rather than the day-to-day events of the campaign, which tend to dominate media coverage of the election.

#### Not too early – Obama popularity early in race matters – but can still shift

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models – <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/>)

Although we are getting to the point where these national polls are at least worth a passing glance, it is still also worth paying attention to Mr. Obama’s approval rating. These have a history of predicting electoral outcomes at least as closely as head-to-head polls in the early stages of the race, especially for incumbent presidents. Mr. Obama’s approval ratings have not moved all that much. For the last month or two, they have been essentially even. Right now, in the RealClearPolitics average, 48.3 percent of Americans approve of the job that Mr. Obama is doing, and 48.6 percent disapprove. A president can get re-elected with numbers like those. Obviously, he can also lose. But the fact that Mr. Obama’s approval ratings are close to even means that it should not be surprising that the numbers in his matchup against Mr. Romney are getting closer to even, too. I am not a purist who says that candidates and campaigns make no difference. That said, the most reliable benchmark in the past of when presidential results deviate from those predicted by approval ratings is when one of the candidates has a relatively “extreme” ideology, like Barry M. Goldwater or George S. McGovern. Mr. Romney does not qualify as an extremist by the various measures we can look at that attempt to quantify this objectively — neither does he qualify as a moderate. Instead, he is a “generic Republican,” who might run fairly close to the outcomes predicted by Mr. Obama’s approval ratings. Mr. Romney also went through a period where his favorability ratings were quite poor. However, they have since improved to about even, possibly because his job has been less complicated since the effective end of the Republican primary campaign. It is not uncommon for favorability ratings to shift over the course of a campaign, particularly once the primaries end.

*(Note – obviously don’t read this card after august!!!)*

#### Now key – swing voters will decide by end of august

**USA Today, 12** (5/7, lexis)

Seven of 10 voters in those states say their minds are firmly made up and won't change. Both campaigns are focused not only on firing up enthusiasm among those core supporters but also winning over the 7% who are undecided and the 24% who are only loosely committed to a candidate. Under the United States' unique Electoral College system, that fraction of voters in a dozen states are likely to decide who can claim the presidency for the next four years. Based on turnout in 2008, these swing voters in the swing states consist of roughly a million people in Virginia; 1.6 million in Ohio; 2.5 million in Florida; 220,000 in New Hampshire -- a total of about 13 million voters out of an expected national turnout of more than 130 million. The next six months, when political spending will likely top $2 billion, will be aimed in large part at winning them over. In the 2008 campaign, almost precisely the same proportion of voters were up for grabs until late August, when it began to decline sharply with the choice of a Republican vice presidential candidate and the political conventions. By Election Day, the number of uncommitted voters nearly disappeared.

#### Trends from recent elections prove people make up their minds early

**Roll Call**, 6/9/**05**

Surveys from 2004 show that voters have become less and less likely to cross party lines when voting for president or Members of Congress. Not only that - these voters were also paying attention, and quite possibly making up their minds, **early in the election cycle.** Typically, voter interest in elections peaks in October and November. But according to Autry's data, 63 percent of voters told pollsters in February 2004 that they were "very interested" in the election - 8 and 15 points higher than the percentage who had said they were very interested in October and November of 2000 and 1996, respectively. And in 2004, the degree of interest climbed all the way until Election Day, finishing up at a remarkable 74 percent. While it's possible that a confluence of unusual factors made 2004 unique, both Autry, of the firm Public Opinion Strategies, and Democrat Fred Yang of the firm Garin-Hart-Yang, agreed that early interest in elections has gone hand in hand with increasing party-line voting for federal offices. "Something has happened in the 21st century with President Bush and Democrats," Yang told the conference, sponsored by the University of North Carolina's program on Southern Politics, Media and Public Life. "It's harder for Democrats in federal races to win crossover votes from Republicans." Yang added that signs of **heightened voter interest** **in the 2006 midterm elections are** **already showing up** in early polls. "Democrats are saying they'll vote for the Democrat, even if it's someone they've never heard of, and Republicans are saying they'll vote for a Republican, even if it's someone they've never heard of," he said. "This heightened partisan voting is starting at an **extremely early stage."**

#### Now is key – campaign mode and fundraising

Wolf **Blitzer**, CNN, Jan 12th **2012**, http://situationroom.blogs.cnn.com/2012/01/12/blitzers-blog-pres-obama-in-full-campaign-mode/?hpt=sr\_mid (BJN)

(CNN) - President Obama is now in full re-election campaign mode. If there was any doubt, just check out the campaign speeches he delivered Wednesday night at three separate fundraising events in Chicago. “I’ve said before, I’m not a perfect man,” he told one Chicago group. “I’m not a perfect president. But I’ve promised you this, and I’ve kept this promise. I will always tell you what I believe. I will always tell you where I stand. I will wake up every single day thinking about how I can make this country better, and I will spend every ounce of energy that I have fighting for you.” The audience, of course, erupted in applause. He inspired them. It was vintage 2008 Barack Obama on the campaign trail. If you need further evidence that he already is way deep in campaigning, just check out the amount of money he’s raised so far, without any Democratic primary challenger. When all the numbers are in on the Republican side, I suspect we will see that Obama raised more money in the last quarter than all the Republican candidates combined. That doesn’t include the super PACs on the Republican and Democratic sides.

#### Not too early to predict

**Sides, 12** (John, Prof polis ci @ G. Washington, 3/12, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/29/in-defense-of-presidential-forecasting-models/?partner=rss&emc=rss>)

Third, if we look at the models in a different way, they arguably do a good enough job. Say that you just want to know who is going to win the presidential election, not whether this candidate will get 51 percent or 52 percent of the vote. Of the 58 separate predictions that Nate tabulates, 85 percent of them correctly identified the winner — even though most forecasts were made two months or more before the election and even though few of these forecasts actually incorporated trial heat polls from the campaign.

### A2: Too Late/Cant Change perception of economic performance

#### Public perception of Obamas economic policy can still swing

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 3/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12306>)

A far more important factor in determining whether voters decide to renew Obama’s contract for another four years is whether they see his stewardship of the economy as a success. Has he done as well as anyone could realistically have done? Or did he have other priorities—like health care—that seemed to merit more attention than dealing with a worsening economic downturn and dramatically escalating unemployment? With each passing week we will get a new crop of statistics that will provide clues as to how the economy is faring. Will the narrative be a continuation of the improvement seen since last fall? Or, will this spurt have been more temporary, bumping against headwinds—in the form of high energy prices, a global economic downturn, and recession in Europe—preventing that pattern from continuing through the November election? How will the economy perform over the seven months between now and the election? Upcoming economic reports are likely to answer the question about whether Obama’s presidency will be judged as a success. The Conference Board on Tuesday will release its latest survey of consumer confidence. On Friday, the Thomson/Reuters/University of Michigan Index of Consumer Sentiment will be released. These are the two most closely watched measures of how Americans see the economy now, and what their expectations are for the coming months. A week from Friday, the March unemployment figures will be reported. Analysts will look to see whether the improvement in the jobless picture seen over the winter will continue or whether it has leveled off. Some speculate that rapidly rising gasoline prices may ease sooner, rather than skyrocketing through the spring and summer, as many have forecasted. Which forecasts turn out to be right will be hugely important both politically and for the economy. Up until now, much of the spike in gas prices has been offset by unusually low heating bills paid during the fourth-warmest winter on record, and the warmest since 1990. The Wall Street research firm ISI Group, as of Oct. 3, had charted 16 out of 20 weeks as having more negative economic news and developments than positive ones. Since October 10, it has marked 25 weeks in a row of more positive than negative news and developments. But it has noted that the positive mix last week was not particularly convincing—a possible sign that the recent upbeat pattern may be breaking up. Right now, a fair number of voters sit on the fence when it comes to assessing Obama’s performance on the economy. They are disappointed that he didn’t do better, but they are unwilling to pass final judgment. How the economy fares in the coming months will determine which side of that fence these voters decide to come down on.

#### Voters can break one way or other even in final weeks

**CNN, 6/4** (<http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/04/cnn-electoral-map-seven-states-up-in-the-air-in-fight-for-white-house/>)

The map currently indicates that seven states are true toss-ups. Those states are Colorado (9 electoral votes), Florida (29), Iowa (6), Nevada (6), New Hampshire (4), Ohio (18) and Virginia (13). Eighty-five electoral votes are up for grabs in those seven states. Four states currently lean towards Obama: Michigan (16), New Mexico (5), Pennsylvania (20) and Wisconsin (10). Four states currently lean towards Romney: Arizona (11), Indiana (11), Missouri (10), and North Carolina (15). "Elections generally break one way late, meaning if you head into the final weeks with six toss-ups, four or five - and sometimes all - break with the winner. And so that could well happen this time. But if you look at the map today, this looks a lot more like Bush vs. Gore than it does Obama vs. McCain," says CNN Chief National Correspondent John King, anchor of "John King, USA." "It's no surprise that Florida and Ohio are toss-ups and potential 'deciders' - they traditionally play that role in presidential politics. What is fascinating is the number of plausible scenarios under which one or two of the 'smaller' battlegrounds could prove decisive," King added. "Iowa and New Hampshire, for example - what a delicious storyline if it all ends in the states where it began. Colorado and Virginia are relative newcomers to the 'swing state' role, and now critical to what amounts to a multi-dimensional chess game." Overall, 15 states right now are either toss-ups or lean towards either the president or Romney. "The 2012 presidential election likely will be decided by these 15 key states, worth a total of 183 electoral votes," CNN Political Research Director Robert Yoon says. "Determining what qualifies as a battleground state is not an exact science, but it's a rough mix of several criteria, including polling, past election results, the state's political, demographic, and economic trends; whether the campaigns and parties will devote resources to the state, such as ad spending, candidate visits, field offices, and staff, and the presence of other high-profile races on the ballot. CNN's Electoral Map will take into account all these factors, as well as its own reporting and analysis."

*(NOTE – Obviously don’t read this after august)*

#### Swing voters aren’t locked up – wont decide until late august

**USA Today, 12** (5/7, lexis)

Seven of 10 voters in those states say their minds are firmly made up and won't change. Both campaigns are focused not only on firing up enthusiasm among those core supporters but also winning over the 7% who are undecided and the 24% who are only loosely committed to a candidate. Under the United States' unique Electoral College system, that fraction of voters in a dozen states are likely to decide who can claim the presidency for the next four years. Based on turnout in 2008, these swing voters in the swing states consist of roughly a million people in Virginia; 1.6 million in Ohio; 2.5 million in Florida; 220,000 in New Hampshire -- a total of about 13 million voters out of an expected national turnout of more than 130 million. The next six months, when political spending will likely top $2 billion, will be aimed in large part at winning them over. In the 2008 campaign, almost precisely the same proportion of voters were up for grabs until late August, when it began to decline sharply with the choice of a Republican vice presidential candidate and the political conventions. By Election Day, the number of uncommitted voters nearly disappeared.

#### Voters can still easily switch

**Ettinger, 6/12/12**

Yoruam Ettinger, Chairman of Special Projects at the Ariel Center for Policy Research. Formerly the Minister for Congressional Affairs to Israel's Embassy in Washington, DC, “Obama’s Steep Uphill Reelection Battle,” 6-12-2012 (http://www.jewishpress.com/indepth/analysis/yoram-ettinger-obamas-steep-uphill-reelection-battle/2012/06/12/)

12. The history of US politics suggests that, in most campaigns, incumbents – rather than challengers – win/lose elections. Irrespective of the long-term and severe economic crisis, and regardless of the results of the June 5, 2012 Wisconsin election, November is still five months away. That is sufficient time for unexpected developments – including significant blunders by Obama and Romney – which could determine the outcome of the election either way.

#### Its super close and shifts can still happen

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/>)

Although we are getting to the point where these national polls are at least worth a passing glance, it is still also worth paying attention to Mr. Obama’s approval rating. These have a history of predicting electoral outcomes at least as closely as head-to-head polls in the early stages of the race, especially for incumbent presidents. Mr. Obama’s approval ratings have not moved all that much. For the last month or two, they have been essentially even. Right now, in the RealClearPolitics average, 48.3 percent of Americans approve of the job that Mr. Obama is doing, and 48.6 percent disapprove. A president can get re-elected with numbers like those. Obviously, he can also lose. But the fact that Mr. Obama’s approval ratings are close to even means that it should not be surprising that the numbers in his matchup against Mr. Romney are getting closer to even, too. I am not a purist who says that candidates and campaigns make no difference. That said, the most reliable benchmark in the past of when presidential results deviate from those predicted by approval ratings is when one of the candidates has a relatively “extreme” ideology, like Barry M. Goldwater or George S. McGovern. Mr. Romney does not qualify as an extremist by the various measures we can look at that attempt to quantify this objectively — neither does he qualify as a moderate. Instead, he is a “generic Republican,” who might run fairly close to the outcomes predicted by Mr. Obama’s approval ratings. Mr. Romney also went through a period where his favorability ratings were quite poor. However, they have since improved to about even, possibly because his job has been less complicated since the effective end of the Republican primary campaign. It is not uncommon for favorability ratings to shift over the course of a campaign, particularly once the primaries end.

### AT: Election is Rigged

#### Election not rigged- 2006 proves

**Hayden ’07** (Craig Hayden is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the University of Southern California’s Center on Public Diplomacy. Craig’s dissertation at the USC Annenberg School for Communication examined the role of presidential advisors in sustaining the Bush administration's media-driven rhetorical campaign for war against Iraq. Previous to his academic studies, he worked as a marketing professional for a series of technology-centric firms in California. Craig Hayden also holds an MA in International Relations from USC, and a BA in Politics and Economics from the University of California, Santa Cruz. April -- PUBLIC RELATIONS, PELOSI, AND THE U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY MACHINE -- <http://uscpublicdiplomacy.com/index.php/newsroom/pdblog_detail/070412_public_relations_pelosi_and_the_us_public_diplomacy_machine/>)

For example, what better way to convey the workings of a democracy than an election? One could argue that the 2006 November elections, which witnessed a dramatic transfer of political power in the United States, was demonstrative of U.S. values and institutions in a very direct way. How did the Arab press cover it? Jihad El-Khazen declared in the November 9 edition of the pan-Arab Al-Hayat: "I expected that Bush and the Republicans would lose, but the extent of their defeat was beyond my expectations, despite remarkable indications at the eleventh hour. In their electioneering, the Republican candidates propagated the belief that they had nothing to do with President Bush and his 'shipwreck.'" Across Arab media outlets, both online and in print, the event was heralded as a repudiation of the Bush administration's policies. More important for public diplomacy, this was often framed as a transition of power carried out by the will of the American people . The election was not depicted as rigged. It was democracy in action. Fast forward a few months to Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s controversial visit to Syria in early April of 2007. While the U.S. media worked itself into a momentary (and largely unwarranted) frenzy over whether the trip was appropriate, this moment was also an event laden with public diplomacy implications. Could this trip demonstrate the pluralistic nature of American politics, and counter Arab media portrayals of the Bush administration as an autocratic and ideological regime? Ultimately, how did the Pelosi visit function as part of the "public diplomacy machine?" The results are not entirely encouraging, and reflect a cynicism in Arab media over the direction of American politics and possibilities for U.S. policy change. The very same Jihad El-Khazen stated in the April 10 issue of Al-Hayat that: I hope that no Arab, especially in Syria, would misunderstand the truth about the policy of the head of the Democratic majority in Congress. El-Khazen was reminding his audience that there are less differences between Bush's policies and those of his Democratic opponents than probably imagined. Meanwhile, a public opinion poll conducted on Al-Arabiya.com on April 11 revealed that a large number of people believed Pelosi's visit to Syria was "merely a struggle between the two main parties in the United States," rather than a significant change in U.S. policy. Much of the coverage on Arab television outlets Al-Jazeerah and Al-Arabiya reflected the frame that the visit was a political maneuver, and some commentators noted that Syria was using the event as stunt for its own propaganda efforts. Despite the political competition frame that dominated Arab coverage of the trip, it generally did show that competition was possible in the politics of American foreign policy. And that in itself may be constructive for public diplomacy. Representing U.S. foreign policy as something more than the whim of a President works toward demonstrating the democratic political culture of the United States. Events such as these are significant moments. They impact the ongoing ebb and flow of messages that define and contextualize public diplomacy. Their representation in media concretizes the symbolic communication in public diplomacy. And, these events are often beyond the control of public diplomacy planners. This means that those responsible for public diplomacy need to be attentive to the actions that speak for the United States, and their subsequent representation in crucial foreign publics. The Rapid Response media analysis unit formed by Karen Hughes is an obvious example of this kind of attention. Also, there is a paradigmatic (or at least stated) trend spreading through the State Department to understand that every action, every foreign service officer, and every public statement they make carries some form of public diplomacy quotient. While the State Department seems to be "getting" this point – I wonder about the rest of U.S. leadership. The "public diplomacy machine" is the product of communicative action (both intentional, symbolic, or otherwise). If this is true, what can we expect if our politics communicates our values? Read Comments (4) | Add Your Own Email this • Technorati Links • Add to del.icio.us • Subscribe to this feed • Digg This! ELIZABETH GILL LUI on April 13, 2007 @ 10:15 am: Our heinous and misguided neocon driven foreign policy will trump any and every good and valid public diplomacy gesture conceived by the DOS or Madison Avenue. The world is not stupid,nor can it be duped, by trying to sell American values when we ourselves are living up to them. Elizabeth Lui on April 13, 2007 @ 10:16 am: sorry...ARE NOT LIVING UP TO THEM! Alan J Simpson on April 14, 2007 @ 5:42 am: May I remind the young writer that holding US Elections up as a shining beacon to the world has a major flaw. Bush won both times by major voter fraud and redrawing the electoral districs thanks to henchman Tom DeLay. In addition no amount of Diplomacy, Government or Corporate will replace failed neo-fascist ideologies (nor ultra-left wing ones either) that cause so much disruption around the world. If a Mugger is kicking the crap out of a victim on the ground don't expect the victim to be enthusiastic about the tune the mugger is whistling. And the Rapid Response Media Unit response by Karen Hughes? Will they wear Black SWAT Team uniforms and go round beating Arab News Bureaus who criticize the US and Israel? Let's get some realism into this debate and end the rhetoric and window dressing. The world, and the electorate has had enough, and they haven't even seen the bill for Bush's Folly yet! Think Democracy and carrying out the Will of the People. What a novel concept! Craig Hayden on April 16, 2007 @ 12:08 pm: The problem with wholesale rejection of the current public diplomacy situation is that it solves nothing. Granted, I'm not sure what policy-makers can (or feel inclined to) do about "fixing" American public diplomacy. For the past two posts, I've tried to speculate on tangible venues for improving American public diplomacy outside of just saying "nothing will work." I recognize that many believe that public diplomacy will only start to "improve" once Bush leaves office. I would also argue that many other countries have followed similar tactics in dealing with the U.S. Better to wait it out and see who comes next. I think that leaves a lot of well-intentioned efforts at improving public diplomacy on the sidelines. Whatever the case, Americans will have to live with the legacy that the current administration has wrought - a severe decline in U.S. credibility being the most obvious and injurious to future international relations. Credibility does not spring from the schoolyard logic of declining to negotiate for fear of appearing weak. Credibility comes from (among other things) acting like a mature, responsible nation-state and adhering to the norms and institutions that sustain international "society." Credibility equates to the character of the United States. To resign oneself to conspiratorial depictions of a subverted U.S. democracy is to undercut the practice of democratic dissent. When we "perform" democracy, we convey the tenets of our democratic institutions and cultural values, and that's the heart of what public diplomacy (or soft power, or whatever you want to call it) is all about. My main point here is that I think U.S. public diplomacy can benefit political dissent. To translate frustration over the current administration's foreign policy is demonstrate faith and the possibility that the U.S. has not crossed some symbolic threshold for foreign audiences that no public diplomacy can ever hope to redress. I'm not saying that official public diplomacy can solely repair damage to U.S. image. Because of that, the sphere of public diplomacy needs to expand, and include evidence for how the U.S. tries to correct itself (rather than appear captive to a political machine.) Sure, policies need to change to help "fix" the image of the U.S. But how we, as citizens and the media outside of government, frame our arguments, symbolically asserts that it can indeed be fixed. Sure, U.S. elections are not perfect. But then again, if the system was as "broken" as some skeptics claim, how could the results of 2006 have occurred? U.S. political culture remains an asset for public diplomacy - and to suggest it as no longer viable is to remove a pillar of credibility that public diplomacy (nor the U.S. image in total) can afford to lose. My position is unfortunately realistic - as there are few other sources of social capital left to draw upon to shore up the sagging reserves of credibility. If the U.S. cannot "play to its strengths" what is left for public diplomacy?

#### No impact to rigging- not effective

**Rossi ’04** (Mark Antony Rossi is a published author of seven books including "Mother Of All Machines: A Bioethics Primer" and recently released "The Intruder Bulletins: The Dark Side of Technology.". Virus in the System: Ethics and Electronics in the Election Process – The Ethical Spectacle – September 2004 -- http://www.spectacle.org/0904/rossi.html)

The title of this article harkens thoughts of the Bush-Gore election of 2000; a serious slugfest hinging on hanging chads and blue-haired Floridians. But I am not referring to that fair election which was ultimately Senator Gore’s to lose and lose he did. A number of tactical campaign errors certainly cost him the presidency, namely losing his home state of Tennessee, distancing himself from Clinton, and choosing a decent yet boring running mate Senator Joseph Lieberman. Elections are usually lost by dumb mistakes. In the near future elections may be stolen by corporate entities in collaboration with hidden agents of either major political party. Some might laugh and say “it’s already been done, Mark.” Referring to the legendary union tampering of West Virginian votes for the Kennedy presidential election, or even farther back in the Truman elections before he became president. In both instances criminal elements in cahoots with collaborative members of the political establishment steered these elections to victory. However; in both instances it can also be argued any undue influence might not had such a dramatic effect since these candidates were generally favored by the public. Either way dubious elections results in a democracy is still the exception and not the rule. The great majority of American elections are fair and honest, if not always politically or practically desirable to certain groups or even the common good. Freedom is messy.

## \*\*\*Internals – Key Issue/A2 Thumpers\*\*\*

### Econ Issues Key

#### Only economic issues will matter

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/14, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12496)

It’s unlikely that same-sex marriage is going to push the economy out of the dominant role in this election. Indeed, short of a major international incident, it is unlikely that any other issue will displace the economic ones. But gay marriage was the most discussed issue last week. The most remarkable thing was not President Obama’s announcement that he would embrace same-sex marriage, even if it wasn’t exactly premeditated. Instead, it was a memo from a very prominent and well-respected Republican pollster suggesting that his party should treat the issue with considerably more caution than it has in the past.

#### Economic Issues key and even small perception of changes create big swing

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12429>)

Regular readers of this column know that in analyzing the 2012 presidential race, I have been preoccupied—some would say obsessed—with the state and direction of the U.S. economy. Presidential elections have many moving parts and can turn on many things, but rarely is a single factor more important than the economy when an incumbent is up for reelection. The latest NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll, conducted among 1,000 adults from April 13-17, supports that view. Overall, 49 percent said they approve of the job that President Obama is doing, and 46 percent said they disapprove. The poll, conducted by Democrat Peter Hart and Republican Bill McInturff, pegs Obama’s approval rating just 1 point higher than the current averages by RealClearPolitics and Huffpost’s Pollster.com, as well as the Gallup tracking average, for the week of April 16-22. Not much disparity there. Obama’s lead in the horse race with Mitt Romney was 6 points in the NBC/WSJ poll, 49 percent to 43 percent. His advantage was a little less in some of the other surveys. RealClearPolitics pegged Obama’s lead at 3.7 points; Pollster reported 2.7 points. For April 18-23, the Gallup tracking poll had the president up by 7 points, 49 percent to 42 percent. If you focus on the economy, though, the situation looks more complicated. Obama’s NBC/WSJ job rating on handling the economy is 45 percent approval and 57 percent disapproval. Those numbers are less favorable than his overall approval rating. When respondents were asked whether they thought Obama’s policies had helped or hurt economic conditions, or had made no difference at all, 36 percent said they had helped, 30 percent said they made no difference, and 33 percent said they had hurt. Obviously, you can push the “made no difference” group in either direction. But the 63 percent who said that Obama’s policies either made no difference or hurt economic conditions do not bode well for the president. When asked whether they thought the economy would get better, get worse, or stay about the same over the next 12 months, 38 percent said that it would get better, 42 percent said it would stay the same, and 19 percent predicted that things would get worse. With 61 percent believing that the economic picture will either get worse or stay the same, the public clearly remains very nervous about the economy—again, not good news for the president. Respondents were given a choice of 13 positive attributes and asked whether each better describes Obama or Romney; the good news for the president is that the respondents associated 10 attributes more with him than with his challenger. They are, in descending order of advantage: “being easygoing and likable”; “caring about average people”; “being compassionate enough to understand average people”; “dealing with issues of concern to women”; “looking out for the middle class”; “being knowledgeable and experienced enough to be president”; “being consistent and standing up for his beliefs”; “sharing your positions on the issues”; and “being honest and straightforward.” Obama also had a narrow advantage, within the margin of error, on “setting the proper moral tone for the country.” Taken together, the results suggest that Obama’s reelection should be a slam dunk, right? Not necessarily. Although Romney had the advantage on only two attributes, they were “having good ideas for how to improve the economy” (by 6 points) and “changing the business as usual in Washington” (by 7 points). Those sound a lot like central tenets of Obama’s campaign four years ago. So Obama had the advantage on most of the attributes, but Romney led on two of the most important ones. The results aren’t convincing enough to give the advantage to either Romney or Obama. All of these findings reinforce the view that the economy will be a very important factor in the election, regardless of whether it improves or just bumps along. Obama badly needs the country’s economic performance over the next six months to validate his policies and decisions. If the overall economy improves, job creation increases, and consumer confidence goes up, those markers will serve as validation. If the economy is bouncing along, with growth at a subdued level and unemployment still at or above 8 percent—not the 9 percent of a year ago, but hardly in the 7.2-to-7.4 percent range that boosted President Reagan’s 1984 reelection fortunes after the 1982 recession—the public will be in no mood to validate Obama’s policies and decisions. Gallup’s most recent polling suggests that Obama has received a bit of a boost from the decline in gasoline prices; his approval rating bumped up to 50 percent in three consecutive days of Gallup’s three-day moving averages. The bump shows just how volatile public attitudes are, particularly when important economic issues are involved. That volatility isn’t likely to change between now and Election Day. The economy will determine this election.

#### Economy and jobs are the key issue

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

With the nation’s economy still struggling and unemployment still high, economic concerns continue to top the public’s policy agenda for President Obama and Congress. More than eight-in-ten cite strengthening the economy (86%) and improving the job situation (82%) as top priorities. These numbers have fluctuated only slightly since the start of 2009.

### Jobs most important econ issue

#### Jobs legislation is most important issue for voters

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

As the 2012 State of the Union approaches, the public continues to give the highest priority to economic issues. Fully 86% say that strengthening the economy should be a top priority for the president and Congress this year, and 82% rate improving the job situation as a top priority. None of the other 20 issues tested in this annual survey rate as a top priority for more than 70% of Americans.

### A2: Thumper - Only on ground econ matters

#### Its not just economic performance – voter *perception* on economic issues swings key battleground states

**Teixeira and Halpin, 11**

Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, Center for American Progress, November, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/11/pdf/path_to_270_execsumm.pdf>

Obviously, much could change between now and then but at the outset of the election campaign it is clear that two large forces will ultimately determine the outcome: the shifting demographic balance of the American electorate, and the objective reality and voter perception of the economy in key battleground states. The central questions of the election are thus fairly straightforward. Will the rising electorate of communities of color, the Millennial generation, professionals, single women, and seculars that pushed Obama to victory in 2008 be sufficient and mobilized enough to ensure his re-election in 2012? Or will the Republican Party and its presidential nominee capitalize on a struggling economy and greater mobilization from a conservative base that holds the president in deep disdain?

#### Voter perception matters – its not just the hard economic data

**Silver, 11** (Nate, 6/3, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/03/what-do-economic-models-really-tell-us-about-elections/>)

So we can breathe a sigh of relief. The economic fundamentals clearly do make some difference — quite a bit really. But we shouldn’t expect any miracles. This cute little model would have called the wrong winner in six of the past 25 elections: 1912, 1948, 1952, 1960, 1968, and 2000 (although it would have gotten the winner of the popular vote right in that year). And it would have missed the margin in the popular vote by about 8 points on average, or roughly 4 points for each of the two major candidates (since a vote for one of them means a vote against the other). This seems like a healthy state of affairs. Simple economic variables can account for a little less than half of the variability in election results. The other half falls into the “everything else” category, including factors such as foreign policy successes and failures, major scandals, incumbency, candidate quality, controversial social legislation and structural factors like changes in partisanship. Technically speaking, some of the variability may also be explained by economic factors that weigh upon voters’ minds, but which are not easily quantified by measures like G.D.P. and inflation. Nevertheless, the heuristic “it’s half the economy and half everything else, stupid” is a pretty good way to think about presidential elections. Some models, however, claim to have much more predictive power than this, using economic variables (sometimes along with noneconomic variables) to explain as much as 90 percent of presidential election results. You should be very skeptical of these claims. Perhaps the best-known of these models is the so-called “Bread and Peace” model designed by Douglas Hibbs of the University of Gothenberg. There are a lot of things to admire about this model. Most notably, it’s not larded down with superfluous variables. Instead, it is based on just two: growth in real, per-capita disposable income (weighted to place more emphasis on the later years of a president’s term than the earlier ones), and the number of military fatalities resulting from U.S.-initiated foreign conflicts. (The latter definition would apply to wars like Iraq or Vietnam — but not to something like the Gulf War or World War II where the U.S. was responding to another country’s attack.) Mr. Hibbs, using data from 1952 through 2008, claims to be able to explain almost 90 percent of the variance in presidential election results based on these variables alone, missing the results by just a point or two on average: There are a couple of common critiques of this model. One is that the way it defines wars is a bit problematic. For instance, because the Korean War resulted in 14 times more U.S. fatalities than the Iraq War, it had about 14 times more effect on Mr. Hibbs’s model. Perhaps that’s a defensible position — U.S. soldiers being killed in action is a very noticeable impact for the public — but by other measures we might have expected Iraq to have a larger impact: it was more unpopular than the Korean War, and it was quite a bit more expensive. Nevertheless, the proof is the model’s predictive power. Mr. Hibbs first released forecasts using this model in 1992, and since then it has performed acceptably well but not superbly, with fairly big misses in 1996 and 2000 but good results in the other years, including 2008. Still, there are some signs that the model is not quite as accurate as claimed. Using these two variables to forecast the results of the elections of 1952 through 1988 — the dataset that Mr. Hibbs originally had to work with — would have missed the incumbent party’s vote share by just 0.8 percentage points, on average. Since then, on the out-of-sample results, the average miss has been 2.6 percentage points. We can, of course, wait to see how this model does in 2012, 2016, 2020 and so forth to get a better sense for how accurate it really is. But I don’t have that much patience! So here’s what we can do instead — it’s a technique that I’ve applied to other models of this type. We can plug in the data from elections prior to 1952, which were outside the period that the model to build its estimates. How would the model have performed in 1948, for example? I dug deep into the bowels of the Census Bureau’s Web site and discovered data on disposable income growth dating back to the 1920s. (The data is annual rather than quarterly, but this is easy to adjust for and should make only an extremely minor difference.) The other variable that Mr. Hibbs uses — military casualties — isn’t pertinent to these years because the only major conflict that the U.S. fought in during this period was World War II, a “good” war in which the United States was compelled into action because of Axis hostilities and that therefore would not meet Mr. Hibbs’s definition. Here, again, is how the model performed from 1952 through 2008: Now, let’s plug in 1948: Uh-oh. The model did really, really badly in 1948. Disposable income growth was actually negative in the four years preceding 1948, according to Mr. Hibbs’s formula. It would have predicted, therefore, just a 43 percent share of the two-party vote (that is, excluding votes for third parties) for Harry Truman. Instead, Truman got 52 percent of the two-party vote and won the election over Thomas Dewey, much to the Chicago Tribune’s surprise. But 1948 was a weird year — lots of erratic economic data in the postwar period. How would the model have performed in 1944? Another bad year for the model. Income growth was prodigious in these years, and the model would have expected Franklin Roosevelt to win a landslide victory, getting 66 percent of the two-party vote. Roosevelt booked a solid win, but his actual total of 54 percent of the two-party vote is not particularly close to the model’s estimate. This election occurred during World War II; perhaps Mr. Hibbs’ distinction between good and bad wars is less salient to the American public than we might think. But this is a poor result. The 1940 election occurred before the bombing of Pearl Harbor, and the model performed better in that year, missing Roosevelt’s vote share by 4 points. But 1936 constituted another big problem. Disposable income growth between 1932 and 1936 was an astounding 8.5 percent. That should have translated, according to the formula, to Roosevelt receiving 77 percent of the two-party vote. Roosevelt performed really, really well in 1936, winning all but two states, but he won only 62 percent of the vote rather than 77 percent. A similar problem is apparent in 1932. Herbert Hoover presided over the biggest economic disaster in United States history, with per capita income growth declining by 8.4 percent. Mr. Hibbs’s formula would have called for him to win just 16 percent of the major-party vote. Hoover did, in fact, lose in a landslide, but things weren’t quite that bad. 1928, a seemingly normal year (no depressions, no wars), was another bad one for the model. Although some other economic measures were decent or good, disposable income growth was slow enough that the model would have predicted that Hoover would receive 47 percent of the vote and lose the election. Instead, he won in a landslide, defeating the Democratic candidate, Al Smith. If it’s any consolation, the model would have performed quite well in 1924. Overall, however, the model performs quite poorly on out-of-sample results. In the years from 1924 through 1948, and from 1992 through 2008, it would have missed the incumbent party’s vote share by an average of 7.8 points, and a median of 4.7 points. By contrast, a naive strategy of simply guessing that the incumbent party would win exactly half the vote would have done better, missing by an average of 5.8 points and a median of 4.3 points. If we redo the model using all the data from 1924 through 2008, it explains about 60 percent — not 90 percent — of the variance in the presidential vote. Importantly, the coefficient on the growth variable is also quite a bit lower, meaning that the electorate is somewhat less sensitive to economic performance. Each percentage point rise in income growth translates to a 1.5 percentage point rise in the incumbent party’s vote share, rather than 3.6 percent as the original model implied. And if we remove the war causalities variable and just focus on what the model tells us about the economy, it explains almost exactly half the vote. That’s good, but not much better than our simple G.D.P.-and-inflation model. To be clear, I think Mr. Hibbs’s model is the best of its kind. But there’s nothing magical about it, and the fact that it performed so uncannily well from 1952 through 1988 is not a good reflection of its predictive power. Core economic variables explain about half of the presidential vote — the rest is up to the candidates and the voters. At the risk of beating a dead horse, let me reiterate that this is a result that I find intuitively appealing. I’d be worried if, as our study of the unemployment rate seemed to imply, the economy had no effect on election results at all; that clearly seems wrong given the effect it has upon people’s lives and the media’s (appropriate) attention to it. But I’d be just as worried if one or two economic variables explained 90 percent of the results. Wars matter, above and beyond what can be measured with a single variable based on military causalities. Watergate mattered. September 11 mattered. Monica Lewinsky mattered. The fact that parties have nominated candidates as strong as Dwight Eisenhower and as weak as George McGovern — that matters. It matters that the electorate goes through phases of being relatively more and relatively less partisan. In 2012, things like President Obama’s unpopular health care bill, the Republicans’ unpopular Medicare bill, and the death of Osama bin Laden are likely to matter. So will the economy (those numbers are getting worse for Mr. Obama). But the results are not quite baked in, as some would have you believe. Until we reach the point where the polls become more reliable — the nice thing about polls is that they permit voters to determine for themselves what matters to them, rather than having preferences inferred by a statistical formula — my advice is to look at more rather than fewer pieces of evidence.

#### Voter economic perception can boost Obama even if economy stays weak

**Lux 2-20-12** (Mike, Co-founder & CEO – Progressive Strategies, Huffington Post, “2012 Scenarios: What if the Economy Heads Back Downhill?” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mike-lux/obama-jobs-2012_b_1289076.html>, jj)

So if the economy starts moving in the wrong direction because of either or both of these factors, are things lost for the Obama re-election effort? They sure don't help, but the answer is no. Here's what **the Obama team needs to** focus on with these dangers in mind: 1. **Keep the focus firmly on fighting for the middle class**. **Most voters** don't blame Obama for the tough times, and they are well aware that the Republicans in Congress aren't doing anything to help, but they **will blame the president if they think he is not fighting hard for them while they are suffering through these bone-crunching times for the middle class**. **The Obama team's shift in messaging toward the Teddy Roosevelt style populism he has exhibited in the last few months is working**. I am firmly convinced that this message -- in contrast to the of the rich, by the rich, for the rich campaign of Mitt Romney -- is what has driven his poll numbers in the right direction, not the modestly improving economic numbers most voters don't feel yet.

#### Its not just hard economics – perception and campaign effects matter

**Sides, 12** (John, Prof polis ci @ G. Washington, 3/12, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/29/in-defense-of-presidential-forecasting-models/?partner=rss&emc=rss>)

But you can’t disentangle the impact of the economy and the campaign that easily. The characteristics of candidates and campaign strategies themselves depend on the economy. Better candidates will challenge incumbents when the economy makes those incumbents vulnerable. Candidates’ decisions to campaign on the economy will depend on whether they will get credit or take blame for economic conditions. And factors like the economy often come to matter precisely because they are emphasized in the campaign. That is to say, the campaign can “make” the forecasting models come true, or at least truer. In short, the economy is bound up with campaigns and elections in may complex ways. There is no simple way to separate the total effects of structural forces like the economy and the total effect of the campaign itself. So although I’ll continue to follow forecasting models and hope that Nate’s comments, among others, make those models better, the bulk of what we can learn and should understand about elections will not come from forecasting models.

#### Voter perception matters – shapes electoral effect of hard economic data

**Silver, 11**

(Nate, 6/2, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models<http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/02/on-the-maddeningly-inexact-relationship-between-unemployment-and-re-election/>)

On the Maddeningly Inexact Relationship Between Unemployment and Re-Election Make no mistake: the higher the unemployment rate in November 2012, the less likely President Obama is to win a second term. But we should be careful about asserting that there is any particular threshold at which Mr. Obama would go from favorite to underdog, or any magic number at which his re-election would either become impossible or a fait accompli. Historically, the relationship between the unemployment rate and a president’s performance on Election Day is complicated and tenuous. An article in today’s Times notes, for example, that “no American president since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has won a second term in office when the unemployment rate on Election Day topped 7.2 percent.” That was the unemployment rate in November 1984, when Ronald Reagan resoundingly won a second term. This type of data may be of limited use for predictive purposes, however. Reagan won re-election by 18 points, suggesting that he had quite a bit of slack. An unemployment rate of 7.5 percent or even higher would presumably have been good enough to win him another term. It’s also not obvious that Roosevelt should be excluded from the calculus, particularly given that the economic crisis the country is working its way out of now is the most severe since his administration. He won re-election in 1936 with an unemployment rate of 16.6 percent, and again in 1940 with a rate of 14.6 percent. For Roosevelt, at least, the unemployment rate was headed in the right direction: down from 19.8 percent in 1933, the year he took office. This was also true for Reagan, although only barely so: he inherited an unemployment rate of 7.5 percent from Jimmy Carter, seeing it drop to 7.2 percent in time for his re-election. The unemployment rate when Mr. Obama took office was 7.8 percent — and he may not follow in his predecessors’ footsteps by leaving it in a better place than he found it. As of last month, private forecasters like Wells Fargo and The Wall Street Journal‘s forecasting panel were anticipating an unemployment rate close to 7.8 percent by late 2012. But those forecasts preceded a bevy of poor economic reports, which may lead some economists to lower their estimates. Looking at unemployment in this way — as the rate of change over a president’s term — is probably the more worthwhile approach. But it, too, is not always reliable. Unemployment increased by 1.9 percentage points over the course of Richard M. Nixon’s first term, but he won re-election easily. It also increased in George W. Bush’s and Dwight D. Eisenhower’s first terms, and their re-election bids were also successful. The unemployment rate fell to 3.9 percent from 5.3 percent, meanwhile, in Bill Clinton’s second term — but his vice president, Al Gore, could not beat Mr. Bush in the Electoral College. There are also cases in which the data behaved more intuitively: Jimmy Carter and the elder George Bush all faced high unemployment rates when they lost their re-election bids, as did Gerald R. Ford in 1976, and that was surely a factor in their defeats. But historically, the correlation between the unemployment rate and a president’s electoral performance has been essentially zero. In the chart below, I’ve provided unemployment data for the last century’s worth of presidential elections, comparing the unemployment rate on Inauguration Day to the one that the president (or the incumbent party’s candidate) faced on Election Day. Data for 1948 onward is on a monthly basis, while only annual estimates are available before then. The most straightforward application is to compare the unemployment rate to the incumbent party’s performance in the popular vote. Historically, there has been no correlation between these variables: Alternatively, we can look at the change in the unemployment rate over the course of a presidential term. This does produce some positive correlation, but it’s quite weak and almost entirely driven by a couple of outlying data points surrounding the Great Depression: Data from after World War II is less noisy — both in terms of the fluctuations in the unemployment rate and the presidential results. But the correlations are not improved any: Another approach is to look only at those cases in which a president, like Mr. Obama, served a full, four-year elected term and was seeking a second one. This cuts the number of data points down to 11 from 25. It does not, however, improve the correlations much, although the second graph — which evaluates the change in the unemployment rate for elected presidents seeking a second term — is somewhat more promising. Perhaps if you go through enough iterations of this exercise — which range of years you look at, which presidents were elected or which ones assumed the office through death or resignation, where you define the starting point and endpoint of a president’s term, which of the several unemployment data series you use — you can get the correlations up a bit higher. But almost no matter what you do — even if you’re more or less deliberately cherry-picking — they range from zero to fairly weak. So does that mean that the unemployment rate should just be ignored and that the news media’s focus on it is misplaced? No, I think that’s emphatically the wrong interpretation. The data is not really strong enough to prove there is a relationship — but because there are a relatively limited number of data points, it is also not strong enough to disprove that there is a relationship. In these cases, it is entirely permissible to default to common sense, which is that the unemployment rate should have some effect on a president’s re-election chances. The problem is that whatever signal there is gets filtered through an awful lot of noise. Consider: The unemployment rate itself is subject to fairly significant measurement error. Voters will interpret the unemployment rate in different ways, and assign the president varying amounts of credit or blame for it.

#### Its not just about the hard data

**Silver, 11**

(Nate, 6/2, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/02/on-the-maddeningly-inexact-relationship-between-unemployment-and-re-election/>)

Some political scientists prefer other economic indicators to the unemployment rate, and there is evidence that measures like growth in real disposable income do a better job of predicting election results. Here, too, however, we ought to be cautious. There are literally thousands of plausible models that one might build, using different economic indicators measured in different ways and over different time periods, taken alone or in combination with one another, and applied to different subsets of elections that are deemed to be relevant. Some of these models, through chance alone, will produce a better fit on the historical data — but the relationships may be spurious and their predictive power will sometimes not be as strong as claimed. Even the most thoughtful, well-designed models — I like this one, for instance — can see their performance deteriorate quite substantially if small, seemingly benign changes are made to their assumptions. Working with data like this gets tricky. We have a good sense for the cards that Mr. Obama holds — the different factors that will work for and against him — but our idea of how the hand will play out is quite fuzzy, and the rules of the game may change from election to election. Clearly, Mr. Obama’s odds will be impaired if his hand contains more deuces and treys than aces and kings — and that, in essence, is what weaker data from the labor sector implies for him. But this is an inexact science — more so than either journalists or political scientists tend to acknowledge.

#### Voter perception matters – not just economic fundamentals

**Silver, 11** (nate, 6/6, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/the-ten-word-question-that-could-cost-obama-the-election/)

I take the middle view here — the fundamentals matter, but campaigns do, too. Many of these models, besides, are predicting a very close election — while the consensus view of economists is that although another recession is unlikely, the recovery is likely to proceed in fits and starts.

### A2: Thumper – Econ/FoPo Surprises

#### No major surprises coming now – econ and foreign policy are static

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 5/30, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/30/economically-obama-is-no-jimmy-carter/)

The forward-looking data was bad as well. The stock market declined in the six months leading up to May 1980 (even without adjusting for inflation), and the consensus of economic forecasters at the time was that conditions would remain recessionary for the six months ahead. By contrast, the data this year is mediocre, but nowhere near that terrible. Industrial production has picked up quite a bit and is an economic bright spot, which could help Mr. Obama in the manufacturing-intensive economies of the Midwest. Inflation has not been a major problem throughout the economy as a whole, although energy prices have been a periodic threat. However, income growth is very slow, as is the growth in consumption as indicated by the broadest measure of it, personal consumption expenditures. (Growth in retail sales has been more robust, but that is a less comprehensive statistic.) Jobs growth has been decent recently, but many economists expect it to slow some in the subsequent months. Gross domestic product in the final six months of the year, likewise, is expected to grow at a below-average rate. Still, there is really no comparison between Mr. Obama and Mr. Carter, who faced an economy that was still bottoming out into a severe and broad-based recession. Mr. Obama, by contrast, faces numbers that are improving but perhaps too slowly. It would probably require an economic shock, instead, to put Mr. Obama in Mr. Carter’s shoes. This could happen, of course – for instance, if there were a meltdown in Europe. Economists differ greatly on whether this would have relatively mild or more catastrophic effects on the American economy. But most versions of it would be enough to leave Mr. Obama as a clear underdog for re-election. Even if that were to occur, however, Mr. Obama’s situation might still not be as bad as Mr. Carter’s. For instance, he does not face an acute foreign policy crisis, at the moment at least, as Mr. Carter did in Iran, and a European-driven recession would probably not be associated with high inflation (although one set off by oil-price instability in the Middle East might). In some ways, in fact, it’s remarkable that Mr. Carter lost his election to Mr. Reagan by only 10 points. Some of this was because the recession of 1980 was extremely unusual: it was severe but also brief, ultimately persisting for only six months. Mr. Carter’s recession technically ended in August 1980, although not in a way that would have been highly visible to consumers and voters at the time. All of this produced some incredibly volatile polling in 1980. Mr. Carter led Mr. Reagan by a wide margin in polls in January and February 1980. The numbers drew closer together in the spring. By the summer, Mr. Reagan had a clear lead, peaking around 25 points in polls conducted immediately after the Republican convention in Detroit. Then, Mr. Carter rebounded, with polls conducted in late October showing him behind Mr. Reagan by only a point or two on average. Mr. Reagan considerably beat his polls on Election Day, however, and won in a landslide. Once we release the election model, we will be a little bit more in “sweat the small stuff” mode, analyzing the trends in the polling and the economic numbers on an almost-daily basis. So far, however, the 2012 election cycle has been extremely stable as compared with some other years like 1980.

### A2: Thumper – Economic Collapse/Recovery Coming

#### No Major Economic Swings before election now – its super close so even small shifts in obama’s support can determine the outcome

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/12, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12364>)

If economists’ consensus is correct, Democrats who hoped that an improving economy would boost the president’s reelection prospects might be disappointed; Obama’s detractors looking for a plunge to seal his fate may be disappointed as well. Certainly, the economy is better today than it was six months ago; gross domestic product growth is higher and unemployment is lower. Consequently, the president’s approval ratings have risen. But that trajectory might not continue. In the just-released, April 10 Blue Chip Economic Indicators survey of 56 top economists, the consensus of forecasts calls for tepid growth between now and the election: 2.2 percent GDP growth for the just-completed first quarter, 2.3 percent for the second quarter, 2.4 percent for the third quarter, and 2.6 percent in the final quarter of the year, The election, of course, falls in the middle of the fourth quarter. While better than the GDP growth of less than 2 percent in the first three quarters of 2011, the outlook is considerably below the 3 percent pace of last year’s fourth quarter. For unemployment, this year’s second-quarter forecast is for 8.2 percent, the same as the reported jobless rate in March, dropping just one-tenth of a point in the third quarter to 8.1 percent and another tenth of a point to 8 percent in the fourth quarter. That’s better than the 9-plus percent unemployment in the first nine months of last year, but it’s not much of an improvement. (And, of course, some argue that the dropping jobless rate is more a product of people leaving the potential labor force than of real job creation.) With these economic numbers, Obama is not close to putting this election away, as some people seem to think he has. The current Intrade odds give the president a 61 percent chance of reelection, but the economic numbers suggest a tightening race, fought down to the last couple of points and states.

### A2: Thumper – Foreign Policy

#### Foreign policy irrelevant – voters don’t care, its already priced in and Romney can’t exploit

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12467)

A second piece of advice for Romney: Shut up about foreign policy. It’s clearly not your forte. You sound shrill at best and, at worst, uninformed. Romney isn’t going to beat Obama on foreign policy. It will be on the economy. Polls show that Obama gets considerably better job-approval ratings on handling foreign policy than on anything else. For Romney, the bad news is that Obama is rated reasonably well on foreign policy. The good news is that voters don’t seem to be voting on foreign policy.

#### Foreign Policy Irrelevant – economic issues key

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/12, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12364>)

Romney must quickly reverse directions, probably grinding some gears in the process, but Obama’s fate is less in his own hands than in the economy’s. As of now, foreign policy is a good news/bad news proposition. The good news for the president is that the public generally approves of his handling of foreign policy. Indeed, if judged on that performance alone, he would win the election quite comfortably today. The bad news for him is that foreign policy doesn’t seem to be a driver for many voters; their focus is the economy.

#### Public doesn’t care about foreign policy – only economic issues matter

**Pew, 12** (Pew Research Center, 1/23, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/01/23/public-priorities-deficit-rising-terrorism-slipping/>)

As the 2012 State of the Union approaches, the public continues to give the highest priority to economic issues. Fully 86% say that strengthening the economy should be a top priority for the president and Congress this year, and 82% rate improving the job situation as a top priority. None of the other 20 issues tested in this annual survey rate as a top priority for more than 70% of Americans. More generally, the public’s concerns rest more with domestic policy than at any point in the past 15 years; 81% say Obama should be focused on domestic policy, just 9% say foreign policy. In keeping with this, defending against terrorism and strengthening the military are given less priority today than over the course of the past decade.

### A2: Thumper – Health Care

#### Health care not key and already priced in – perception on economic issues outweighs and can still swing

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 3/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12306>)

Count me among the few who don’t believe that this week’s oral arguments before the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, aka “Obamacare,” and whatever ruling the justices announce, will be pivotal in determining President Obama’s fate in November. Notwithstanding the natural tendency for journalists to breathlessly cite everything (and every primary night!) as hugely consequential, some issues have already run their course with the public. President Obama’s two-year-old health care law has already been fully litigated in the court of public opinion, with a split and very close decision: A plurality think it and the individual mandate were bad, a handful of points ahead of those who approved of both. These attitudes are fairly stable. This is unlikely to be a topic that dominates conversations around the water cooler, grocery aisle, or backyard fence. Attitudes toward Obama’s health care law are already baked into the cake of how people perceive Obama himself, his performance, and whether he should be reelected. An extremely high percentage of those who disapprove of the law also disapprove of him. Similarly, an extremely high percentage of those who approve of the law also approve of him. The few who don’t have opinions are more likely to be swayed by other factors. A large majority of Americans already have some form of health insurance coverage. A majority of those people are reasonably satisfied with whatever they have. Their votes in November certainly aren’t hanging in the balance. A Supreme Court decision is unlikely to change those views of whether the law is good or bad. Obamacare has become a political Rorschach test: People read into it what they want to. The law’s enactment was either a dangerous overreach that would destroy liberty, free enterprise, and our current health care system, or it was badly needed, though imperfect, and will do far more good than bad. But again, it all goes back to the larger question of how voters see Obama. Americans vote with their pocketbooks. A far more important factor in determining whether voters decide to renew Obama’s contract for another four years is whether they see his stewardship of the economy as a success. Has he done as well as anyone could realistically have done? Or did he have other priorities—like health care—that seemed to merit more attention than dealing with a worsening economic downturn and dramatically escalating unemployment? With each passing week we will get a new crop of statistics that will provide clues as to how the economy is faring. Will the narrative be a continuation of the improvement seen since last fall? Or, will this spurt have been more temporary, bumping against headwinds—in the form of high energy prices, a global economic downturn, and recession in Europe—preventing that pattern from continuing through the November election? How will the economy perform over the seven months between now and the election? Upcoming economic reports are likely to answer the question about whether Obama’s presidency will be judged as a success. The Conference Board on Tuesday will release its latest survey of consumer confidence. On Friday, the Thomson/Reuters/University of Michigan Index of Consumer Sentiment will be released. These are the two most closely watched measures of how Americans see the economy now, and what their expectations are for the coming months. A week from Friday, the March unemployment figures will be reported. Analysts will look to see whether the improvement in the jobless picture seen over the winter will continue or whether it has leveled off. Some speculate that rapidly rising gasoline prices may ease sooner, rather than skyrocketing through the spring and summer, as many have forecasted. Which forecasts turn out to be right will be hugely important both politically and for the economy. Up until now, much of the spike in gas prices has been offset by unusually low heating bills paid during the fourth-warmest winter on record, and the warmest since 1990. The Wall Street research firm ISI Group, as of Oct. 3, had charted 16 out of 20 weeks as having more negative economic news and developments than positive ones. Since October 10, it has marked 25 weeks in a row of more positive than negative news and developments. But it has noted that the positive mix last week was not particularly convincing—a possible sign that the recent upbeat pattern may be breaking up. Right now, a fair number of voters sit on the fence when it comes to assessing Obama’s performance on the economy. They are disappointed that he didn’t do better, but they are unwilling to pass final judgment. How the economy fares in the coming months will determine which side of that fence these voters decide to come down on.

#### Health care ruling not key – several reasons

**Green, 12** (Laura, Washington Bureau, Palm Beach Post, 6/6, lexis)

It's difficult to predict whether voters will switch sides in the presidential election based on the court's ruling. Americans are deeply divided over the law. A CNN poll taken just days before the oral arguments in March found that 23 percent of those surveyed wanted the court to uphold the law in its entirety, while 30 percent wanted the whole law struck down. Another 43 percent thought some of the law's provisions should be overturned. The court's ruling is expected to influence some voters, but generally Americans are more likely to be swayed by other issues, the poll found. Health care was rated the No. 1 issue by only 11 percent of respondents. The economy (53 percent) and federal budget deficit (20 percent) dwarfed health care as an important issue. Health care, however, did outscore the war in Afghanistan, which was rated by just 6 percent as the top issue. Given his role in providing universal health care as governor of Massachusetts, critics say presumptive GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney is uniquely unqualified to hammer Obama if the law is ruled unconstitutional.

#### Court will uphold but issue narrow ruling that blunts conservative backlash

**Green, 12** (Laura, Washington Bureau, Palm Beach Post, 6/6, lexis)

"If the law is not upheld, then it's back to the drawing boards at a time when our health care system is really in serious danger of imploding," said Elliott Pollack, a lawyer specializing in health care at Pullman & Comley in Connecticut, and the health law writer for the American Bar Association. The court must decide whether, under its commerce clause powers, Congress can regulate the health insurance industry. Congress is permitted by the Constitution to regulate commerce between the states, but critics of the law say Americans who are not buying insurance are not engaging in commerce. The law's supporters say that health care is unique because virtually all Americans will need it at some point, and if they become ill without it, they are passing on costs to other Americans. Thus, by not buying insurance, they are still engaging in commerce. Congress has successfully waded into health care with the Medicare and Medicaid programs, Pollack said. "I believe that, on reflection, given the massive nature of the problem, and that fact that Congress has already played such a large role in the health care problem, (the court will find that) health care is an interstate activity," he said. The state of health care in America could drive the court to issue a one-off opinion, as it did in Bush v. Gore, Jarvis said. The court said that its 5-4 decision to stop a statewide recount in Florida after the 2000 presidential election should not serve as a precedent. Opponents of the health care law have warned that if Congress can force people to buy insurance, it could order them to buy GM, to prop up the American auto company. Senior U.S. District Judge Roger Vinson of Florida famously worried that the health care law could set the stage for Congress to require Americans to purchase broccoli, and struck it down. Issuing an opinion that specifically says it has no bearing on any other case could potentially blunt that point and appeal to conservatives who believe there must be checks on Congress' power, Jarvis said.

### A2: Thumper – Iran strikes

#### Iran Strikes won’t be October surprise – several reasons

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12454)

According to The New York Times, top Israeli and U.S. intelligence and military officials agree that Iran has suspended its nuclear-weapons program. They believe that Iran unquestionably had an active program but some time ago stopped short of taking advanced steps to create weapons. Some well-placed foreign-policy officials of close U.S. allies also share this view. In the past two weeks, current and very recent Israel intelligence and military officials have publicly made these points. These officials’ statements contrast starkly with those of Israel’s political leaders, notably Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Defense Minister Ehud Barak, who see Iran’s nuclear capability as an immediate and existential threat to their country. The growing consensus that Iran is no longer actively developing nuclear weapons and that the Persian nation is facing increased economic hardship—with an embargo slated to begin on July 1—has lessened fears of an imminent attack on Iran. This is one reason, along with rising Saudi and domestic U.S. oil production and diminished demand, for the recent drop in oil prices. The American Automobile Association’s latest Daily Fuel Gauge Report indicates that the national average for regular-grade gasoline is $3.81 a gallon, 12 cents below the $3.93 of a month ago. It is also 13 cents below the average of a year ago. The perceived threat of war is lower, helping to bring gas prices down some. We don’t know, though, whether prices will continue to drop in the coming months or stay relatively high until Election Day. The combination of the fourth-warmest winter on record and historically low natural-gas prices has significantly diminished home-heating costs for many Americans this year, and that has worked to offset spiking gasoline prices during the winter months. So, for now, the threat of major military action in the Middle East before November 6 is less likely than it was just a few months ago. It’s just unclear whether the odds have declined enough to create a peace dividend in the form of lower oil and gasoline prices in the next six months. Foreign-policy insiders don’t think that Obama will participate in, or support, a unilateral attack on Iran unless he is convinced that Iran is on the cusp of developing a nuclear-weapons capability. But they are equally certain that he would act if intelligence showed that capability is drawing near. The insiders say that a knee-jerk reaction to protect Israel wouldn’t motivate Obama. The president, they believe, is worried that if Iran developed a nuclear-weapons capability, other countries in the region would immediately go on the market to acquire their own nuclear capabilities from Pakistan or elsewhere, triggering an arms race on his watch that he would consider abhorrent and unacceptable.

#### No Strikes before the election

**National Journal Subscriber, 3-4**-2012 <http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-plays-hawk-in-chief-on-iran-20120304>

But after delivering those more martial pledges, Obama then tried to tamp down what he called “loose talk of war. Over the last few weeks, such talk has only benefited the Iranian government, by driving up the price of oil, which they depend upon to fund their nuclear program. For the sake of Israel’s security, America’s security, and the peace and security of the world, now is not the time for bluster; now is the time to let our increased pressure sink in, and to sustain the broad international coalition that we have built.” Obama laid out a timetable for obtaining a diplomatic commitment from Iran to negotiate away its nuclear program that seemed to take him well beyond November. “Sanctions are continuing to increase, and this July – thanks to our diplomatic coordination – a European ban on Iranian oil imports will take hold,” he said.

### A2: Thumper – X legislation

#### Nothing will pass before election now

**Steinhauer, 12**

Jennifer, Bureau Chief, NYT, 6/9, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/09/us/politics/congressional-memo-as-recess-nears-little-hope-for-breaking-partisan-impasse.html>)

As Recess Nears, Little Hope for Breaking Partisan Impasse They are the sort of bills that, once upon a time in Washington, passed easily: money for highways and students, protection for battered women. But in this Congressional climate, it seems unlikely that all or even any of these stalled measures will be enacted before the July 4th recess — an ominous sign for the much harder work of preventing an entire fiscal unraveling at the end of the year. Crisis looms, because crisis is all Washington can do these days. Members of Congress are increasingly worried about the lame-duck session after the election, one replete with expiring tax provisions and onerous budget cuts that are increasingly becoming known as the “fiscal cliff.” But there is also a policy precipice at the end of June, when two important programs will expire if Republicans and Democrats cannot find a way to compromise on them. “There is frustration among a bipartisan group,” said Senator Jeanne Shaheen, Democrat of New Hampshire. “There are an awful lot of red states that need transportation funding, too.” Even more remarkably, the two parties are at an impasse on a formerly benign measure that has routinely passed with near unanimous bipartisan support, one that protects women from domestic violence. With both chambers set to recess for a Fourth of July holiday, on top of the House being out all of next week and senators once again racing for the region’s airports on Thursday afternoon, it is becoming hard to see how a spate of deals will be done. Absent such action, come July 1, millions of college students will see the interest rates on their federally subsidized loans double to 6.8 percent, and highway financing will again be in jeopardy. The measure that helps protect women would leave uncertainty about future funding for its programs. The mood on Capitol Hill was sizzling with partisan rancor this week, particularly after an article on Politico suggested that Representative Eric Cantor, the Virginia Republican and majority leader, had declared 2012 legislation more or less finished. Senator Harry Reid, Democrat of Nevada, the majority leader, took to the Senate floor to berate Mr. Cantor, although there was no actual quotation in the article to point to, for saying “out loud what every Republican on Capitol Hill has been thinking all along — they care more about winning elections than creating jobs.” Over in the House, a spokeswoman for Representative Kevin McCarthy of California, the Republican whip, said on Twitter that the House would be voting “well after Harry Reid’s bedtime.” Ouch. And Speaker John A. Boehner, Republican of Ohio, hinted Thursday that the highway bill would remain unresolved, and that a six-month extension might be in the offing. The failure of Congress to reach agreement has serious implications for road projects, families with college-age children and women who use shelters and other legal services. “This is a major concern for us and our students,” said Diane Stemper, the director of student financial aid at Ohio State University, where 57 percent of the undergraduates have federal student loans. “Our students on average are graduating with $20,000 in debt.” In New Hampshire, sections of an expansion of Interstate 93 have already been delayed because the state waited to issue bonds because of uncertainty over a clear revenue stream from Washington, said Cliff Sinnott, the executive director of the Rockingham Planning Commission. The summer impasse also presages tough days ahead for both parties charged with resolving far more controversial tax and spending matters before the end of the year. “These things should be pretty easy,” said Representative Jo Ann Emerson, Republican of Missouri. “I think it all depends now on what happens with the election. And I hate to say that because the fact is we have the responsibility to get our work done and we need to get it done, and I would hope that everyone acts like adults and we do the work we need to do.” In the case of each piece of legislation, members of both parties agree on the essential details. With the exception of a handful of very conservative Republicans in both chambers, a majority of members agree that student loan rates should not increase, but the parties are tied in knots over how to cover the $6 billion price tag for doing so. Republicans and Democrats have volleyed some different ideas back and forth over the last week — late Thursday, Mr. Reid proposed two ways to shore up private pensions and generate more tax revenues as a means to pay for the loan rate extension, While there seemed to be some signs of movement, no deal seemed in the immediate offing. While the Senate has passed a bipartisan transportation bill, the House has rejected it, because it does not offer the streamlining and program consolidation Republicans seek. The House bill has provisions for the next phase of the Keystone XL pipeline and a measure concerning coal ash. The two sides appear at loggerheads. “The Tea Party is holding up a major transportation bill,” Ms. Shaheen said. Similarly, the Senate passed a Violence Against Women Act, and the House has its own version that removes Senate provisions like those that would subject non-Indian suspects of domestic violence to prosecution before tribal courts for crimes allegedly committed on reservations and expand the number of temporary visas for illegal immigrant victims of domestic violence. This bill that once passed by voice vote seems hopelessly stalled. “It’s always frustrating, “said Senator Richard C. Shelby, Republican of Alabama, “that’s part of the legislative life up here — always has been. This is an election year, and not many things happen in an election year.”

#### No legislation before election now

**Bontempo, 12** (Lisa, energy lobbyist, including 13 years with NPGA, LP/Gas, 3/1, lexis)

In addition, there are few internal congressional deadlines that would force Congress to work together to pass legislation before the elections. Since January, the 10-month extension of the payroll tax cut has passed Congress. The government is already funded through October, and last summer's deal has set the budget funding levels for the next fiscal year. Because funding issues are one of the biggest divides between the parties, expect to see stopgap funding bills this fall for fiscal year 2013 since it's unlikely Congress will complete its regular annual appropriations bills before it leaves for elections. What makes this even more intriguing is the fact that several major issues must be dealt with before the end of 2012, including the expiration of all Bush-era tax cuts. If they are not renewed, it will mean a significant increase in federal revenue and a return to higher tax rates for millions of Americans. Also, the debt ceiling agreement of August 2011 put in place across-the-board cuts for nearly all federal spending of about $1.2 trillion over 10 years. Half of this must come from the Defense Department. Expect Congress to try to act on the Bush tax cuts as well as to try and reverse or change the automatic spending cuts, something the GOP and many Democrats have vowed to do. Election-year agendas designed to exploit political advantage will be dead on arrival: Even if the House's Republican majority passes legislation, it will face a presidential veto and/or not be able to pass the Democratic majority in the Senate.

## \*\*\*Internals – Key Voters\*\*\*

### Base/Turnout Key – o/w swing voters

#### Turnout key – not swing voters

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 5/31, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/buying-a-presidential-election-its-not-as-easy-as-you-think/>

The airwaves in the eight or 10 states that will decide the outcome of the 2012 presidential election will soon be saturated with ads supporting and opposing Barack Obama and Mitt Romney, all aimed at persuading a small group of undecided voters — less than 10%, according to most recent polls. These undecided voters are much less interested in the presidential election than those who have already chosen sides. When the ads come on, they generally ignore them. Moreover, undecided voters are not stupid, and they’re generally skeptical about the messages that they see on TV. As a result, the net impact of all of this advertising is likely to be minimal. Research by political scientists and evidence from 2012 polls in the battleground states suggests that the parties and candidates would do better to focus their efforts in these states on mobilizing their supporters rather than trying to persuade uncommitted voters. But I’ll have more to say about that in my next article.

#### Comparative ev – base key for Obama in key battleground states – not swing voters

**Abramowitz, 6/7/12**

Alan I. Abramowitz, Senior Columnist, Center for politics, 6/7/12 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/>

Despite the closeness of the presidential race, the Obama and Romney campaigns find themselves in very different strategic situations in the battleground states. For the Romney campaign, a strategy focused on persuading and mobilizing registered but undecided voters looks promising given the negative views of President Obama held by most swing voters. In contrast, for the Obama campaign, a strategy focused on mobilizing supporters who are not currently registered seems to hold more promise than one emphasizing persuasion of undecided voters.

#### Specifically true for dems

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/24, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12537>)

Starting with 44 percent, Democrats need to win the support of only about half of the 15 percent in the middle. Republicans, coming from a much smaller share of the independent and nonaligned slice of voters to win, need all 15 percent to reach a majority. In short, it’s a lot more important for Republicans to extend beyond their base than it is for Democrats. Conversely, Democrats have to worry about getting out the vote among some of their strongest groups. Overall, 81 percent of respondents rate themselves as 8’s, 9’s, or 10’s in terms of interest in this election, meaning they are very likely to vote. Obama won 66 percent of the 18-to-29-year-olds in 2008; only 64 percent indicated to Hart and McInturff’s interviewers that they were 8’s, 9’s, or 10’s for this November’s election. Obama won 67 percent of the Hispanic vote last time; only 68 percent in the survey were 8’s, 9’s, or 10’s. Among African-Americans, Obama won 95 percent of the vote; 83 percent were 8’s, 9’s, or 10’s, meaning that African-Americans are significantly more interested in this election than the other two groups. The poll has an enormous amount of data, and very little of it pushes toward a strong conclusion in favor of either Obama or Romney. More evidence that a tight race is in the offing.

### (Dem) Base Key/A2: decline in turnout inevitable

#### Minimizing decline in Dem base turnout is key

**Tomasky, 11**

Newsweek/Daily Beast special correspondent Michael Tomasky is also editor of Democracy: A Journal of Ideas.Newsweek, 6/26/11, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/06/26/2012-how-obama-can-mobilize-his-liberal-base.html>

The base vote can still emerge in large numbers, but the dominant factor this time won’t be hope and change. Instead, the factors will be fear of the other side, state and local political conditions (think of how motivated Democrats are to regain control of their politics in Wisconsin), and demographic changes that are still redounding to the Democrats’ benefit. And because we elect presidents by states, the place to assess Obama’s prospects is on the ground. Wake County, N.C.; Arapahoe County, Colo.; Franklin County, Ohio—these are representative base Democratic counties. They are in swing states, which means the president will need a big vote in these places to offset a presumed high conservative turnout in other parts of these states. And they are counties that have only recently become solidly Democratic, because of demographic changes. “Obama’s majorities in these counties are not secure,” says Ruy Teixeira, coauthor of the 2002 book The Emerging Democratic Majority, which predicted the bluing of states like then-red Colorado. “He needs a full-bore mobilization effort in these counties to get his supporters out and develop the margins he needs to carry swing states like Ohio, Colorado, and North Carolina.” Cont… That’ll be about the strongest argument Obama can make to base voters: it could, and will, be a lot worse if you don’t vote for me. That’s true, and fear is usually a pretty good motivator in politics. But it still isn’t what people were hoping for, and it seems inevitable that some percentage of the most loyal Democrats will stay home. In these three counties and others like them, that percentage will be the difference between reelection and retirement.

### A2: Base/Turnout Key

#### “enthusiasm gap” and turnout not key – close election guarantees turnout even if voter enthusiasm is low

**Silver, 12** (Nate, NYT Blogs, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models 2/6, lexis)

It should be remembered, however, that Republicans have the turnout advantage in November because their voters tend to come from demographic groups (like older Americans and wealthier Americans) who vote more frequently. This usually manifests itself in the fact that polls of likely voters show somewhat more favorable results for Republicans than polls of registered voters. The safest default assumption is probably that this gap will exist again, but that it will amount to a more typical value like 2 or 3 percentage points than the 6-point "enthusiasm gap" that existed in 2010. Or it could be that the middling enthusiasm for Mr. Romney will only make much difference if he appears to be in trouble by November. Democratic turnout was quite poor, for instance, in 1984 for Walter Mondale, a candidate who has some parallels to Mr. Romney. However, it was clear that Ronald Reagan was going to win that election anyway; low Democratic turnout contributed to Reagan's margin of victory, but strong turnout would not have reversed the result. On the other hand, Democrats had somewhat limited enthusiasm for John Kerry in 2004 - but that election was much closer, and they did not have any major problems in getting their voters to the polls. In other words, perhaps if Mr. Obama appears poised for a 6- or 7-point victory by November based on the economic fundamentals, Republican voters may feel that their vote makes little difference anyway and some of them will stay home as a protest, expanding Mr. Obama's victory margin to 8 or 9 points instead and making it look prettier in the Electoral College. But I'm more skeptical that this will matter much in an environment in which the election will be very close and every vote could make a difference.

### A2: (Dem) Base Key

#### Independent Swing voters key – not dem base

**Saunders, 12**

Debra J. Saunders, Columnist @ San Fransisco Chronicle, Creators Syndicate, January 7, 2012, lexis

The bigger issue, however, concerns Team Obama's apparent decision to win re-election by playing to the liberal base, not the American political middle. While the administration should be working to heal the economy, the administration is busy pointing fingers at bad Republicans. Tea Party Express co-founder Sal Russo likened the Obama strategy to Bush guru Karl Rove's strategy to win re-election in 2004 by ginning up the base. Russo doesn't see how it could work for the Democrats this year. To independent voters especially, the president's failure to work with Congress doesn't compute. "Look, you're president," Russo said. "Why can't you just walk over to Congress and talk to these guys?" To the average Joe, there's only one standard, noted Russo. "You've got to get the job done."

### A2: (GOP) Base Key - Resilient

#### GOP Base enthusiasm is locked up and irreversible – moderates key

**Epstien, 12** (Reid, Columnist @ Politico, 5/17, lexis)

Romney can make the about-face on Clinton, GOP operative Rick Wilson said, because the combination of the primary's end and Obama's embrace of gay marriage have coalesced for him the conservative base. What's left to target is the political middle and voters who remember fondly the Clinton era. "Romney now has the Republican base done and done. Locked up, cooked, in the bag," Wilson said. "He is still soft a little bit with moderates. Bill Clinton is beloved by those folks. He's not seen as a Democratic partisan in the same way he was when he was president."

### A2: (GOP) Base Key – GOP must reach out to independents

#### Strict opposition to spending or taxes backfires – alienates swing voters

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/1, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12442>)

Veteran Democratic pollster Stan Greenberg offers up an alternative view. Noting the polls of his own firm and plenty of others, Stan points to signs that, while the Democratic Party’s brand has it’s own issues with favorable-unfavorable and positive-negative gaps (different pollsters test these things in various ways), invariably, the GOP has higher unfavorables and negatives than favorables and positives. Likewise, this applies to comparisons of “Democrats in Congress” and “Republicans in Congress.” It would seem that, in the minds of independents (and to a lesser extent in those of others), Democrats have not covered themselves in glory. The GOP brand has taken on considerably more water. Greenberg’s theory is that it is not one thing but the combination of factors. In some states, notably in Wisconsin and Ohio, actions by Republican governors and state legislatures pushed way too far. They took positions and pushed policies that looked extreme to many non-ideological independent voters, sometimes rubbing moderate Republicans the wrong way as well. Then there is Washington, where Greenberg argues that Republicans -- particularly Budget Chairman Paul Ryan and his budget, nearly universally embraced by fellow party members in Congress -- come across as too ideological or too harsh. Finally, there was the overheated rhetoric in the 20 or 21 Republican presidential debates. It was a conversation clearly aimed at the party base but overheard by other voters, who found much of the talk more than a little exotic for their tastes. Each of the eight GOP presidential contenders, in an August debate sponsored by Fox News, said they would not go along with a budget proposal that included $10 in spending cuts for every $1 of tax increases. Positioning that far to the right is way too out there for most independent voters, who respond well to the suggestions of balanced approaches to deficit reduction. While I don’t buy into Greenberg’s argument of a potential Democratic wave, if any kind of partisan wave is likely to develop -- barring some cataclysmic political, military, or economic development at home or abroad -- it sure seems more likely to break in favor of the Democrats, as he's suggesting, as a result of a backlash against Republicans going too far to the right. I don’t yet see signs that the Republicans’ obsession with their conservative base has reached a tipping point that will create a Democratic wave. But if I were a Republican leader, I’d at least consider the possibility.

#### Spending opponents not key, they already hate Obama – and the issue only alienates more important swing groups

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/19, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12401>)

The messaging and signals emanating from Republican presidential candidates, as well as from elected officials in Washington and in state capitals, seem to be aimed at only conservative, white men. This is a group that once dominated the electorate but is now considerably smaller than a majority. The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press released a poll of 2,373 registered voters, culled from a larger group of 3,008 adults, interviewed April 4-15. Among all registered voters, President Obama led presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney by just 4 percentage points, 49 percent to 45 percent, down from a 12-point lead, 54 percent to 42 percent, a month ago. In the survey, respondents rated the importance of 18 issues and then indicated their preference between Obama and Romney. Not too surprisingly, Obama did best with those who rated the environment as very important; he led that group by 39 percentage points. He also won the folks who picked education as very important by 22 points, birth control by 19 points, and health care by 15 points. See a pattern here? Romney prevailed among those who picked the budget deficit as very important, winning them by 19 points, and among those who named Iran, by 14 points. Those kinds of issues are very different from birth control and health care. The relevance of all of this comes through when you look at key demographic breakouts from the trial heat between Obama and Romney. Overall, Obama led among women by 13 points: 53 percent to 40 percent. Romney was ahead among men by 6 points: 50 percent to 44 percent. Given that women generally make up 51 to 52 percent of the electorate, whenever Republican candidates lose women by more than they win among men, they can skip ordering the champagne for election night. In all but the most unusual cases, a Republican needs to win among men by a wider margin than a Democrat does among women. But it gets really interesting when you break the genders down by age: under 50 versus over 50. Among all women 50 and older, Obama beat Romney by 7 points, 50 percent to 43 percent. Among all women under 50, though, Obama prevailed by 18 points, 56 percent to 38 percent. That’s an 11-point difference in the president’s lead between the younger and older groups of women. Among men, Obama actually led among those under 50 by 1 percentage point: 47 percent to 46 percent. But Romney prevailed among men 50 and older by 11 percentage points, 53 percent to 42 percent. So, a 12-point difference in Obama’s standing between the younger and older men. When you make the same comparisons among just white voters, the contrast is even starker. Romney’s support came overwhelmingly from white men, a group he carried by 26 points, 60 percent to 34 percent. In comparison, the Republican had an advantage of just 5 points among white women, 49 percent to 44 percent. The age difference among white women was considerably less important than that among all women. Among white women 50 and older, Romney defeated Obama by 7 points, 50 percent to 43 percent. Among white women under 50, he won by 3 points, 48 percent to 45 percent, for only a 4-point difference between younger and older groups of women. Among white men, Romney won the under-50 cohort by 13 percentage points, 53 percent to 40 percent. Among white men 50 and older, he prevailed by 27 percentage points, 61 percent to 34 percent. That’s a 14-point difference. Taking all of this into consideration and then adding that Obama led by 40 points among Hispanic voters, 67 percent to 27 percent, and by 93 points among African-Americans, 95 percent to 2 percent, it’s clear that, assuming these groups turn out in numbers approaching 2008, it’s women under 50 who are the demographic that either will or won’t put Obama over the top in the general election. Democrats hope to make the case that Republicans have tailored their priorities for white men, particularly white men over 50, to such a degree that they seem to deliberately exclude women voters, especially younger women. Other polling shows real deterioration for Romney among independent women—most specifically, those under 50.

#### Base support inevitable – appealing to them backfires

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/7, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12467)

Here’s some totally unsolicited advice from the peanut gallery, first for Mitt Romney and then for Barack Obama. Having devoted every waking hour for the last year and a half to catering to the carnivores in his party, Romney needs to cut back on the red-meat rhetoric that was required of him to win the GOP nomination. The vast majority of conservatives would vote for very nearly anyone running against Obama. In a New York Times piece, Campbell Robertson wrote that “the antipathy toward the current administration among Republican voters, described here in terms ranging from the vulgar to the apocalyptic, can hardly be exaggerated.” While Romney must win a few Democratic votes, he doesn’t need to switch to a vegan or even a vegetarian diet. By the same token, independent and swing voters don’t eat all their meals at steak houses. He needs a more balanced and reasoned rhetoric, appealing to brains and not just to glands. A discussion with Republicans and conservatives about health care reform has usually entailed talking about big government. Independents, meanwhile, were concerned about Obama’s health care law because they already had health insurance. They were reasonably happy with it and were fearful that any major changes to the system would either raise premiums or cut benefits. Unlike conservatives and Republican partisans, independents don’t see health care or any other issue through an ideological lens. Transitioning from primary to general-election politics is rarely easy. Candidates and campaign operatives develop Pavlovian conditioning. For months, they talk exclusively to partisans, looking for rhetoric that will elicit heads moving up and down in agreement. This rhetoric may create frowns or at least cause puzzled responses from swing voters. Sitting Romney down in front of a laptop, watching focus groups with swing voters, may resensitize him.

### A2: Business lobbies/Chamber Commerce Key

#### Business lobby won’t get involved in presidential election and wouldn’t back Obama no matter what

**Daily Political, 12** (5/12, <http://www.dailypolitical.com/politics/u-s-politics/chamber-of-commerce-to-spend-in-record-numbers-on-2012-election.htm>)

This business lobby has opposed Obama’s administration key domestic policies which includes the 2010 healthcare restructuring law and has historically stayed away from the presidential race.

“Our strategy is to protect the pro-business majority in the house and advance our interests in the Senate” said the group’s national political director, Rob Engstrom.

### Fundraising Key

#### Fundraising key- primaries and 2008 prove

**FDL, 2-17**-2012 <http://elections.firedoglake.com/2012/02/17/obama-campaign-boasts-of-impressive-january-fundraising-figures/>

The Obama campaign is boasting of some impressive campaign figures for the month of January. On twitter, the campaign claims to have raised just over $29.1 million for the campaign, DNC and other relevant committees. The powerful Obama fundraising apparatus, which was an important force in 2008 election, appears to be functioning very well. The Obama team will clearly have the money to be on par or to even outspend the eventual Republican nominee. I think this is relevant because Mitt Romney’s success in the Republican primary so far has relied heavily on radically outspending his rivals. Romney and his allies won Florida but only after outspending Newt Gingrich and his allies by an incredibly five to one margin. When the Romney campaign decided not to completely flood the zone with campaign spending in the early February states it allowed Rick Santorum to score a surprise triple win. If Romney does manage to regain the lead in Michigan it will be in part because of his team spending dramatically more in the state than Santorum can afford to. This hugely outspending your rivals can work in the GOP primary for Romney given the pathetic fundraising of his rivals, but it is simply not going to be an option in the general when he finally faces someone with a very competent fundraising machine.

#### Super PACs mean fundraising key

**USA Today, 3-8**-2012 <http://www.cnbc.com/id/46668882/Obama_Tops_Recent_Presidents_at_Fundraisers>

President Obama has attended 191 fundraisers for himself and others, far exceeding the fundraising pace of presidents going back to Jimmy Carter as he drives to stockpile money for his re-election, according to new data compiled for USA TODAY. The fundraising push comes as Obama's campaign has rebuffed requests from congressional Democrats to transfer campaign funds from the Democratic National Committee to bolster the party's efforts to retake the House and maintain control of the Senate. His campaign is in talks with former President Bill Clinton to join him at fundraising events in the months ahead. By comparison, President George W. Bush had headlined 134 fundraisers at this point in his first term, according to an analysis by Brendan Doherty, a political scientist at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md., and the author of the forthcoming book "The Rise of the President's Permanent Campaign." Doherty maintains records on presidential activity back to the Carter administration. Obama has surpassed the record 173 fundraisers Bush headlined during his entire first term, Doherty's numbers show. More than 10 months remain in Obama's first term. The rising cost of campaigns and the explosion of new super PACs that can raise and spend unlimited money from corporations, unions and individuals help drive the pace, experts say. "This election raises the possibility that someone will come and drop $10 million, $20 million or $50 million in the race," said Jonathan Krasno, a Binghamton University political scientist. "Politicians are at full, hyper-red alert." Your Money Your Vote - A CNBC Special Report Super PACs raised more than $126 million from Jan. 1, 2011, to Jan. 31 this year, and a recent USA TODAY analysis found that nearly 25% of the money came from five wealthy individuals. "We are in a whole new world here," campaign adviser David Axelrod said Wednesday. "We would be insane not to be worried about that." Obama campaign manager Jim Messina said he expected Republican-aligned outside groups to spend more than $500 million to attack the president. Republicans, who have seized on the heavy schedule to deride Obama as "campaigner in chief," say the pace is a sign of money trouble for Obama. "Fundraising is definitely his No. 1 priority," said Republican National Committee spokeswoman Kirsten Kukowski. "They are worried they don't have the fundraising advantage he once had because enthusiasm is down on his side."

#### 2008 proves

Edward Wyckoff **Williams** expert in Political Economy. He is a former Investment Banker, currently working as a private equity adviser **3-9**-2012 <http://www.thegrio.com/politics/small-donors-still-the-backbone-of-barack-obamas-election-hopes.php>

The devil is in the details; in order to find him, just follow the money. The 2012 election is finally taking shape, and Mitt Romney, the proverbial businessman in a bowler hat, leads the pack of Republican challengers to President Barack Obama. In 2008, senior strategist David Axelrod and campaign manager David Plouffe led the president's Chicago-based team in developing a never-before-seen multimedia election platform, collecting a vast amount of money and support from average Americans. Using the tools of the Internet age, President Obama built a coalition of young adults, students, African-Americans, Latinos and constituency groups from Los Angeles to Colorado, and North Carolina to Florida, giving him an organizational edge over Hillary Clinton and, eventually, John McCain. Obama's success was not simply a matter of the hope and change he inspired, but was mostly due to a well-oiled, well-funded campaign machine. The unique aspect of this success is that the majority of Obama's donations were less than $250 -- with the vast majority being $5, $10 or $25. Average working Americans, who could not afford to give much, showed support for the young Senator from Illinois, whose message resonated.

### A2: Fundraising key

#### Campaign contributions not key – multiple reasons

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 5/31, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/buying-a-presidential-election-its-not-as-easy-as-you-think/>

Buying a Presidential Election? It’s Not as Easy as You Think It looks like it’s going to be another tough season for long-suffering fans of the Chicago Cubs. Two months into the 2012 baseball season, the Cubs are mired in last place in the National League’s Central Division with one of the worst records in Major League Baseball. But the patriarch of the family that owns the Cubs, billionaire investor Joe Ricketts, has had more on his mind lately than the Cubs’ problems. It seems that he’s been busy with another major project — stopping Barack Obama from winning a second term in the White House. A few weeks ago it was revealed that Ricketts, who made a fortune as the founder of the online brokerage firm TD Ameritrade, was preparing to spend $10 million on an advertising campaign reminding voters in battleground states about Obama’s relationship with fiery Chicago pastor Jeremiah Wright. After stories about the proposed ad campaign appeared in the media, it was almost universally panned by political commentators on the right as well as the left, and Ricketts announced that he would not be funding it. But that didn’t mean that he was giving up on his goal of defeating President Obama. It turns out that Ricketts is providing major financial support for another anti-Obama venture. This time it’s a film being made by the conservative writer Dinesh D’Souza, attacking the president for an anti-colonial worldview that he supposedly inherited from his Kenyan father. Like the Jeremiah Wright ad campaign, D’Souza’s line of attack has been criticized as inaccurate, misleading and downright silly by prominent conservative commentators, including the Washington Post’s George Will. One sign of just how little support there is for D’Souza’s claims in mainstream conservative circles is the fact that the only candidate to make the Obama as anti-colonial Kenyan claim during the Republican primary campaign was Newt Gingrich. One might simply dismiss Joe Ricketts’ behavior as the quixotic quest of a lone wolf with more money than he knows what to do with. But Ricketts’ actions are far from unique. He is one of a small but growing group of conservative billionaires who have taken advantage of lax campaign finance rules reinforced by recent Supreme Court decisions to pour millions of dollars into the 2012 presidential campaign. The Democrats have their own wealthy sugar daddies, of course, but there are fewer of them and, so far at least, they have been much less willing to open their wallets to help reelect the president. During the recent Republican primary campaign, billionaire casino magnate Sheldon Adelson almost single-handedly kept Newt Gingrich’s floundering campaign afloat for several months by donating tens of millions of dollars to a pro-Gingrich Super PAC. Another billionaire, financial investor Foster Friess, gave several million dollars to a SuperPAC supporting Rick Santorum, helping the former Pennsylvania senator emerge as Mitt Romney’s main challenger for the GOP nomination. And of course, Romney himself benefited from millions of dollars donated to his own SuperPAC, much of it from a handful of extremely wealthy supporters. In the end, the Republican contest turned out the way most political experts expected it to from the beginning: The candidate with the broadest support from Republican voters and the most endorsements by GOP officeholders, Mitt Romney, locked up the nomination well before the end of the primaries. All of the millions of dollars spent by billionaire-funded SuperPACS, most on negative ads attacking other Republican candidates, probably had little impact on the final outcome. So what can we expect from all of the spending by SuperPACs and their billionaire donors in the general election? No doubt much of it will be wasted on negative advertising campaigns and propaganda like the aborted Jeremiah Wright ads or the Obama as anti-colonial Kenyan film. Such messages appeal mainly to a small group of conservatives who don’t need to be convinced to vote against Barack Obama. But not all of those running these SuperPACs are political amateurs or ideologues. Republican campaign guru Karl Rove has his own Super PAC that has raised millions of dollars from a relatively small number of wealthy conservative donors. Rove has already launched a multi-million dollar ad campaign in a number of swing states attacking the President’s economic record by highlighting the continued suffering of ordinary Americans more than three years after Obama took office. Rove’s message is much more likely to resonate with swing voters in key battleground states such as Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin. But despite the clever messaging, the Rove Super PAC’s anti-Obama campaign is also likely to have little or no impact on the outcome of the election. That’s because the tens of millions of dollars that they are spending on television ads in the swing states is coming on top of hundreds of millions of dollars already being spent on TV ads in these states by the candidates themselves, party organizations, labor unions, liberal and conservative organizations and wealthy individuals. The airwaves in the eight or 10 states that will decide the outcome of the 2012 presidential election will soon be saturated with ads supporting and opposing Barack Obama and Mitt Romney, all aimed at persuading a small group of undecided voters — less than 10%, according to most recent polls. These undecided voters are much less interested in the presidential election than those who have already chosen sides. When the ads come on, they generally ignore them. Moreover, undecided voters are not stupid, and they’re generally skeptical about the messages that they see on TV. As a result, the net impact of all of this advertising is likely to be minimal.

### Independent/Swing Voters Key

#### Independent voters key – determine battleground states

**Walsh, 12**

Kenneth, Chief White House Correspondent, US News and World Report, USNews.com, 5/30, lexis

3. Pivot to swing voters. Once he is formally nominated, Romney needs to show independent voters--who will be crucial in the battleground states such as Colorado, Florida, and Ohio--that he hasn't been captured by right-wing orthodoxy. He might do this in his choice of a vice-presidentlal running mate--selecting someone who is conservative but is not seen as extreme. Ohio Sen. Rob Portman or former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush are among those who would fill the bill. Of course this effort could run counter to his objective of unifying conservatives, demonstrating the tightrope walk that Romney faces. A central part of this strategy also is to persuade swing voters that President Obama has been a failure, especially on the economy.

#### Independent swing voters key and outweigh base support– economic issues determine outcome

**Defrank, 12** (Thomas, Columnist @ Daily News, 1/24, lexis)

Obama has been shaping and test-driving his election message for months and will reinforce it to the 9 p.m. TV audience. He will offer a bipartisan hand to Republicans and urge them to set politics aside to advance the national interest. But he's been making the same overture for months and been repeatedly slapped down by GOP lawmakers intent to defeating him this fall. "It took a long time for him to get the message, but now he understands the Republicans won't do him any favors for as long as he's President," a White House official said. Obama handlers say he will offer some soothing words to Democrats to shore up and energize his political base. But for the most part he'll direct his message at the 20% of the electorate, mostly independent swing voters, who historically provide the margin of victory in presidential elections. That bloc broke for Obama in 2008 but abandoned Democrats in 2010, giving Republicans control of the House. Obama will also use Tuesday's address to reinforce his spin on what both sides agree is this election's make-or-break issue: the economy.

### Independent/Swing Voters key – A2: “there’s not enough”

#### Swing Voters key – contrary claims based on flawed studies

**Eberly, 12**

Todd Eberly, a political science professor at St. Mary’s College of Maryland, Center For Politics.org, 5/12/12

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, 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. My findings have been criticized largely based on my selection of the 2000-2004 data series. Some contend that the events of Sept. 11 and the subsequent War on Terror made that time period unique and therefore unrepresentative. Unfortunately there is no other comparable data set exploring the same respondents across multiple elections. In a recent post challenging the findings contained in the Third Way report, Alan Abramowitz examined the 2008-2009 panel study and compared the partisan loyalty and partisan vote choice of respondents in the 2008 presidential election. Abramowitz came to the same conclusion as did I in my Third Way report: that independent partisans behave much like their more partisan peers in a given election. Unfortunately, the 2008-2009 panel survey does not allow one to follow partisanship or partisan loyalty across multiple elections. As such it is not a useful data source for the study of partisan loyalty and the presence of independent voters. Additionally, I researched partisan loyalty by examining House elections, because it allows one to study multiple elections across a relatively short timeframe. To address concerns about the 2000-2004 data, I conducted additional analyses with that data source and with the 1992-1997 panel survey by ANES. Having already demonstrated that leaners are less loyal to party over time, I wanted to focus on estimating the number of true independent voters in the electorate. Based on my study for Third Way, I placed the number at approximately 25% of the electorate, which is a number also endorsed by Linda Killian in her book, The Swing Vote. I compared the 1994 and 1996 as well as the 2002 and 2004 partisan vote choice to the choice made in 1992 and 2000 respectively. In other words, what share of the folks who voted Democratic in 1992 voted Republican in 1994 or 1996? What share of folks voting Republican in 2000 voted Democrat in 2002 and 2004? As I am interested in two-party vote shares, I limited my study to only those who voted for one of the two parties in each of the elections covered. Of those who voted for a Democrat in the 1992 House elections, 25% opted to vote Republican in 1994 and 24% opted to vote Republican in 1996. Among Republicans, 12% voted for a Democrat in 1994 and 21% voted for a Democrat in 1996. Based on the two-party vote shares in each election, nearly 19% of those voting in 1992 and 1994 changed their partisan vote choice. The overall share was closer to 23% between 1992 and 1996. When looking at the more recent era, of those who voted for a Democrat in the 2000 House elections, 16% voted Republican in 2002 and 21% voted Republican in 2004. Among Republicans, 11% voted Democrat in 2002 and 21% voted Democrat in 2004. Both panel series show that partisan loyalty declines over time, and that Democratic voters are less loyal than Republican voters. Consistent with the findings of the Third Way report, both panel series show that partisan loyalty is weakest among weak, but especially among independent, partisans (most defections came from independent partisans). Much is made of surveys by Gallup and Pew that suggest that a plurality of voters are independents — perhaps as much as 40%. This is simply incorrect. But so too are arguments that independent voters make up less than 10% of the electorate. The stability of a partisan coalition is dependent upon sustained loyalty across elections, but roughly 20% of the voting electorate are not loyal partisans (and that share would grow if I expanded my study to include folks who opted to not vote — as non-voters could hardly be considered loyal partisans). In an era of closely matched political parties and relatively narrow two-party vote shares, winning and maintaining the support of that 20% is crucial.

### A2: Independent/Swing Voters Key

#### Undecided swing voters not key – prefer our ev – specific to key battle ground states

**Abramowitz, 6/7/12**

Alan I. Abramowitz, Senior Columnist, Center for politics, 6/7/12 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/>

These findings raise an important question for the Obama and Romney campaigns. In deciding how to allocate money and other resources, how much emphasis should they give to mobilizing potential supporters versus persuading undecided voters? The answer to this question depends on the characteristics and political attitudes of two key groups of voters in the battleground states: unregistered supporters and undecided registered voters. In order to compare the potential payoffs of a strategy emphasizing mobilization compared with a strategy emphasizing persuasion, I analyzed data from a March 20-26 Gallup Poll in 12 key battleground states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. This was the most recent battleground state polling data available for analysis. A total of 1,046 adults were interviewed on landline and cellular telephones, including 871 registered voters. Swing voters: Unhappy with Obama but unenthusiastic about voting One important finding from Gallup’s March swing state poll is that there were relatively few swing voters in these swing states. Among registered voters, 49% supported Barack Obama and another 1% indicated that they leaned toward Obama, while 41% supported Mitt Romney and another 2% leaned toward Romney. The March 20-26 survey was conducted at a time when Mitt Romney was still battling with Rick Santorum for the Republican nomination. Now that Romney has locked up the GOP nomination, Obama’s lead in these battleground states may very well be smaller. What is striking, however, is that as early as March, relatively few registered voters were unwilling to state a preference in a Romney-Obama contest. Even combining leaners with the undecided, swing voters made up less than 10% of the electorate in these 12 states.

#### They won’t vote and appeals from Obama only backfire

**Abramowitz, 6/7/12**

Alan I. Abramowitz, Senior Columnist, Center for politics, 6/7/12 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/>

The data in Table 1 show that compared with voters supporting a candidate, swing voters were disproportionately white and female. They were also much more likely to describe themselves as completely independent and much less likely to describe themselves as Democrats or independents leaning toward the Democratic Party. But the most dramatic differences between swing voters and voters supporting a candidate involved their opinions about President Obama and their enthusiasm about voting in 2012. Swing voters had much more negative opinions of President Obama’s job performance than other voters. In fact, their opinions were almost as negative as those of Romney supporters. Only 11% of swing voters approved of Obama’s job performance compared with 6% of Romney voters. In contrast, 92% of Obama voters approved of the president’s job performance. But while swing voters were similar to Romney voters in their evaluation of President Obama’s job performance, they were much less enthusiastic about voting. Only 19% of swing voters described themselves as extremely or very enthusiastic about voting in 2012 compared with 47% of Romney supporters and 50% of Obama supporters. And 58% of swing voters described themselves as not too enthusiastic or not at all enthusiastic about voting compared with only 27% of Romney supporters and 21% of Obama supporters. These findings suggest two different conclusions about the likely results of efforts by the Obama and Romney campaigns to persuade swing voters to support their candidate. From the standpoint of the Obama campaign, efforts at persuading swing voters are likely to be unproductive and could even backfire. These voters have a decidedly negative view of the president and are very unlikely to vote for him. The best the Obama campaign can hope for is that most of these swing voters will not bother to turn out in November.

#### Comparative ev – base key for Obama in key battleground states – not swing voters

**Abramowitz, 6/7/12**

Alan I. Abramowitz, Senior Columnist, Center for politics, 6/7/12 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/>

Despite the closeness of the presidential race, the Obama and Romney campaigns find themselves in very different strategic situations in the battleground states. For the Romney campaign, a strategy focused on persuading and mobilizing registered but undecided voters looks promising given the negative views of President Obama held by most swing voters. In contrast, for the Obama campaign, a strategy focused on mobilizing supporters who are not currently registered seems to hold more promise than one emphasizing persuasion of undecided voters.

#### Independent swing voters are a myth – consensus of studies

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 4/12, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/are-independent-leaners-closet-partisans-or-true-independents/>)

This is an important issue because according to almost all recent surveys, the large majority of independent voters lean toward one of the two major parties. In the 2008 American National Election Study, for example, about three-fourths of independent voters leaned toward a party, and the vast majority of those leaning independents voted for the candidate of the party they leaned toward. It is this sort of finding, repeated in many surveys of voters in many different elections, that has led political scientists, including myself, to conclude that most independent leaners are closet partisans rather than true independents. And, indeed, there are good reasons to be skeptical about the conclusions of the Third Way study.

#### “swing” voters won’t swing

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 4/12, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/are-independent-leaners-closet-partisans-or-true-independents/>)

An examination of the results of the ANES 2008-2009 panel surveys shows that first, the vast majority of independent leaners, and especially of independent Democrats, continued to identify with the party they originally leaned toward more than a year and a half after the initial interview in January 2008. In August 2009, 82% of respondents who were independent Democrats in January 2008 continued to identify with or lean toward the Democratic Party, while 73% of independent Republicans continued to identify with or lean toward the Republican Party. Only 5% of both groups of leaners had switched to the opposing party. Moreover, the vast majority of respondents who leaned toward a party in January 2008 ended up voting for that party’s presidential candidate in November 2008, even though the identities of the presidential candidates were far from certain in January. Nevertheless, 87% of independent Democrats ultimately voted for Barack Obama while 82% of independent Republicans ultimately voted for John McCain. Independent Democrats and Republicans were actually more loyal to their party’s presidential candidates than weak Democrats and Republicans in 2008 –only 80% of weak Democrats and only 78% of weak Republicans ultimately voted for their party’s presidential candidates. The reason for the high rate of loyalty of those independent leaners is not hard to find: Both groups of independent leaners generally shared the dominant ideological orientation of the party they leaned toward. Independent Democrats were quite liberal and independent Republicans were quite conservative. In fact, independent Democrats were more liberal than weak Democrats while independent Republicans were more conservative than weak Republicans. About three of five (59%) of independent Democrats placed themselves on the liberal side of the ideology scale compared with 50% of weak Democrats, while 74% of independent Republicans placed themselves on the conservative side of the scale compared with 72% of weak Republicans. These results from the ANES 2008-2009 panel survey reinforce the findings of many other surveys of American voters — Americans who identify themselves as independents but who indicate that they lean toward one of the two major parties generally think and behave more like partisans than like true independents. They tend to maintain their party preference over a long period of time, they tend to vote overwhelmingly for the party that they lean toward, and they tend to hold ideological orientations consistent with their party preference. Independent Democrats, in particular, lean toward the liberal side of the ideological spectrum and would not be likely to defect from Democratic candidates who take progressive positions. That is why they voted overwhelmingly for Barack Obama in 2008 and are very likely to do so again in 2012.

### A2: Independent Swing Voters Key - A2: Third Way Study/Eberly Ev

#### Swing voters are myth – our study is better than yours

**Abramowitz, 12**

(Alan, Senior Columnist, Center For Politics.org, Prof Poli Sci @ Emory, 4/12, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/are-independent-leaners-closet-partisans-or-true-independents/>)

A recent report from Third Way, a centrist Democratic think tank, criticized my research and that of other political scientists who have concluded that independent leaners — voters who identify themselves as independents but indicate that they usually feel closer to one political party or the other — are really closet partisans. The Third Way report, which relies almost entirely on data from a single three-wave panel survey conducted by the American National Election Study between 2000 and 2004, finds that these independent leaners have rather unstable party preferences and that independent Democrats in particular are not reliably Democratic voters. The implication of the report is that Democratic Party leaders and candidates need to adopt more centrist policies to appeal to this large group of swing voters. This is an important issue because according to almost all recent surveys, the large majority of independent voters lean toward one of the two major parties. In the 2008 American National Election Study, for example, about three-fourths of independent voters leaned toward a party, and the vast majority of those leaning independents voted for the candidate of the party they leaned toward. It is this sort of finding, repeated in many surveys of voters in many different elections, that has led political scientists, including myself, to conclude that most independent leaners are closet partisans rather than true independents. And, indeed, there are good reasons to be skeptical about the conclusions of the Third Way study. First, the 2000-2002-2004 panel survey was based on a rather small sample of voters. Moreover, it was a sample that was skewed in a Republican direction. For example, in the 2004 wave of the survey, George W. Bush defeated John Kerry by a margin of 12 percentage points, far larger than Bush’s actual margin of less than three percentage points. And the 2000-2002-2004 era was marked by an overall shift in American public opinion toward the Republican Party in the aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks. Even so, 71% of those who identified themselves as independent Democrats in 2000 continued to identify with the Democratic Party four years later, not very different from the 73% of independent Republicans who continued to identify with the Republican Party. Fortunately, though, we do not have to rely on one panel survey done at one particular moment in American political history to examine the stability of party identification in the electorate. In 2008-2009 the ANES conducted another panel survey, this one encompassing multiple waves during the course of the 2008 campaign and afterwards. This panel survey also included about twice as many respondents as the 2000-2002-2004 survey. And the results of the 2008-2009 survey provide strong support for the conclusion that leaning independents are indeed more like closet partisans than like true independents.

### A2: Labor Unions Key

#### Times Have Changed – labor unions lack election influence

**Jasinowski, 12**

(Jerry Jasinowski, an economist and author, served as President of the National Association of Manufacturers for 14 years and later The Manufacturing Institute, Political Machine, 6/8, lexis)

Second, the attempt to recall Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, in which the Democrats invested tremendous time and resources, was a flop. Walker won decisively. Organized labor is probably the largest and most influential sector in the Democratic alliance, and public sector unions are the most influential sector of organized labor. But labor took a whipping. It is now clear that many voters believe public sector employees are better off than private sector employees and wield too much influence. The vote in Wisconsin suggests most voters are receptive to the Republican message that public sector unions need to be reined in and budget deficits reduced. This will spread to other states like Ohio and Florida. And third, there is a growing consensus that President Obama will have to trim his sails and cooperate with Congressional Republicans on extending the Bush tax cuts. The President has made taxing the rich a pillar of his campaign rhetoric, but the pressure on him is building. Even former President Bill Clinton has weighed in in favor of renewing the tax cuts. Everyone knows we have to bring the deficit down, but as Great Britain has demonstrated, too much austerity too fast will abort economic growth and leave an even bigger deficit in its wake. It's a long time until November, but this week will surely cause the White House to reassess its campaign strategy, as it should.

#### Labor unions NOT key to the election -- declining membership and weak clout and it’s going to get worse

**Washington Post, 12**

Washington Post, “The End of Unions?” 6-11-2012 (http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/post/the-end-of-unions/2012/06/11/gJQAngBhTV\_blog.html)

Over the last several decades, unions have increasingly fallen out of favor with the American public. While Gallup polling showed 72 percent approved of unions in 1936 and 60 percent did in 2007, that number has since dipped below 50 percent. That means that, when these unions are embattled, there are fewer people ready to stand up for them. The result, as we saw in Wisconsin and on ballot measures in San Jose and San Diego [stripping public employees of pension benefits](http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/voters-in-san-diego-san-jose-back-cutting-pensions-for-public-workers-in-early-returns/2012/06/06/gJQAdzzTHV_story.html), is that efforts to fight back don’t have as much might behind them. The [same Gallup poll](http://www.gallup.com/poll/149279/approval-labor-unions-holds-near-low.aspx) in August showed that 55 percent of Americans thought unions would be weaker in the future than they are today, versus 20 percent who thought they’d be stronger. Americans aren’t fortune-tellers, of course, but they can spot a trend. And lastly – and perhaps most importantly – union membership continues to decline. While about one-quarter of Americans were in unions in the 1960s, that number has fallen by half, to just 11.8 percent in 2011. While 37 percent of public sector employees belong to a union, just 7 percent of private sector employees are still in unions — a reversal of the historical balance between the too. The public sector union’s lifeline, though, is the will of the public itself. While Americans may be less approving of unions than they were in the past, they are still in favor of the concept of unions. A [Fox News poll](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/03/18/fox-news-poll-concerned-public-employee-unions-influence/) conducted after the brouhaha in Wisconsin early last year showed that 60 percent of Americans said unions are necessary to protect workers. And when Ohio’s Republican governor stripped his public employees of collective bargaining rights, voters overturned that decision with a ballot amendment; so it’s not like unions haven’t notched any wins in the last couple years. When you combine that with the fact that about half of Americans still approve of unions (52 percent approve, 42 percent disapprove in the most recent Gallup poll), it’s not hard to see how they will stick around. The question for now seems to be what role they will play. The election in Wisconsin was certainly an embarrassment for unions – capped off by the concurrent votes in San Jose and San Diego and the fact that [nearly half of people who live with union members](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CAsQqQIwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.washingtonpost.com%2Fblogs%2Fthe-fix%2Fpost%2Fwisconsin-recall-union-voters--union-households%2F2012%2F06%2F06%2FgJQA3l6VHV_blog.html&ei=ZnDVT4CODOTC6AGuxYH8Ag&usg=AFQjCNFKmYRPlZyutRAvyr8hjmvxg6n7Kg) voted for Walker. It may also have the unhelpful effect of making other Republican governors and legislatures bolder in their efforts to fight unions. And as we saw in Wisconsin, [it doesn’t take much to cause union membership to take a nosedive](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304821304577436462413999718.html).

#### Labor unions not key -- lack political muscle

**Cassata, 12**

Donna Cassata, Associated Press, “After Wisconsin Recall Defeat, Labor Unions Have to Play More Defense in Other States,” Printed in the Coshocton Tribune, 6-7-2012 (http://www.coshoctontribune.com/article/20120607/NEWS01/206070304/After-Wisconsin-recall-defeat-labor-unions-may-play-more-defense-other-states)

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Gov. Scott Walker's definitive victory in Wisconsin's recall election is reverberating in other state capitals. It exposed the shrunken political muscle of the unions that tried to oust him, underscoring their vulnerability to attacks from the right and inability to retaliate. Republicans in some nearby states where anti-union measures failed this year said they plan to use Walker's victory to mount renewed efforts in 2013. Instead of ejecting the Republican who slashed state and local government workers' job benefits and bargaining rights, the union-instigated recall has made Walker a heroic model for conservatives five months before the November election. "I think it's bad news for the labor movement," said John Russo, a labor studies professor at Youngstown State University. "It gives the impression they are not as strong as they once were, which they are not."

### Latin Voters Key

#### ( ) Latin Vote key to the general election

**Smith ‘12**

Adam C. Smith, Tampa Times Political Editor, Politico, May 6th – http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/75949.html#ixzz1xKvkkz6v

Hispanic voters hold key to 2012 Electoral College map At a private fundraising reception in Palm Beach recently, Mitt Romney was overheard acknowledging his weakness among Hispanic voters. If it’s not turned around, he said, “It spells doom for us.” Take a look at the electoral map, and you’ll see why. President Barack Obama starts the general election with a sizable electoral vote lead over Romney, looking strong in states totaling 247, while Romney has a strong edge in states totaling 191. It takes 270 to win. And if Romney can’t narrow Obama’s considerable lead among Latino voters, key battlegrounds including Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado and Florida could be out of reach for the Republican nominee. Even reliably Republican Arizona could wind up in play, and Obama already has five campaign offices there. “It’s about holding down the margins,” said Nathan Gonzales, deputy editor of the nonpartisan Rothenberg Political Report. “Romney doesn’t need to get a majority of Hispanics nationwide, but he has to avoid getting swamped by Obama among Hispanic voters.”

### Unregistered Voters Key

#### Unregistered voters key – can be persuaded to turnout and swing critical states for obama

**Abramowitz, 6/7/12**

Alan I. Abramowitz, Senior Columnist, Center for politics, 6/7/12 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/>

In addition to swing voters, there is another group in the electorate whose behavior has the potential to influence the outcome of a close presidential election — voters who are not currently registered. In fact, according to the Gallup battleground state poll, there were almost twice as many unregistered voters as undecided registered voters in these 12 states. Not only did unregistered voters outnumber swing voters, but their characteristics and political attitudes were very different from those of swing voters and registered voters as can be seen in Table 2. Unregistered voters were disproportionately young and nonwhite and, in marked contrast with swing voters, they had more favorable opinions of Barack Obama’s job performance than registered voters. Most importantly, when asked about their presidential candidate preference, unregistered voters chose Obama over Mitt Romney by a better than two-to-one margin. These findings suggest that the Obama campaign would be well advised to focus its efforts in these 12 battleground states on voter registration and turnout. However, unregistered voters, like swing voters, tend to be rather unenthusiastic about voting. Getting them registered and to the polls could be challenging. But while unregistered voters in general were rather unenthusiastic about voting, unregistered Obama supporters were considerably more enthusiastic about voting than unregistered Romney supporters. This can be seen very clearly in Table 3. Fifty-nine percent of unregistered Obama supporters were at least somewhat enthusiastic about voting compared with only 34% of unregistered Romney supporters. These results suggest that a strategy that emphasizes voter registration and turnout could pay significant dividends for the president’s reelection campaign in the swing states.

### Women Voters Key

#### Women Voters Key

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/19, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12401>)

The relevance of all of this comes through when you look at key demographic breakouts from the trial heat between Obama and Romney. Overall, Obama led among women by 13 points: 53 percent to 40 percent. Romney was ahead among men by 6 points: 50 percent to 44 percent. Given that women generally make up 51 to 52 percent of the electorate, whenever Republican candidates lose women by more than they win among men, they can skip ordering the champagne for election night. In all but the most unusual cases, a Republican needs to win among men by a wider margin than a Democrat does among women. But it gets really interesting when you break the genders down by age: under 50 versus over 50. Among all women 50 and older, Obama beat Romney by 7 points, 50 percent to 43 percent. Among all women under 50, though, Obama prevailed by 18 points, 56 percent to 38 percent. That’s an 11-point difference in the president’s lead between the younger and older groups of women. Among men, Obama actually led among those under 50 by 1 percentage point: 47 percent to 46 percent. But Romney prevailed among men 50 and older by 11 percentage points, 53 percent to 42 percent. So, a 12-point difference in Obama’s standing between the younger and older men. When you make the same comparisons among just white voters, the contrast is even starker. Romney’s support came overwhelmingly from white men, a group he carried by 26 points, 60 percent to 34 percent. In comparison, the Republican had an advantage of just 5 points among white women, 49 percent to 44 percent. The age difference among white women was considerably less important than that among all women. Among white women 50 and older, Romney defeated Obama by 7 points, 50 percent to 43 percent. Among white women under 50, he won by 3 points, 48 percent to 45 percent, for only a 4-point difference between younger and older groups of women. Among white men, Romney won the under-50 cohort by 13 percentage points, 53 percent to 40 percent. Among white men 50 and older, he prevailed by 27 percentage points, 61 percent to 34 percent. That’s a 14-point difference. Taking all of this into consideration and then adding that Obama led by 40 points among Hispanic voters, 67 percent to 27 percent, and by 93 points among African-Americans, 95 percent to 2 percent, it’s clear that, assuming these groups turn out in numbers approaching 2008, it’s women under 50 who are the demographic that either will or won’t put Obama over the top in the general election.

## \*\*\*Internals – Key States\*\*\*

### A2: X Swing State Key - General

#### Swing states are a myth – overall support is key – elections determined by “uniform swings”

**Bernstein, 12**

Jonathan Bernstein is a political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post, Star Tribune, 6/9, <http://m.startribune.com/opinion/?id=158323795&c=y>)

Five myths about swing states Much of what we think we know about these key states has been knocked down by political science research. Swing states: Pundits love to talk about them, and candidates lavish attention on them. Sometimes it seems that the nominees are running for president of the United States of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Florida, and that the rest of us are just spectators. But much of what we think we know about these key states, which switch party allegiances with some frequency, has been knocked down by political science research - and sometimes, by recent history. Here are a few misperceptions about these in-demand states. 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.

#### National polls more accurate than “battleground state by state” polls

**Bernstein, 12**

Jonathan Bernstein is a political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post, Star Tribune, 6/9, <http://m.startribune.com/opinion/?id=158323795&c=y>)

But much of what we think we know about these key states, which switch party allegiances with some frequency, has been knocked down by political science research - and sometimes, by recent history. Here are a few misperceptions about these in-demand states. 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 three 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. Granted, political junkies like me won't be able to stop themselves from peeking at what the Des Moines Register thinks is happening in the Hawkeye State. But if we're smart, we'll look at the national polls to find out what's really going on.

#### Key swing states are a myth

**Bernstein, 12**

Jonathan Bernstein is a political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post, Star Tribune, 6/9, <http://m.startribune.com/opinion/?id=158323795&c=y>)

Republicans can't win without Ohio. 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.

#### Can’t predict what key swing states will be – recent history proves

**Bernstein, 12**

Jonathan Bernstein is a political scientist who contributes to the Washington Post, Star Tribune, 6/9, <http://m.startribune.com/opinion/?id=158323795&c=y>)

It's true that some states will perpetually be competitive, but over time, some experience significant changes. West Virginia, for instance, went from being one of the strongest Democratic states in 1980 to being one of the strongest Republican states now. It's very hard to know in advance, certainly until the last few weeks of the campaign, what the key swing states - the ones that will truly determine the winner - will turn out to be. The best illustration of that is to note which states have been closest to the national margin of victory in the past few elections. For example, when Obama won by seven percentage points in 2008, which state results most closely matched that number? Those states would have determined the winner, had the electoral college count been very narrow. The five states closest to the overall margin of victory in 2008 were Virginia, Iowa, New Hampshire, Florida and Minnesota. In 2000, they were Oregon, Iowa, New Hampshire, New Mexico and Florida; and in 2004, they were Pennsylvania, Nevada, Ohio, Michigan and Minnesota. That's 11 states over three cycles, including completely different sets in 2000 and 2004. Sure, we don't expect solidly Republican Wyoming or solidly Democratic Vermont to be competitive. But the past three cycles show that we can't know right now whether the state that puts Romney or Obama over the top will be Colorado, Ohio, or any of a dozen or more possibilities.

### Virginia Key

#### Virginia Key – outweighs other “swing” states

**Sabato, 12** (Larry, UVA Center For Politics, 4/26, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/plan-of-attack-obama-romney-and-the-electoral-college/>)

Would winning Ohio guarantee the presidency for Romney? Not necessarily. Richard Nixon won Ohio in 1960 but lost the presidency (just like Dewey in 1944). When Nixon in 1968 won his first presidential victory, his winning coalition was built on three big-state pillars: California (40 electoral votes) and Ohio and Illinois (both with 26 electoral votes). Ohio is now down to 18 electoral votes as its population growth has sagged. It remains a prize, but Obama has paths to victory without it. One way of looking at this election is this: Obama took 52.87% of the popular vote in 2008, which was the best performance in the popular vote by a Democrat since 1964. In 23 of the 28 states he won (plus DC), Obama won a greater percentage of the vote than he did nationally. Conveniently for Obama, if he simply retains the states where he ran better than he did nationally, he will take 272 electoral votes — two more than necessary. This scenario assumes that Romney garners all 22 of John McCain’s states, plus Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Ohio and Virginia. Of all the states in 2008, Virginia (52.63% for Obama) came closest to matching the president’s national average. If one assumes that Obama can keep all of his overperforming states from 2008 minus New Hampshire — the fickle state next door to the one where Romney was governor — then the election comes down to Virginia, not to Ohio. Indeed, it’s not hard at this early point to imagine Romney winning Florida and/or Ohio but still losing the election. It is also easy to imagine Obama losing overall if he can’t win the Old Dominion, which gave Obama a considerably larger share of its 2008 votes than did Florida or Ohio.

#### Virginia is the key

**Silver, 12**

Nate, 6/7, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/>

The model suggests that the campaigns might do best to concentrate their resources. As much as campaign operatives love to talk about how they are expanding the map, contemplating unusual parlays of states in which they reach 270 electoral votes, the election is very likely to come down to a mere handful of states. In many ways, the relative ordering of the states is more predictable than how the election as a whole will play out. The term the model uses for these key states is tipping point states, meaning that they could tip the balance between winning and losing in an election that came down to the final vote. Foremost among these tipping point states are Ohio and Virginia. In 2008, both states had a very slight Republican lean relative to the rest of the country. However, the economy is comparatively good in each state, and Mr. Obama’s polling has held up reasonably well in them, putting them almost exactly in balance. Mr. Obama is given just slightly over 50 percent odds of winning each one, just as he is given a very slight overall lead in our national projection. But if Mr. Obama’s national standing slips, he would probably lose his lead in those states as well.

### Florida Key

#### ( ) Florida is key to the election

**Falconer ‘11**

(Matthew Falconer is a member of the statewide Workforce Florida board of directors. The Workforce Florida Board seeks to improve workforce issues – Florida Political Press – http://www.floridapoliticalpress.com/2011/08/21/election-2012-and-the-swing-states/)

Many Democrats feel Obama is a lock to win reelection. History has shown most incumbent presidents win reelection. The economy and the 2010 election suggest a Republican victory. But the presidential election of 2012 will come down to “swing states.” It is a numbers game. The winner of the United States presidency needs 270 “electoral votes.” The number of votes each state receives is based on population. Because of the large populations in coastal cities the Democrats have a “base” of approximately 215 electoral votes. In that group are Wisconsin and Minnesota that can go Republican. The Republicans have a “base” of 155 electoral votes. This means they need to win most of the swing states to take back the White House. These swing states include; Florida (29), Ohio (18), Pennsylvania (20), Iowa (6), Virginia (13), North Carolina (15), Georgia (16), Oregon (7), Nevada (6), Arizona (11), New Mexico (5) and Colorado (9). This group represents 155 electoral votes. Obama needs just 55 and the Republicans need 115. For the sake of this analysis let’s assume the parties split Pennsylvania and Ohio, and Virginia and North Carolina. Nevada and Colorado lean left so these four victories give the Democrats 50 electoral votes. We know anything can happen because Reagan won 49 states. With the economy on the brink and “hope” is becoming “despair” the Democrat base is in jeopardy. But given the electoral math it is difficult to see the Republicans winning back the White House without a victory in Florida. The biggest swing state is the biggest prize in 2012 and will decide the fate of our nation.

### A2: Florida Key

#### Florida Not Key and Not a Swing State – Polls don’t account for more advanced factors

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 6/7/12,chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/)

Taken by itself, however, Florida may be a less valuable prize than usual. Right now, the polls there show almost an exact tie. But the model views Florida as leaning toward Mr. Romney, for several reasons. First, the polls showing a tie there were mostly conducted among registered voters rather than likely voters. Republicans typically improve their standing by a point or two when polling firms switch from registered voter to likely voter polls, probably because Republican voters are older, wealthier, and otherwise have demographic characteristics that make them more reliable bets to turn out. The model anticipates this pattern and adjusts for it, bolstering Mr. Romney’s standing by a point or two whenever it evaluates a registered-voter poll. In addition, the fundamentals somewhat favor Mr. Romney in Florida. The state has been somewhat Republican-leaning in the past, and its economy is quite poor. Mr. Romney has raised more money than Mr. Obama there, and its demographics are not especially strong for Mr. Obama. The model considers these factors in addition to the polls in each state. In the case of Florida, they equate to Mr. Romney having about a 60 or 65 percent chance of winning it, and Mr. Obama probably has easier paths to 270 electoral votes.

#### Florida not key – dems won’t even try to compete

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, The Cook Political Report, National Journal, 6/8, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12599>)

Everyone who avidly follows politics has his or her own list of the true “swing states” in this presidential election. The lists that really matter, however, are the ones kept by top strategists for the Obama and Romney campaigns, and the ones kept by the one large Democratic and five Republican-oriented super PACs and by other major presidential advertisers this year. Figures compiled by Elizabeth Wilner of Kantar Media’s Campaign Media Analysis Group show that, beginning on April 10—the day Rick Santorum dropped his presidential bid, effectively making Mitt Romney the Republican nominee—and through May 29, there have been 63,793 television spots run in 57 out of the nation’s 210 media markets. CMAG figures look at all broadcast and cable, national, and local television ads in each of those 210 media markets. They are analyzed by CMAG’s staff and divided by the number of Electoral College votes that each state has. Nevada ranked first with $677,332 per Electoral College vote. Iowa came in second with $496,088, and Ohio was third with $467,068. In fourth place was Virginia with $331,680, followed by Colorado with $313,653. New Hampshire came in sixth with $283,342, and North Carolina came in seventh with $237,329. In eighth and ninth places, respectively, were Pennsylvania at $204,670 and Florida at $101,107. These data potentially call into question the Romney campaign’s seriousness about contesting Pennsylvania and about how long Democrats plan to compete for Florida.

#### ( ) Florida no longer key to the election

**Harkleroad ‘12**

Stephen Harkleroad, creator of Crank Crank revolution – a political blog – “Some Early Electoral Math” – Crank Crank Revolution – June 6, 2012 – http://www.crankcrankrevolution.com/2012/06/some-early-electoral-math.html

Let's take a look at the past three elections. We can't go much further back than that, since the political landscape has changed too much to read too far back than that. (One can certainly argue that the landscape has changed simply between 2004 and 2008, but given how the polls look I'm not willing to make that bet quite yet--it seems reasonably clear that 2008 was a spike in Democratic support as opposed to a meaningful realignment, especially given the gains Republicans made in 2010.) By looking at the margin of victory of each candidate the top swing states are (in order of swinginess): Florida Ohio Iowa Missouri New Hampshire Wisconsin New Mexico Minnesota Pennsylvania Nevada Everything from Florida to Wisconsin has an average of less than 5% margin of victory per year. The math here's a little wonky, I realize, but we have to go with what we have. The list would look a lot different if we lopped off 2008; in fact, one of the surprising things looking at the list is how close the 2004 election really was. States that are a given for Obama this year were almost lost by Kerry that year--for example, Kerry won Oregon by only 4%, despite the fact that Obama won it by almost 17%. The same stats apply in Michigan--Kerry won by around 4%, but Obama carried it by 17%. Even in Wisconsin, Kerry won by .3%, while Obama ran away with 14%. (A lot of the percentages are going to be deceptively strong for Obama. There's no way he wins North Carolina again, even though he won by a comfortable margin. The violent reaction in the 2010 congressional elections confirmed that the few states who flipped to Obama, like Indiana and NC, aren't going to be easy for him this time around.) If the factors that made 2008 so different no longer really apply--if the same enthusiasm that propelled Obama to office four years ago fades and everything reverts back to 2004 levels--then the number of swing states will dramatically increase, probably to over 15 or so. States currently assumed to be safe now become in play; If, say, Pennsylvania (a state Kerry won with barely 3% but Obama won with 10%) suddenly is in contention, a whole new set of math becomes apparent, and Florida is no longer necessary.

#### ( ) Florida is not key to the election

**Smith ‘11**

Adam C. Smith, Tampa Times Political Editor, October 11, 2011 – http://www.tampabay.com/news/politics/national/the-tricky-2012-math-for-president-barack-obama/1196157

There's good news for President Barack Obama as he sweeps into Florida today to raise money in a state where barely four in 10 voters approve of his performance: He can lose Florida's 29 electoral votes and still comfortably win re-election in 2012. Thanks to the expanded political playing field he helped create three years ago, even a long-standing presidential election axiom — whoever wins two out of three between Florida, Pennsylvania and Ohio wins the White House — is out the window. Obama could lose all three of those mega battleground states, 67 electoral votes combined, and still have more than enough to win the required 270. That's because in 2008, Obama overwhelmingly won the electoral vote, 365 to John McCain's 173.

#### Florida Not Key

**Sabato, 12** (Larry, UVA Center For Politics, 4/26, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/plan-of-attack-obama-romney-and-the-electoral-college/>)

Would winning Ohio guarantee the presidency for Romney? Not necessarily. Richard Nixon won Ohio in 1960 but lost the presidency (just like Dewey in 1944). When Nixon in 1968 won his first presidential victory, his winning coalition was built on three big-state pillars: California (40 electoral votes) and Ohio and Illinois (both with 26 electoral votes). Ohio is now down to 18 electoral votes as its population growth has sagged. It remains a prize, but Obama has paths to victory without it. One way of looking at this election is this: Obama took 52.87% of the popular vote in 2008, which was the best performance in the popular vote by a Democrat since 1964. In 23 of the 28 states he won (plus DC), Obama won a greater percentage of the vote than he did nationally. Conveniently for Obama, if he simply retains the states where he ran better than he did nationally, he will take 272 electoral votes — two more than necessary. This scenario assumes that Romney garners all 22 of John McCain’s states, plus Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Ohio and Virginia. Of all the states in 2008, Virginia (52.63% for Obama) came closest to matching the president’s national average. If one assumes that Obama can keep all of his overperforming states from 2008 minus New Hampshire — the fickle state next door to the one where Romney was governor — then the election comes down to Virginia, not to Ohio. Indeed, it’s not hard at this early point to imagine Romney winning Florida and/or Ohio but still losing the election. It is also easy to imagine Obama losing overall if he can’t win the Old Dominion, which gave Obama a considerably larger share of its 2008 votes than did Florida or Ohio.

### A2: North Carolina Key

#### North Carolina not key

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 6/7/12, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/)

Other states that are sometimes considered battlegrounds are even less likely to swing the national outcome. Mr. Obama has only about a 30 percent chance of carrying North Carolina again, according to the model. In the instances where he does, it will most likely come along for the ride only after Mr. Obama has already accumulated enough electoral votes elsewhere to win another term.

### Ohio Key

#### Ohio Key

**Silver, 12**

Nate, 6/7, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/>

The model suggests that the campaigns might do best to concentrate their resources. As much as campaign operatives love to talk about how they are expanding the map, contemplating unusual parlays of states in which they reach 270 electoral votes, the election is very likely to come down to a mere handful of states. In many ways, the relative ordering of the states is more predictable than how the election as a whole will play out. The term the model uses for these key states is tipping point states, meaning that they could tip the balance between winning and losing in an election that came down to the final vote. Foremost among these tipping point states are Ohio and Virginia. In 2008, both states had a very slight Republican lean relative to the rest of the country. However, the economy is comparatively good in each state, and Mr. Obama’s polling has held up reasonably well in them, putting them almost exactly in balance. Mr. Obama is given just slightly over 50 percent odds of winning each one, just as he is given a very slight overall lead in our national projection. But if Mr. Obama’s national standing slips, he would probably lose his lead in those states as well.

#### Ohio is key and even tiny shifts change the outcome

**Hutchinson, 12**

Earl Ofari Hutchinson is an author and political analyst. He is a weekly co-host of the Al Sharpton Show on American Urban Radio Network. He is the author of How Obama Governed: The Year of Crisis and Challenge. He is an associate editor of New America Media. He is host of the weekly Hutchinson Report Newsmaker Hour heard weekly on the nationally network broadcast Hutchinson Newsmaker Network, Political Machine, 5/8, lexis

Obama simply can't afford a repeat of what happened in the Democratic primaries in 2008. In the Democratic primary in Ohio, Obama's Democratic rival Hillary Clinton beat him out and she did it mainly with white votes. But that wasn't the whole story. Nearly one quarter of whites in Ohio flatly said race did matter in voting. Presumably that meant that they would not vote for a black candidate no matter how politically attractive or competent he was. Four years later, the warning sign is still there that an undetermined number of white conservative Democrats have not relented one bit in their racial hostility to Obama. In recent interviews with Democratic voters in Ohio a small number flatly said they still wouldn't vote for him, and race was the reason. If even a small percentage of them meant it, that could result in a percentage point or two dropped from his Democratic vote total. This could be devastating in a state where the race is projected to be close and absolutely crucial for either Obama or Romney to win.

### Ohio – Swing Voters Key

#### Independent swing voters key in ohio

**Chicago Tribune, 12** (5/4, lexis)

Facing the reality of running their candidate as a bruised incumbent in a politically divided country, Obama's advisers say they are plotting a strategy that does not depend on a wave of support to lift the president's chances across the country. And it won't hinge on a single theme such as "change" that captured the zeitgeist in 2008. Instead, the Obama campaign is prepping for a block-by-block, hard-slog approach. The campaign, which the president kicks off this weekend, will be tailored to swing states and the key voters in those states. That means talking up the revival of manufacturing in Ohio. But in Virginia it means tapping into the growing suburban vote and using the state's GOP-controlled Legislature and Republican governor as a foil to energize female voters. "Each state's volunteers (will) help drive what is important for them to work on in that state," said campaign manager Jim Messina. Campaign advisers, however, stress that what voters in Columbus, Ohio, and Richmond, Va., hear from the president Saturday will not be inconsistent. "We are not the candidate who reinvents himself from week to week," David Axelrod, Obama's top campaign strategist, said in a dig at the GOP's Mitt Romney. Republicans, for their part, see this as an option of last resort for an incumbent who cannot run on his own record. "Overall, this will be a referendum on whether or not we want four more years of misery," said Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus. Even before the Obama campaign unveiled its national slogan, "Forward," its Ohio campaign had its own: "Made in Ohio." The slogan was rolled out on a media tour of auto manufacturing plants across northern Ohio -- a state he won by just 4 points in 2008. A message stressing manufacturing and the auto bailout is key in a state where the campaign must persuade skeptical independent voters to give the president another shot.

### A2: Ohio Key

#### Ohio Not key

**Sabato, 12** (Larry, UVA Center For Politics, 4/26, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/plan-of-attack-obama-romney-and-the-electoral-college/>)

Would winning Ohio guarantee the presidency for Romney? Not necessarily. Richard Nixon won Ohio in 1960 but lost the presidency (just like Dewey in 1944). When Nixon in 1968 won his first presidential victory, his winning coalition was built on three big-state pillars: California (40 electoral votes) and Ohio and Illinois (both with 26 electoral votes). Ohio is now down to 18 electoral votes as its population growth has sagged. It remains a prize, but Obama has paths to victory without it. One way of looking at this election is this: Obama took 52.87% of the popular vote in 2008, which was the best performance in the popular vote by a Democrat since 1964. In 23 of the 28 states he won (plus DC), Obama won a greater percentage of the vote than he did nationally. Conveniently for Obama, if he simply retains the states where he ran better than he did nationally, he will take 272 electoral votes — two more than necessary. This scenario assumes that Romney garners all 22 of John McCain’s states, plus Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Ohio and Virginia. Of all the states in 2008, Virginia (52.63% for Obama) came closest to matching the president’s national average. If one assumes that Obama can keep all of his overperforming states from 2008 minus New Hampshire — the fickle state next door to the one where Romney was governor — then the election comes down to Virginia, not to Ohio. Indeed, it’s not hard at this early point to imagine Romney winning Florida and/or Ohio but still losing the election. It is also easy to imagine Obama losing overall if he can’t win the Old Dominion, which gave Obama a considerably larger share of its 2008 votes than did Florida or Ohio.

### A2: Pennsylvania Key

#### Pennsylvania not a swing state

**Itkowitz, 12**

Colby Itkowitz, Washington Bureau, Morning Call, 5/5, <http://articles.mcall.com/2012-05-05/news/mc-pennsylvania-swing-state-presidential-20120505_1_pennsylvania-voters-obama-campaign-presidential-battlefield>

Still, early television ad buys — the most expensive and targeted campaign tool — have not been made in Pennsylvania. Last week the SuperPAC supporting Romney, Restore Our Future, bought television ad time in nine so-called "swing states," but not in Pennsylvania. Also last week, the Obama campaign began airing an attack spot on Romney in Ohio, Virginia and Iowa. Previously, Obama's team had placed ad buys in Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Ohio, Nevada and Virginia. Other SuperPACs have taken the same tack. The conservative Americans For Prosperity and American Crossroads have run ads in six to eight battlegrounds, but not Pennsylvania. The pro-Obama SuperPAC Priorities USA Action, aired ads in April in Ohio, Virginia, Florida and Iowa. Sean Trende, senior elections analyst for Real Clear Politics, which aggregates political news and polls, said in recent times Pennsylvania has tended to be a few points more Democratic than the nation overall. It makes sense that groups would make their early investments in states truly up for grabs, he said. For Romney, winning Pennsylvania would be "icing" — not a state Romney is looking at to get the 270 electoral votes needed to win the presidency, Trende said. On the flip side, "if Obama is fighting over Pennsylvania," Trende said, "it probably means he's losing the election."

### A2: Wisconsin Key

#### Wisconsin not a swing state

**Silver, 12** (Nate, 6/7/12, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/)

Likewise, although Republicans might be tempted to make a play for Wisconsin after winning the gubernatorial recall election there on Tuesday. The model suggests that it is over-hyped as a swing state. Mr. Obama has had a fairly consistent lead in the polls there, including in the exit poll among voters who turned out on Tuesday. Although Mr. Obama is unlikely to win Wisconsin by 14 points, as he did in 2008, all indications from the polls are that the state remains somewhat more favorable to him than the country as a whole, meaning that is not quite at the electoral tipping point and is more like Mr. Romney’s equivalent of North Carolina.

## \*\*\*Impacts – Solves Case\*\*\*

### Romney does plan

#### Romney will do plan – he can get GOP on board

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO, Soul of America, 1/25, <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

In that scenario, Romney is most likely to endorse the new Transportation bill to differentiate himself from Gingrich and Santorum. Despite flip-flopping, Romney remembers that significant Highway, transit and HSR investment and job creation (Boston Big Dig, Boston Transit and more Amtrak NEC) made a positive difference to jobs under his watch. If Romney is the leading GOP candidate by then, it would give air cover for more Congressional GOP to split from the Tea Party on Transportation funding.

### Obama does plan

#### Obama will do plan if he wins

**Levy, 12** (Alon, transportation commentator @ market urbanism and urbanophile, profiled in national review online as transportation expert, 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

I don’t think there’s much hope coming from the current Congress. Obama probably realizes it. Both the correct strategy and the strategy that the administration seems to be pursuing is to wait until 2013. Obama will probably win reelection, and if Gingrich manages to defeat Romney in the primary, then Obama will win by a considerably margin and probably get enough coattails to obtain a friendly Democratic Congress. In that situation, the Tea Party’s influence will drop to close to zero, and a transportation bill that includes nonzero money to local transit and to HSR becomes an option. At this stage even Romney looks vulnerable, but still less so than Gingrich.

## \*\*\*Impacts – General\*\*\*

### AT: No Impact- Just Campaign Rhetoric

#### Studies prove- campaign promises are enacted

Jonathan **Bernstein** is a political scientist who writes about American politics, especially the presidency, Congress, parties, and elections. Washington Monthly, Campaign Promises What they say is how they'll govern. Jan/Feb **12** <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/campaign_promises034471.php?page=2>, jj)

George W. Bush had a problem. As he prepared to sweep to his party’s presidential nomination with the endorsements of several GOP governors, and to run a moderate general election campaign against Al Gore, he didn’t need to worry about social conservatives, thanks to a solid record on their issues and a great story to tell about his personal path to religion. But his strongest opponent in the early going was publisher Steve Forbes, running on a flat tax platform. Bush had no particular record of exceptional orthodoxy on taxes, and of course that was an area in which being his father’s son was highly problematic, and therefore might have been vulnerable to attacks by Forbes. The solution was obvious, and for the U.S. budget, fateful: Bush ran on a radical regressive tax cut, thereby destroying the rationale for the Forbes campaign and leaving the Texas governor a clear path to the nomination. And, as everyone knows, that tax cut also became part of Bush’s general election campaign platform, and was eventually enacted into law in the massive 2001 and 2003 tax cuts—tax cuts that have set the terms of budget politics for the last decade. The lesson: we can be governed now by measures that were adopted years ago, in some cases decades ago, based on what some candidate said in reaction to the particular dynamics of some now-obscure nomination battle. Or, to be more blunt: presidents usually try to enact the policies they advocate during the campaign. **So if you want to know what** Mitt **Romney or the rest of the Republican crowd would do in 2013 if elected, the best way to find out is to listen to what they are saying right now**. I suspect that many Americans would be quite skeptical of the idea that elected officials, presidents included, try to keep the promises they made on the campaign trail. **The presumption is that politicians are liars who say what voters want to hear to get elected and then behave very differently once in office**. The press is especially prone to discount the more extreme positions candidates take in primaries on the expectation that they will “move to the center” in the general election. Certainly everyone can recall specific examples of broken promises, from Barack Obama not closing Gitmo to George W. Bush and “nation building” to, well, you may remember this from the Republican National Convention in 1988: And I’m the one who will not raise taxes. My opponent, my opponent now says, my opponent now says, he’ll raise them as a last resort, or a third resort. But when a politician talks like that, you know that’s one resort he’ll be checking into. My opponent won’t rule out raising taxes. But I will. And the Congress will push me to raise taxes, and I’ll say no, and they’ll push, and I’ll say no, and they’ll push again, and I’ll say, to them, “Read my lips: no new taxes.” **Political scientists**, however, **have been studying this question for some time, and what they’ve found is that out-and-out high-profile broken pledges like George H. W. Bush’s are the exception, not the rule**. That’s what two book-length studies from the 1980s found. Michael **Krukones** in Promises and Performance: Presidential Campaigns as Policy Predictors (1984) **established that about 75 percent of the promises made by presidents** from Woodrow Wilson through Jimmy Carter **were kept**. In Presidents and Promises: From Campaign Pledge to Presidential Performance (1985), Jeff **Fishel** looked at campaigns from John F. Kennedy through Ronald Reagan. What he **found** was that **presidents invariably attempt to carry out their promises;** the main reason some pledges are not redeemed is congressional opposition, not presidential flip-flopping. Similarly, Gerald **Pomper** studied party platforms, and **discovered** that **the promises parties made were consistent with their postelection agendas.** More recent and smaller-scale papers have confirmed the main point: presidents’ agendas are clearly telegraphed in their campaigns. Richard **Fenno’s studies** of how members of Congress think about representation **are relevant here**, even though his research is based on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. Fenno, in a series of books beginning with Home Style in 1978, has followed members as they work their districts, and has transcribed what the world looks like through politicians’ eyes. What he has found is that representatives and senators see every election as a cycle that begins in the campaign, when they make promises to their constituents. Then, if they win, they interpret how those promises will constrain them once they’re in office. Once in Washington, Fenno’s politicians act with two things in mind: how their actions match the promises they’ve made in the previous campaign; and how they will be able to explain those actions when they return to their district. Representation “works,” then, because politicians are constantly aware that what they do in Washington will have to be explained to their constituents, and that it will have to be explained in terms of their original promises. Of course, there’s more to it than that; at the presidential level, one of the key ways that campaigns constrain presidents is that **the same people who draft the candidate’s proposals usually wind up working on those same issue areas in the White House or the relevant departments and agencies, and they tend to be highly committed to the ideas they authored**. **And don’t sell short the possibility that candidates themselves are personally committed to the programs they advocate—either because those issues sparked their interest in politics to begin with** (and that’s why they were advocating them on the campaign trail), **or because it’s just a natural human inclination to start believing your own rhetoric**. So why are most Americans (and many members of the working press) so skeptical of campaign promises? One reason is that we tend to care a lot when promises are broken, and so those examples get a lot more attention than do the ones that are redeemed, which often can seem by the time they are finally acted on as foregone conclusions, not news. That’s especially true for the president’s strongest supporters, who are the most likely to be upset about a broken presidential promise, and “Democrats upset with Obama” or “Republicans upset with Bush” is more unexpected and therefore more newsy than when the other party attacks the president. Another reason is that the Madisonian system of checks and balances, especially in eras of frequent divided government, often yields situations in which a president may try hard to achieve a goal he campaigned for, only to be stymied by Congress. (And not just Congress: the bureaucracy doesn’t automatically implement even those initiatives that can be accomplished without legislation.) But given the media’s intense focus on the president at the expense of the rest of the system, activists often blame the president for falling short, rather than holding Congress or others responsible for blocking presidential initiatives. The result is that **people systematically underestimate the importance of positions taken on the presidential campaign trail.** For illustrations of this, it’s useful to look back on the last few elections, including at least one—the close 2000 election between George W. Bush and Al Gore—in which many pundits and voters (not to mention Ralph Nader) believed that it didn’t matter what happened. As it turned out, of course, some of the things that Bush did that Gore might not have done were only dimly predictable from the campaign. But in fact **the 2000 campaign was a good guide to many of Bush’s initiatives as president, from No Child Left Behind to his faith-based initiative to**, most notably, **his tax and budget preferences**. A look back at the Republican debates leading into the primaries makes that very clear. Republicans held a debate in Iowa in December 1999, just before the caucuses (this was the debate in which Bush was asked about his favorite philosopher, and he answered, “Christ”). Other than pandering to social conservatives, what did Bush promise to do if he was elected? **If we look at public policy issues mentioned in the debate, Bush supported the following: ethanol; trade agreements** as a key way of boosting the economy, including easier **trade with China; missile defense, and withdrawing from the ABM treaty; more military spending; and the status quo (but tougher) on drugs**. **These are all ideas he went on to support as president.** His proposed tax cuts were mentioned in that debate a few times, as well. **Particularly interesting**, I think, **was Bush’s rhetoric on missile defense:** “No, our country must not retreat. **We must not worry about what the Russians and Chinese think. What we need to do is lead the world to peace. And that’s exactly the kind of president I intend to be.**” **And it was exactly the kind of president he turned out to be, with regard to foreign policy—never worrying about what other nations thought, considering any type of accommodation or compromise an unacceptable “retreat,” and imagining the most bellicose actions, including, in this case, withdrawing from a treaty and building a new generation of weapons, to be “lead[ing] the world to peace.**” Things are not so different when one turns to Barack Obama. According to Politifact’s “Obameter,” **Obama made 508 separate promises during the campaign. Of these, he has fulfilled**, by the Obameter’s count, **158, or just under a third**—**everything from ordering the troop surge in Afghanistan to removing don’t ask, don’t tell to reforming health care to reducing strategic nuclear weapons**. **He has broken**, again according to Politifact’s count, **fifty-four promises, just over 10 percent**. But **even on these, such as failing to end the Bush tax rates for upper-income taxpayers and passing “card check” for unions, generally the story is that Obama wound up placing a low priority on some items and was defeated on them**. What I think is most telling is that **of the original 508 promises, only two—two!—are “not yet rated,” implying that there’s been no action at all.** What the Obameter is really telling us is the same thing that political scientists have found: **presidents certainly try to carry out their campaign promises, and they succeed in many cases**, although they’ll push harder on some things than on others, and they are sometimes defeated or forced to compromise. **Campaign promises set the presidential agenda**, even when they don’t tell you which items will pan out and which won’t. Let’s return to George H. W. Bush’s “kinder, gentler” speech, the one in which he made his (later broken) tax pledge. The first thing that’s notable about that speech is how few policy promises are contained in it; all candidates feature a lot of rhetorical flourishes in their convention speeches, but Bush’s was almost entirely composed of them. That in itself was a good predictor of his presidency, especially on the domestic side, in that Bush’s presidency was marked by passivity in domestic policy. But to the extent that he took policy positions, they were ideas on which he mostly followed through, from abortion to gun control to a vow to “make sure the disabled are included in the mainstream,” a pledge he redeemed by signing the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act. The discarded tax pledge, as it turned out, was clearly an exception. **So as you listen to Mitt Romney and the rest of the Republicans as they debate and make speeches and release policy papers, don’t assume that it’s all meaningless, empty rhetoric that will be dropped once the campaign is over and governing begins.** Don’t assume, either, that since the Republican nominee will no doubt move (rhetorically) to the center after clinching the nomination, specific pledges made in the primary season will be left behind—remember the story of George W. Bush and tax cuts. **The truth is that careful observation of the candidates really can tell us a good deal of what they’ll do—and what they’ll be like—as president.**

### AT: No GOP Agenda- Congress Blocks

#### GOP will greenlight any significant agenda iteam- will remove the filibuster

Thomas **Mann and** Norman **Ornstein** collaborated on this article. Mann is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. Ornstein is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. **2012** http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/features/congress034473.php

Yet even with this audacious victory, some items remain on the GOP agenda that simply couldn’t be wedged into a reconciliation bill. These include changes to Social Security, repeal of financial reform, possibly the full repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and the nomination of like-minded judges. To secure these measures, McConnell’s first option, of course, is to try to win over enough Democrats to get to sixty votes, or at least get enough Democrats to make the plan appear bipartisan. That is the route George W. Bush used with tax cuts in 2001, and Max Baucus’s willingness to accommodate Bush, despite the fact that the supporters in the end numbered fewer than sixty, made the use of reconciliation at that time seem less illegitimate. But two things have changed since 2001. First, back then filibusters were still relatively rare events; since Obama, they have become routine, applied to everything, big and small. Second, far fewer Democrats, Baucus included, will be willing to be used in this fashion now. So while there may be a few Democrats who move, far more than the forty necessary to sustain a filibuster are firm in their willingness to do so. Faced with that roadblock, McConnell’s only other choice is to try to limit the reach of the filibuster. He will not be eager to do this. Filibuster-empowered delay tactics such as holds have become the bread-and-butter means of exerting power by many senators on both sides of the aisle. But the Senate leader quickly finds himself under immense pressure from the Wall Street Journal editorial page, Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and others to throw caution to the wind. If McConnell can find fifty votes to pass through a bill that fundamentally alters the policy landscape, eviscerating or erasing health reform and financial regulation and changing Social Security and Medicare, and confirming a slew of forty-something conservative judges who will be on the bench for decades, there is a better-than-even chance that he would succumb to temptation and erase the filibuster rule by fiat. Would a President Romney, who, after all, has endorsed many of these elements in the course of his campaign, veto these bills? Not a chance. Would he be able, in his early days, to influence their content, perhaps by including in the Medicare plan a continuation of traditional Medicare as an option for seniors, and by adjusting the inflation levels for increasing the vouchers given to seniors? Maybe, especially since Ryan and Senator Ron Wyden announced a plan in December with those elements included. But it is very likely that Republican conservatives would seize their window of opportunity to enact at least semirevolutionary change.

#### If Romney wins Congress will be GOP enough to get his proposals done

Thomas **Mann and** Norman **Ornstein** collaborated on this article. Mann is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. Ornstein is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. **2012** http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/features/congress034473.php

President Obama obviously faces a difficult (though far from hopeless) battle for reelection. What is less obvious from reading campaign coverage at this point in the election cycle is that, if he fails, it is also unlikely that his party will be able to retain its Senate majority or retake the House. There are twenty-three Democratic-held Senate seats up for contest next November to only ten Republican. Record- low approval ratings for the GOP Congress may mean some Democratic pickups in the House. But GOP gains at the state level in 2010 have given them enough control in enough states to dominate redistricting in a way that has built firewalls around some of their most vulnerable House members. The rest comes down to turnout: if enough conservative voters show up at the polls to unseat Obama, chances are they will have the same advantage in doing damage to Democrats in Congress. If Obama loses, Republicans will probably control, if narrowly, both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue for the second time in a decade. When that last happened, under George W. Bush—with a nine-seat House majority and a tied Senate— the party succeeded in passing major tax cuts but failed to reduce the size of government or roll back the welfare state, despite riding into town on its usual small-government rhetoric. So too during the Reagan years, when the White House and the Senate (though not the House) were in Republican hands. During both these periods of GOP dominance, entitlement and other programs grew substantially.

## \*\*\*EPA Regs Internals\*\*\*

### No Romney EPA Rollback

#### Even if Romney and GOP win – dems block EPA rollback

**Star Ledger, 12** (6/3, <http://blog.nj.com/njv_editorial_page/2012/06/scary_times_for_environment_--.html>)

Yes, there are restraints on how bad this could get. Some of the EPA’s toughest regulations were put in place as a result of lawsuits. One example is the rule limiting mercury emissions from coal plants. New Jersey, in the pre-Christie era, was one of the states that filed that lawsuit. 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.

#### Romneys bluffing – its just a campaign tactic

**Star Ledger, 12** (6/3, <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."

### Yes Romney Roll Back

#### Romney win blocks EPA regs

**Williams, 12** (Jean, Environmental Policy, 5/31, Examiner, <http://www.examiner.com/article/a-romney-administration-would-intensify-the-world-s-climate-extremes>)

Nonetheless, a Mitt Romney presidency would strive for Republican control in congress and the senate, which would guarantee that carbon emissions management would grind to a halt. They have vowed to dismantle the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), because any laws that aim to guard water and air from the ramifications of greenhouse gas pollution is in direct opposition to GOP vested interests. Environmentalists believe the Republican Party is not concerned about the possibility of impending atmospheric destruction or the survival of planet Earth for future generations, but are essentially controlled by what corporate billionaires and big oil companies want for their daily existence now.

### EPA regs now/coming

#### EPA CO2 regs now and will massively expand

**Walsh, 11** (Bryan, senior writer for TIME magazine, covering energy and the environment,Time Magazine, 1/3, [http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2040485,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0%2C8599%2C2040485%2C00.html))

But the Obama Administration has a Plan B — and its already putting it into place. On Jan. 2, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) enacted what are the first regulations of major stationary sources of greenhouse gases. (While auto fuel-efficiency standards of the sort strengthened by President Barack Obama in 2009 essentially regulate mobile sources of greenhouse gases, the EPA has never tried to regulate major stationary sources such as power plants, refineries and factories.) The new rules will be modest at first, affecting only new plants or existing facilities that are undergoing major upgrades — perhaps 400 facilities will be affected initially. But eventually the EPA will be issuing regulations for nearly all sources of greenhouse gases — providing the only federal action to control U.S. carbon emissions. "We are following through on our commitment to proceed in a measured and careful way to reduce GHG pollution that threatens the health and welfare of Americans, and contributes to climate change," EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said in a statement late last month.

### 2NC A2: Dems block

#### EPA has discretion – doesn’t require congress

**Institute for 21st Century Energy, 9** (Institute for 21st Century Energy, US Chamber of Commerce, 4/21, http://energyxxi.org/sites/default/files/ClimateChange101.pdf

Massachusetts vs. EPA: Supreme Court decision that held that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority to regulate CO2 under the Clean Air Act from new automobile tailpipes if the agency finds that CO2 emissions endangers public health or welfare. However, the Court did not require EPA to regulate.

#### post EPA v mass decisions prove executive has discretion

**Fozard, ‘08**

Colette Fozard, attorneys of Bracewell & Giuliani, Energy Legal Blog, 11/21/08 (http://www.energylegalblog.com/archives/2008/11/21/1316)

In a noteworthy Clean Air Act decision in the wake of Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007), the Environmental Appeals Board (EAB) avoided the key question of whether carbon dioxide (CO2) is currently “subject to regulation” under the Clean Air Act (Act). In the Matter of Deseret Power Electric Cooperative, EAB App. No. PSD 07-03. (November 13, 2008). It appears that the decision is carefully designed to leave open for the next Administration the question of whether CO2 will be regulated under a key EPA permitting program. On the one hand, EAB sided with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), agreeing that EPA is not required to treat CO2 as “subject to regulation” for purposes of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permitting program. On the other hand, EAB found that EPA could exercise its discretion to treat CO2 as “subject to regulation,” and thus require permit limits for CO2 based on the “best available control technology” (BACT). Under the Bush Administration, EPA has made it clear that, for both legal and policy reasons, it does not want to treat CO2 as “subject to regulation” under the Act. The EAB found, however, that the Deseret permitting record was not adequate to support this position. It then remanded the permit back to the Agency with instructions that will make it very hard for EPA to respond to the remand until the new Administration takes office. In doing so, the EAB has created significant uncertainty for anyone planning to construct virtually any type of commercial building or industrial facility.

#### If Romney wins Congress will be GOP enough to block EPA regs

Kevin **Drum**, Blogger, Mother Jones,**1-17**-2012 <http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2012/01/president-romney-vs-president-obama-cage-match>

Karl Smith doesn't care if Mitt Romney is a liar, a cad, or a prick. He just wants to know what concrete things would be different under a Romney presidency compared to an Obama Presidency. My list is so conventional that I'm afraid it's pretty boring, but here goes. All of this is based on the assumption that if the electorate is pro-Republican enough to elect Romney, it will also be pro-Republican enough to give Republicans control of the Senate. Obamacare gets repealed via reconciliation. And even if that turns out not to be possible, it will be gutted enough to make it all but dead in practice. The judicial system gets packed with a lot more conservative, business-friendly judges. The Bush tax cuts are made permanent. Corporate tax rates are cut substantially. There's a slim chance that this would be done via a 1986-style tax reform bill that's a net positive, but since Republicans wouldn't need any Democratic help to pass it, probably not. The estate tax might very well be eliminated. Overall, for reasons of basic arithmetic, spending cuts will be much smaller than Romney and the GOP are promising, and the deficit will be substantially higher than it would be under Obama. We might stay in Afghanistan significantly longer than we would otherwise — though I'm not sure about this. Tightening of environmental regs would come to a halt. (Though it's unclear how much of the existing regulatory infrastructure would get rolled back. Probably not that much.) If another financial crisis hits, Romney would be very constrained in how he could deal with it. (So would Obama, but probably somewhat less so.) Although congressional Republicans will be less successful than they'd like at slashing social welfare programs, they'll still make some cuts. Life will get tougher for the poor. The NLRB would become toothless once again.

#### Even if rollback can’t occur – executive expansion to *future* harsh regulations are the real issue

**Walsh, 11** (Bryan, senior writer for TIME magazine, covering energy and the environment,Time Magazine, 1/3, [http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2040485,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0%2C8599%2C2040485%2C00.html))

But the Obama Administration has a Plan B — and its already putting it into place. On Jan. 2, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) enacted what are the first regulations of major stationary sources of greenhouse gases. (While auto fuel-efficiency standards of the sort strengthened by President Barack Obama in 2009 essentially regulate mobile sources of greenhouse gases, the EPA has never tried to regulate major stationary sources such as power plants, refineries and factories.) The new rules will be modest at first, affecting only new plants or existing facilities that are undergoing major upgrades — perhaps 400 facilities will be affected initially. But eventually the EPA will be issuing regulations for nearly all sources of greenhouse gases — providing the only federal action to control U.S. carbon emissions. "We are following through on our commitment to proceed in a measured and careful way to reduce GHG pollution that threatens the health and welfare of Americans, and contributes to climate change," EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said in a statement late last month.

### Ext – EPA has discretion

#### Congress can’t block – Post EPA Mass challenges to EPA discretion have failed

**Fozard, ‘08**

Colette Fozard, attorneys of Bracewell & Giuliani, Energy Legal Blog, 11/21/08 (http://www.energylegalblog.com/archives/2008/11/21/1316)

Highlights from EAB’s Decision EPA Region 8 issued a PSD permit to Deseret Power Electric Cooperative (Deseret) for a proposed waste-coal-fired electric generating unit planned at the existing Bonanza Power Plant in Utah. Deseret’s permit was subsequently challenged by the Sierra Club, which claimed that, in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in Massachusetts v. EPA, the permit was invalid because it did not include a CO2 emissions limit. In making its decision, the EAB parsed through a variety of arguments regarding textual and historical interpretations of the Act. Sierra Club’s challenge relied on sections 164 and 169 of the Act, provisions that prohibit the issuance of a PSD permit unless it includes a BACT emissions limit for “each pollutant subject to regulation under this Act.” With sections 164 and 169 in mind, Sierra Club pieced together its argument using (1) the Supreme Court’s ruling in Massachusetts v. EPA that CO2 is a “pollutant” as defined under the Clean Air Act; and (2) an argument that the CO2 “monitoring and reporting” requirements under section 821 of the Act constitute “regulation.” Thus, Sierra Club argued that CO2 should be considered a “pollutant” that is subject to “regulation.” On the other hand, EPA argued that “monitoring and reporting” requirements are not considered “regulation” and that deference should be given to its historical interpretations of the relevant provisions of the Act. In the end, the EAB found no Congressional intent in the Act that would require EPA to apply BACT to “pollutants” that are merely subject to “monitoring and reporting” requirements. The EAB also noted that in reconsidering its conclusions regarding CO2 BACT requirements, the EPA should be allowed to exercise discretion in interpreting what constitutes a “pollutant subject to regulation” under the Act. However, because the record did not support EPA’s current reasoning for failing to include a BACT limit for CO2 in the permit, the EAB remanded Deseret’s permit. In issuing the remand, the EAB noted that EPA has discretion to interpret the term “subject to regulation under the Act,” an interpretation that will determine whether BACT is required to limit CO2 emissions. The EAB noted in the closing paragraphs of its decision that it recognized the national implications this decision may have, and called for the EPA to consider whether “an action of nationwide scope” is required to address the issue.

### Ext – Dems won’t be able to block

#### EPA rollback efforts are close now – election will determine outcome

**McAuliff, 11**

Michael McAuliff was a Washington correspondent for the New York Daily News, where he covered Sen. Hillary Clinton, the 2008 presidential campaign, and the fight over the 9/11 health and compensation law. Before coming to the paper in 2003 as a national and metro desk editor, he was the national editor of ABCNews.com, Huffington Post, 10/9, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/10/09/epa-republican-war-defund_n_1000664.html>

For the moment, it will be difficult for many of the House's bills to get through the Senate, where Boxer plans to stop them. The White House also has promised vetoes of the measures. Still, once anti-EPA legislation is written, it can wind up attached must-pass bills, or at least used to try and embarrass Democrats. Thursday night, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) tried to attach a measure to a bill on Chinese currency manipulation that ostensibly aimed to stop the EPA from regulating farm dust. But the measure's language doesn't actually mention "farm dust" after its title. Instead, it targets soot regulation. Democrats successfully blocked it. More troubling to environmental advocates is that they see the attempts to roll back regulations as a sustained effort that will not go away, and likely could pick up steam -- especially if Republicans take back the Senate in 2012. "I think it certainly will continue through the 2012 election," said Goldston. "I think it's partly an attack on Obama but I think much is a broader part of a Tea Party effort to question the role of government in providing public health protections across the board and funding that." And he predicted the range of attacks would only get broader. "This can play out in spending; this can play out in the series of efforts to block any additional protections, not only in the clean air area, but more broadly, there are bills that have been pending in the house and the senate ... that would change the entire structure necessary to create protections," Goldston said. The anti-EPA campaign has born some fruit already for the GOP, with President Obama delaying planned new regulations of ozone and citing economic reasons. The political climate has left Democrats wary -- and concerned they could lose some battles -- but they also think the GOP could pay a price. Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.), chairman of the Water and Wildlife Subcommittee, expressed relief that so far lawmakers had successfully blocked EPA-targeted legislation in the Senate. But, he added, environmental protections remain vulnerable.

#### Some Dems will crossover and accept congressional restrictions on EPA

**Murray, 11** (James, Editor, Business Green, 4/7, http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2041506/senate-rejects-attempt-scupper-epa-greenhouse-gas-rules)

The Senate also rejected three Democrat amendments that would have watered down or delayed the EPA's new climate change rules, after Republicans refused to support proposals that they dismissed as "cover votes" that did not go far enough to limit the watchdog's power. However, GOP officials were quick to note that, with several Democrats from energy states voting for one or more of the amendments, in total 64 Senators voted for amendments calling for the scrapping or diluting of the EPA's emissions rules, suggesting that there is an appetite within Congress for a rethink on the administration's strategy.

### Obama Win = Cap + Trade

#### Obama win key to cap and trade

**Politico, 2011** <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.

## \*\*\*Obama Bad - EPA Regs Bad\*\*\*

### IMPACT: AGRICULTURE

#### EPA regulations 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%3A/Users/Dave/Documents/Macintosh%20HD%20250%3A/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%3A/Users/Dave/Documents/Macintosh%20HD%20250%3A/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.

#### US AG PRODUCTION KEY TO ECON, HEGEMONY, AND SOLVES GLOBAL HUNGER

**National Defense University 3** [Agribusiness Group Paper, Roundtable with 16 military leaders, http://www.ndu.edu/icaf/industry/reports/2003/pdf/2003\_AGRIBUSINESS.pdf]

 “Agribusiness is to the United States what oil is to the Middle East.” This single statement encapsulates the criticality of agribusiness to the United States - to our economy, our way of life, and our national Power, No other industry crosses such a broad and diverse constituency . everyone living in the US is touched by and benefits from agribusiness.
History demonstrates that a nation able to feed its own citizens is inherently stronger and thus able to provide a safer and more secure socicty. Convcrscly, a nation dcpendcnt on other nations for food is inherently more vulnerable and subject to the whims of external forces. Agribusiness is a key component of our national power, and is one of the few industries that produces net exports each year. Further, the abundance of American agriculture provides food for much of the world through our foreign aid and humanitarian assistance programs.Agribusiness is a source of great strength for our nation**.**

#### Causes Extinction and Turns Warming

**Lugar 4** (Richard G., U.S. Senator – Indiana and Former Chair – Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “Plant Power”, Our Planet, 14(3), http://www.unep.org/ourplanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe. Productivity revolution To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.

### EXT: REGS KILL ECON

#### EPA REGULATIONS TANK THE ECONOMY – snowball effect freaks out market.

**WSJ 9 [**“Business Fumes Over Carbon Dioxide Rule” – Dec 7 -- http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126013960013179181.html]

Officials gather in Copenhagen this week for an international climate summit, but business leaders are focusing even more on Washington, where the Obama administration is expected as early as Monday to formally declare carbon dioxide a dangerous pollutant. An "endangerment" finding by the Environmental Protection Agency could pave the way for the government to require businesses that emit carbon dioxide and five other greenhouse gases to make costly changes in machinery to reduce emissions -- even if Congress doesn't pass pending climate-change legislation. EPA action to regulate emissions could affect the U.S. economy more directly, and more quickly, than any global deal inked in the Danish capital, where no binding agreement is expected. Many business groups are opposed to EPA efforts to curb a gas as ubiquitous as carbon dioxide. An EPA endangerment finding "could result in a top-down command-and-control regime that will choke off growth by adding new mandates to virtually every major construction and renovation project," U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Thomas Donohue said in a statement. "The devil will be in the details, and we look forward to working with the government to ensure we don't stifle our economic recovery," he said, noting that the group supports federal legislation. EPA action won't do much to combat climate change, and "is certain to come at a huge cost to the economy," said the National Association of Manufacturers, a trade group that stands as a proxy for U.S. industry.

#### SPILLS OVER TO ALL SECTORS.

**Kreutzer and Campbell 8**. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

In addition to increasing the costs of energy use, regulating GHGs through the Clean Air Act will expand the EPA's authority to unprecedented levels. The ANPR will likely: Trigger the Prevention of Signifi cant Deterioration (PSD) program, which could require permits for large office and residential build ings, hotels, retail stores, and other similarly sized projects; Regulate the design of manufac turing plants; Regulate the design of airplanes; Lower speed limits below current levels; Impose speed restrictions on ocean-going freighters and tankers; Export economic activity to less-regulated coun tries, thereby compromising the U.S.'s ability to compete in the global economy; and Transform the EPA into a de facto zoning author ity, granting the agency control over thousands of previously local or private decisions, affecting the construction of schools, hospitals, and com mercial and residential development. These regulations are just a small sample of the areas into which the ANPR would expand the EPA's authority.

#### KILL COMPETITIVENESS AND JOBS.

**BRAVENDER 10**. [Robin, Greenwire writer, “16 Endangerment lawsuits filed against EPA before deadline” NYT -- Feb 17]

"If EPA moves forward and begins regulating stationary sources, it will open the door for them to regulate everything from industrial facilities to farms to even American homes," NAM President John Engler said in a statement. "Such a move would further complicate a permitting process that EPA is not equipped to handle, while increasing costs to the manufacturing sector. These costly burdens and uncertainty will stifle job creation and harm our competitiveness in a global economy."

#### Tanks the economy

-GDP hit

-short and long-term unemployment

- energy price spikes

**Kreutzer and Campbell 8**. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) foreshadows new regulations of unprecedented scope, magnitude, and detail. This notice is not just bureaucratic rumination, but could very well become the law of the land. Jason Grumet, a senior environmental advisor to Barack Obama, has promised that a President Obama would "initiate those rulings." These rulings offer the possibility of regulating everything from lawn-mower efficiency to the cruising speed of supertankers. Regardless of the chosen regulatory mechanisms, the overall eco nomic impact of enforced cuts in carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions as outlined in the ANPR will be equivalent to an energy tax. By expanding the scope of the 1990 amendment to the Clean Air Act (CAA), the EPA will severely restrict CO2 emissions, thereby severely restrict ing energy use.[[1]](%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn1) Specifically, the EPA would use the CAA to regulate emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) from a vast array of sources, including motor vehicles, boats and ships, aircraft, and rebuilt heavy-duty highway engines.[[2]](%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn2) The regulations will lead to significant increases in energy costs. Fur thermore, because the economic effect of the pro posed regulations will resemble the economic effect of an energy tax, the increase in costs creates a correspondingly large loss of national income. Using the CAA to regulate greenhouse gases will be very costly, even given the most generous assumptions. To make the best case for GHG regula tion, we assume that all of the problems of meeting currently enacted federal, state, and local legislation have been overcome.[[3]](%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn3)Even assuming these unlikely goals are met, restricting CO2 emissions by 70 per cent will damage the U.S. economy severely: Cumulative gross domestic product (GDP) losses are nearly $7 trillion by 2029 (in infla tion-adjusted 2008 dollars), according to The Heritage Foundation/Global Insight model (described in Appendix A). Single-year GDP losses exceed $600 billion (in inflation-adjusted 2008 dollars). Annual job losses exceed 800,000 for several years. Some industries will see job losses that exceed 50 percent.

### IMPACT: UNEMPLOYMENT

#### EPA REGULATIONS CAUSE MASSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT

**Kreutzer and Campbell 8**. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

Number of Jobs Declines. The loss of economic output is the proverbial tip of the economic iceberg. Below the surface are economic reactions to the leg islation that led up to the drop in output. Employ­ment growth slows sharply following the boomlet of the first few years. Potential employment (or the job growth that would be implied by the demand for goods and services and the relevant cost of capital used in production) slumps sharply. In 2015, regu lation-induced employment losses exceed 500,000; and they exceed that level for the remainder of the investigated period. Non-farm job losses peak at more than 800,000. Indeed, in no year after the boomlet does employment under the ANPR outperform the base line economy where these proposed regulations never become law. For manufacturing workers, the news is grim indeed. Employment will already be in decline due to increased labor-saving productivity: Our baseline shows that even with out additional job-killing regula tions, manufacturing employment will drop by more than 980,000 jobs. The ANPR accelerates this decrease substantially: Employ ment in manufacturing declines by an additional 22.6 percent or 2,880,000 jobs beyond the baseline losses. By 2029, several specific areas of the manufacturing industry will experience particularly harsh employment losses: Durable-manufacturing employ ment will decrease by 28 percent; Machinery-manufacturing job losses will exceed 57 percent; Textile-mills employment will decrease by 27.6 percent; Electrical-equipment and -appli ance employment will decrease by 22 percent; Paper and paper-product jobs will decrease by 36 percent; and Plastic and rubber products employment drops 54 percent. All employment declines described are in addi tion to those that occur in the baseline projections.

#### HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT GUARANTEES ECONOMIC CRASH.

**WRAY 9**. [L. Randall, PhD, Prof of Economics @ UMKC, Senior Research Scholar @ Levy Economics Institute, “When all else has failed, why not try job creation” -- http://neweconomicperspectives.blogspot.com/2009/11/when-all-else-has-failed-why-not-try.html]

The US continues to hemorrhage jobs even as some purport to see “green shoots”. All plausible projections show that unemployment will rise even if our economy begins to grow. Personally, I think those green shoots will die this winter because the stimulus package is far too small and because the financial system is going to crash again. The longer we wait to actually address the unemployment problem, the worse are the prospects for a real recovery. In his recent piece, Paul Krugman writes: Just to be clear, I believe that a large enough conventional stimulus would do the trick. But since that doesn’t seem to be in the cards, we need to talk about cheaper alternatives that address the job problem directly. Should we introduce an employment tax credit, like the one proposed by the Economic Policy Institute? Should we introduce the German- style job-sharing subsidy proposed by the Center for Economic Policy Research? Both are worthy of consideration. The point is that we need to start doing something more than, and different from, what we’re already doing. And the experience of other countries suggests that it’s time for a policy that explicitly and directly targets job creation.

### EXT: REGS KILL JOBS

#### EPA REGS WILL COST MILLIONS OF JOBS.

**LIEBERMAN 8**. [Ben, JD from George Washington Senior Policy Analyst in Energy and the Environment in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, The True Costs of EPA Global Warming Regulation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/bg2213.cfm]

Legislation designed to address global warming failed in Congress this year, largely due to concerns about its high costs and adverse impact on an already weakening economy. The congressional debate will likely resume in 2009, as legislators try again to bal ance the environmental and economic considerations on this complex issue. Meanwhile, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), pursuant to a 2007 Supreme Court decision, has initiated steps toward bypassing the legislative process and regulating greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act. The EPA's Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) is nothing less than the most costly, compli cated, and unworkable regulatory scheme ever pro posed. Under ANPR, nearly every product, business, and building that uses fossil fuels could face require ments that border on the impossible. The overall cost of this agenda would likely exceed that of the legisla tion rejected by Congress, reaching well into the tril­lions of dollars while destroying millions of jobs in the manufacturing sector.[[1]](#_ftn1) The ANPR is clearly not in the best interests of Americans, and the EPA should not proceed to a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and final rule based upon it.

### IMPACT: MANUFACTURING INTERNAL

#### REGULATIONS COLLAPSE THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR

**Kreutzer and Campbell 8**. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

Nevertheless, the net impact on a CO2-con strained economy is negative, since GDP is never higher than in the baseline scenario. Higher energy costs decrease the use of carbon-based energy in the production of goods, incomes fall, and demand for goods subsides. GDP declines in 2020 by $332 billion, in 2025 by $528 billion, and in 2029 by $632 billion. The aggregate income loss for the 20-year period is $6.8 trillion. All figures have been adjusted for inflation to reflect 2008 prices. This slowdown in GDP is seen more dramatically in the slump in manufacturing output. Again, the manufacturing industry benefits from the initial investment in new energy production and energy-efficient capital, but the manufacturing sector's declines are sharp thereafter. Indeed, by 2029, manufacturing output in this energy-sensitive sector will be 27 percent below what it would be if the ANPR proposals are never applied. In 2029, the manufacturing output is $1.48 trillion less than the baseline output; that is, when compared to the economic world without the CAA regulation of CO2. This is equivalent to losing more than 80,000 manufacturing firms. Aggregate manufacturing loss from 2010 to 2029 is $10.9 trillion.

### MANUFACTURING IMPACT – AUTO INDUSTRY

#### AUTO INDUSTRY MANUFACTURING KEY TO CONVENTIONAL READINESS.

**Gallagher 6** (Paul -- an economic analyst and editor for Executive Intelligence Review -- EIR – June 9th -- http://www.larouchepub.com/eirtoc/2006/eirtoc\_3325.html)

Auto production plants which are being idled in the United States this year and next—a total of nearly 80 million square feet of capacity full of very diverse and capable machine tools—are also being rapidly sold off at auctions, and their unmatched machine-tool capabilities lost to the national economy. Rather than simply being "idled" with the possibility of workforces returning and work resuming, these plants are disappearing under auctioneers' hammers almost as fast as they are shut down. A list of 65 major auto plants shutting down, and their capacities which may be lost, was featured in EIR, May 12, 2006 and in the LaRouche PAC pamphlet, Economic Recovery Act of 2006. The pattern of auctions, of which two examples are shown here, makes clear that the automakers and major auto supply producers, seeing at least 65-70 of their plants as unutilized capacity, do not plan or expect that capacity to come back into use for production of automobiles; rather, underutilization will continue to grow by outsourcing under conditions of rampant globalization. The pattern also presents a challenge to Congress to act fast to save this huge unutilized chunk of the auto sectors' machine-tool design and production capability, and use it for missions more urgent to the nation's economy than producing cars and light trucks to fill the ranks of lengthening traffic jams across the country. Lyndon LaRouche has proposed, and his LaRouche PAC is mobilized to get through Congress, a Federal Public Corporation to adopt the capacity the automakers are discarding, and use it to help build a new national infrastructure from high-speed rail lines to electric power. `No Longer Required' EIR's investigation shows that three major auto plants, closed within six months or less, were auctioned off in their entirety in the second half of May; and a fourth auction, in late April, sold off machinery for production of electrical systems from four different plants of Delphi Corporation: in Rochester, New York; Athens, Alabama; and Dayton and Moraine, Ohio. The complete plant contents auctioned were the General Motors transmission plant in Muncie, Indiana, hammered away in a three-day sale May 16-18; the metal stamping and machining plant known as "Chrysler machine," sold off in Toledo, Ohio on May 24-25; and the Delphi electrical systems plant in Irvine, California, auctioned on May 23. The Toledo plant's auction sale notice is shown in the illustration, marked "no longer required" by Chrysler. The featured machines in the sale included some of the largest and most capable metal presses used in the auto industry. The case of Muncie Manual Transmissions LLC, "one of the largest gear manufacturers in North America," is shown here in the auction company's brochure. Its illustrations make clear that most of the machines in this plant are quite new, built and bought since 1995. Virtually all of its machinery was auctioned off from May 16-18. "The building will be empty now," said one person present, and GM's plan is to demolish it immediately. That plant has some 600,000 square feet of production space, and had 300 remaining production workers before being closed. The workforce had recently used about 500 major machine tools in the plant; many had a replacement value of $500,000-1,000,000 each. All sold, according to the auction brochure, and the entire plant full of machinery apparently brought about $30 million. So a rough estimate might be that the machine tools were sold for 15 cents on the dollar of their replacement value for production. It is no secret that the purchasers at these auctions include other U.S. firms, scrap outfits, and foreign firms employing machine tools, including for production for export to the United States. People in the business indicate that the pace of these sales has been brisk for more than a decade; but the size of the auctions has definitely grown in the past two years or so, with large plants like this going under the hammer. "We also see a lot of aerospace tools" from Boeing and other companies, said one. As for the city of Muncie, it has been told to hope that the GM jobs that were lost, will be matched by new jobs gained—from a Sallie Mae "center for debt management"! Machine tools and productive skills will be "no longer required" there. Dissipation of Bankrupt's Assets In Delphi's case, a full 25 out of its 33 auto parts and supply plants in the country are on the management's list to close down or sell; in addition, others, like the Irvine electrical systems plant, have been closed in recent months. The management under CEO Steve Miller, who was brought in last year to declare the company bankrupt, are flouting the principles of bankruptcy by hiding the accounts of the company's outsourced foreign operations (already 75% of its total work!) while bankrupting and trying to liquidate only the U.S. capacity. On May 28, calls to the lawyers for parties contesting Delphi's filing in New York Federal bankruptcy court, found that with the exception of the UAW's lawyer, none of those attorneys was aware that the productive assets of the "bankrupt" company were being auctioned off. Sources say that the UAW has attempted to protest and stop the auctions of Delphi's plant and equipment in the court, but has been unable to do so. The attorney representing Delphi's shareholders said that the actions would not be permitted unless Delphi had sought and received permission from Judge Robert Drain to sell the machines. None of the attorneys knew whether Delphi had gotten Drain's approval, nor could this be learned from the judge's clerk. In any case, it is clear that the intention of Delphi's management is "globalization by bankruptcy," and that critical productive machinery of the "bankrupt" company is being dissipated—a violation of at least the spirit of the law—through auctions to other firms, other divisions, and other countries, because it does not intend to emerge from bankruptcy to produce again in the United States. And vital high-technology productive machine tools and other capacity of the U.S. national economy, essential for producing the infrastructure of productivity, are being lost. Had Congress already acted along the legislative lines LaRouche is calling for, this capacity could have been purchased by a Federal Public Corporation and saved for use in the critical purposes of building a new national economic infrastructure, and creating skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled employment. Another month's set of U.S. auto sales reports came in on June 2 and showed the urgent need to diversify the "product" of the auto industrial sector in this way, as it will not come back to building more autos for sale. Ford's U.S. sales through May are 3.3% below a year ago; Daimler-Chrysler's, 4.1% down; Ford-Volvo's 6.3% down; GM's, 4.6% down; Nissan's, 8.4% down. Toyota, Hyundai, and Mazda's sales are still up for the year, but the overall national trend is down. Total sales of cars and light trucks fell from a 16.7 million annual rate last May, to a 16.3 million rate this May, and the annual sales rate for January-May 2006 as a whole, is only 16.4 million units, compared to 16.9 million for all of 2005, and 17.1 million in 2004. Use It or Lose It International Association of Machinists president Thomas Buffenbarger charged in a Washington, D.C. speech May 15, "We have lost the ability to manufacture the means of our prosperity," and now Congress has given away "the ability of this country to defend itself" by outsourcing its machine-tool production in aerospace-defense and auto. Every week that Congress delays emergency legislation to save this remaining industrial power, more of it is lost, irretrievably. Auto skilled trades workers, machinists, and others among America's dwindling base of industrial production workers, realize that the loss of machine-tool and other skilled engineering employment in the United States, could end technological progress in our economy, and ruin our national security. In LaRouche PAC's one-hour documentary DVD on retooling and saving the auto industry, "Auto and World Economic Recovery," the auto unionists and Midwest elected officials interviewed all stressed the potential threat: The United States could find itself in a war, needing new munitions and related industrial production, with effectively all of our machine-tool design and production capability exported to other nations. These nations may not be allies, in part because of their exploitation by the very same low-wage outsourcing which made them the repositories of the machine tools now being auctioned off from Rochester, Toledo, and Irvine.

#### READINESS CHECKS NUCLEAR CONFLICT WITH CHINA AND OTHERS.

**Record 95** (JEFFREY prof , Department of Strategy and International Security @ USAF Air War College -- Parameters, Autumn, pp. 20-30. http://www.carlisle.army.mil/USAWC/parameters/1995/record.htm

In terms of training, sustainability, and weaponry, it is always better to be ready and modern than unready and obsolete. What Congress does not look at, because it is constitutionally incapable of doing so in a coherent fashion, is the broader and far more critical question: Ready for what? What exactly should we expect our military to do? Against whom do we modernize? Have we correctly identified future threats to our security and the proper forces for dealing with those threats? Are we breathlessly and blindly pursuing modernization for its own sake, or are we tying it in with the quality and pace of hostile competition? These are the questions I would like to address. Informed line-item judgments on readiness and modernization hinge on informed judgments at the level of strategy, whose formulation is the responsibility of the Executive Branch. Our present strategy portends an excessive readiness for the familiar and comfortable at the expense of preparation for the more likely and less pleasant. Introducing Realism Into Our Assessments The basis of present strategy is the Administration's Bottom-Up Review, a 1993 assessment of US force requirements in the post-Soviet-threat world. The assessment concluded, among other things, that the United States should maintain ground, sea, and air forces sufficient to prevail in two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies. For planning purposes the assessment postulated another Iraqi invasion of Kuwait (and Saudi Arabia's eastern province) and another North Korean invasion of South Korea--two large and thoroughly conventional wars fought on familiar territory against familiar Soviet-model armies. Congressional and other critics rightly point to disparities between stated requirements for waging two major wars concurrently and the existing and planned forces that would actually be available. Shortfalls are especially pronounced in airlift, sealift, and long-range aerial bombardment. Critics also note that the Bottom-Up Review more or less ignores the impact of Haiti- and Somalia-like operations on our capacity to fight another Korean and another Persian Gulf war at the same time. Few in Congress or elsewhere, however, have questioned the realism of the scenario. How likely is it that we would be drawn into two major wars at the same time? What are the opportunity costs of preparing for such a prospect? The prospect of twin wars has been a bugaboo of US force planners since the eve of World War II--the only conflict in which the US military was in fact called upon to wage simultaneously what amounted to two separate wars. Chances for another world war, however, disappeared with the Soviet Union's demise. Moreover, two points should be kept in mind with respect to World War II. First, the two-front dilemma came about only because of Hitler's utterly gratuitous declaration of war on the United States just after Pearl Harbor--a move that has to go down as one of the most strategically stupid decisions ever undertaken by a head of state. Had Hitler instead declared that Germany had no quarrel with the United States, and therefore would remain at peace with it, President Roosevelt would have been hard put to obtain a congressional declaration of war on Germany, or, with one, to pursue a Germany-first strategy. Second, during World War II the United States was compelled to pursue a win-hold-win strategy against Germany and Japan, respectively, even though we spent 40 percent of the GNP on defense, placed 12 million Americans under arms, and had powerful allies (unlike Germany or Japan). We sought to--and did--defeat Germany first, while initially remaining on the strategic defense in the Pacific. In the decades since 1945, US planners persisted in postulating scenarios involving at least two concurrent conflicts, even though we have never had the resources to wage two big wars at the same time. Recall that the Vietnam conflict was a "half-war" in contemporary US force planning nomenclature. More to the point, our enemies have without exception refused to take advantage of our involvement in one war to start another one with us; not during the three years of the Korean War, the ten years of the Vietnam War, or the eight months of the Persian Gulf crisis of 1990-91. States almost always go to war for specific reasons independent of whether an adversary is already at war with another country. This is especially true for states contemplating potentially war-provoking acts against the world's sole remaining superpower. In none of the three major wars we have fought since 1945 did our enemies, when contemplating aggression, believe that their aggressive acts would prompt war with the United States. If prospects for being drawn into two large-scale conventional conflicts at the same time are remote, prudence dictates maintenance of sufficient military power to deal quickly and effectively with such conflicts one at a time. And for this we are well prepared. Our force structure remains optimized for interstate conventional combat, and it proved devastating in our last conventional war, against Saddam Hussein's large--albeit incompetently led--Soviet-model forces. Though most national military establishments in the Third World, which today includes much of the former Soviet Union, are incapable of waging large-scale conventional warfare, the few that are or have the potential to do so are all authoritarian states with ambitions hostile to US security interests. Among those states are Iran, Iraq, Syria, a radicalized Egypt, and China. Russia can be excluded for probably at least the next decade. Russia's conventional military forces have deteriorated to the point where they have great difficulty suppressing even small insurrections inside Russia's own borders. The humiliating performance of the Russian forces in Chechnya reveals the extent to which draft avoidance, demoralization, disobedience, desertion, political tension, professional incompetence, and the virtual collapse of combat support and combat service support capabilities have wrecked what just a decade ago was an army that awed many NATO force planners. China is included not just as a potential regional threat but as a potential global threat. We need to be wary of today's commonplace notion that the United States is the last superpower, that we will never again face the kind of global and robust threat to our vital security interests once posed by the Soviet Union, and before that, the Axis Powers. The present planning focus on regional conflict should not blind us to the probable emergence over the next decade or two of at least one regional superpower capable of delivering significant numbers of nuclear weapons over intercontinental distances and of projecting conventional forces well beyond their national frontiers. China comes first to mind. China's vast and talented population and spectacular economic performance could provide the foundation for a military challenge in Asia of a magnitude similar to that posed by the growth of Japanese military power in the 1930s. Our capacity for large-scale interstate conventional combat is indispensable to our security. It served us well in Korea and the Persian Gulf, where we continue to have vital interests threatened by adversaries who have amassed or are seeking to amass significant, and in the case of North Korea, vast amounts of conventional military power.

#### (Optional) That causes extinction

**Straits Times -2K** 6-25-00.

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.

### AT: MANU =/= AUTO INDUSTRY

#### MANUFACTURING AND THE AUTO INDUSTRY ARE INTRINSICLY LINKED – THE AUTO INDUSTRY IS THE BIGGEST SECTOR.

**AMERICAN ECONOMIC ALERT 8**. [“Can US Manufacturing Industry Be Saved?” Dec 4, http://www.americaneconomicalert.org/view\_art.asp?Prod\_ID=3087 DA 7/16/10]

But if the Big Three fail what will be left of the U.S. manufacturing base? Televisions, computers, cell phones, radios and other electronics have already been ceded to Asia, particularly to China. The U.S. barely makes cruise ships, Boeing is becoming a relic, and U.S. factories dwindle as China assumes her spot as the factory floor to the world. "If the automotive sector is dramatically downsized, the overall manufacturing sector takes tremendous hit," Alan Tonelson, research fellow for the United States Business and Industry Council, said, adding much of U.S. manufacturing is somehow related to the auto industry.

### MANUFACTURING IMPACT - ECON IMPACT

#### THE IMPACT IS ECONOMIC COLLAPSE

**VARGO 3.** [Franklin, National Association of Manufacturers, “CHINA'S EXCHANGE RATE REGIME AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY” Federal News Service, 10-1, Lexis]

I would like to begin my statement with a review of why manufacturing is vital to the U.S. economy. Since manufacturing only represents about 16 percent of the nation's output, who cares? Isn't the United States a post-manufacturing services economy? Who needs manufacturing? The answer in brief is that the United States economy would collapse without manufacturing, as would our national security and our role in the world. That is because manufacturing is really the foundation of our economy, both in terms of innovation and production and in terms of supporting the rest of the economy. For example, many individuals point out that only about 3 percent of the U.S. workforce is on the farm, but they manage to feed the nation and export to the rest of the world. But how did this agricultural productivity come to be? It is because of the tractors and combines and satellite systems and fertilizers and advanced seeds, etc. that came from the genius and productivity of the manufacturing sector. Similarly, in services -- can you envision an airline without airplanes? Fast food outlets without griddles and freezers? Insurance companies or banks without computers? Certainly not. The manufacturing industry is truly the innovation industry, without which the rest of the economy could not prosper. Manufacturing performs over 60 percent of the nation's research and development. Additionally, it also underlies the technological ability of the United States to maintain its national security and its global leadership. Manufacturing makes a disproportionately large contribution to productivity, more than twice the rate of the overall economy, and pays wages that are about 20 percent higher than in other sectors. But its most fundamental importance lies in the fact that a healthy manufacturing sector truly underlies the entire U.S. standard of living -because it is the principal way by which the United States pays its way in the world. Manufacturing accounts for over 80 percent of all U.S. exports of goods. America's farmers will export somewhat over $50 billion this year, but America's manufacturers export almost that much event month! Even when services are included, manufacturing accounts for two-thirds of all U.S. exports of goods and services. If the U.S. manufacturing sector were to become seriously impaired, what combination of farm products together with architectural, travel, insurance, engineering and other services could make up for the missing two-thirds of our exports represented by manufactures? The answer is "none." What would happen instead is the dollar would collapse, falling precipitously -- not to the reasonable level of 1997, but far below it -and with this collapse would come high U.S. inflation, a wrenching economic downturn and a collapse in the U.S. standard of living and the U.S. leadership role in the world. That, most basically, is why the United States cannot become a "nation of shopkeepers."

### MANUFACTURING IMPACT - HEG IMPACT

#### MANUFACTURING IS KEY TO HEG – innovation, leadership, readiness.

**VARGO 3.** [Franklin, National Association of Manufacturers, “CHINA'S EXCHANGE RATE REGIME AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY” Federal News Service, 10-1, Lexis]

I would like to begin my statement with a review of why manufacturing is vital to the U.S. economy. Since manufacturing only represents about 16 percent of the nation's output, who cares? Isn't the United States a post-manufacturing services economy? Who needs manufacturing? The answer in brief is that the United States economy would collapse without manufacturing, as would our national security and our role in the world. That is because manufacturing is really the foundation of our economy, both in terms of innovation and production and in terms of supporting the rest of the economy. For example, many individuals point out that only about 3 percent of the U.S. workforce is on the farm, but they manage to feed the nation and export to the rest of the world. But how did this agricultural productivity come to be? It is because of the tractors and combines and satellite systems and fertilizers and advanced seeds, etc. that came from the genius and productivity of the manufacturing sector. Similarly, in services -- can you envision an airline without airplanes? Fast food outlets without griddles and freezers? Insurance companies or banks without computers? Certainly not. The manufacturing industry is truly the innovation industry, without which the rest of the economy could not prosper. Manufacturing performs over 60 percent of the nation's research and development. Additionally, it also underlies the technological ability of the United States to maintain its national security and its global leadership. Manufacturing makes a disproportionately large contribution to productivity, more than twice the rate of the overall economy, and pays wages that are about 20 percent higher than in other sectors. But its most fundamental importance lies in the fact that a healthy manufacturing sector truly underlies the entire U.S. standard of living -because it is the principal way by which the United States pays its way in the world.

#### GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

**KHALILZAD 95**. [ZALMAY, Zalmay, Rand Corporation, The Washington Quarterly]

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.

### IMPACT: LNG IMPORTS

#### EPA REGULATIONS WILL CAUSE MASSIVE NATURAL GAS PRICE SPIKES.

**BERG 8**. [Amanda, legislative assistant @ NCPA, “Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency” National Center for Policy Analysis -- Oct Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency -- http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba634]

Effects of Regulations on Energy Costs. As with other pollutants, if the EPA finalizes these findings, the agency could go beyond regulating CO 2 emissions from automobiles to regulating greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources as well. The EPA would likely implement an emissions permit program covering stationary sources emitting 250 tons per year of any regulated pollutant. This would subject thousands of new sources to EPA regulations — including small businesses, hospitals and even large single-family homes. It would require costly new technology or retrofits to meet stringent emissions criteria. Furthermore, the proposed EPA rule would cause a shift from coal — currently used to generate half of the domestic electricity supply — to natural gas. Due to the limited domestic supply of natural gas and the moratorium on production from reserves on the Outer Continental Shelf, more natural gas would be imported, reducing U.S. energy security. According to a study by Science Applications International Corporation, an increase in demand for natural gas would cause its price to skyrocket, raising electricity prices: Natural gas prices could increase by as much as 146 percent. Electricity prices could increase 129 percent. A two-thirds reduction in coal-fired electric power generation would lower gross domestic product (GDP) by $371 billion annually, say Pennsylvania State University researchers.

#### INCREASES IN DEMAND FOR NATURAL GAS CAUSE INCREASE LNG IMPORTS.

**BOWE ET AL 6**. [James F, William Rice, Oleg Bilousenko, Federico Valle, Christian Rolf, Delia Patterson, Jan Krekeler, all at Dewey Ballantine LLP “Global Overview” Getting the Deal Through: Gas Regulation in 35 jurisdictions worldwide – published by Global Competition Review ]

With US and Canadian production falling, achieving the goal of expanding United States gas supplies means a new reliance on imported LNG. Some 96 per cent of the world’s natural gas reserves are found outside North America. Growing demand for natural gas in the US will lead to an increase in gas imports in the form of LNG. Imports of LNG currently supply only about 3 per cent of US natural gas demand. North American LNG imports are expected to increase as new receiving terminals are built. In 2005, however, US gas markets were unable to compete for spot LNG on the international market as Spain and other LNG importing countries bid the price above US benchmarks.

### EXT: PRICE SPIKES 🡪 LNG IMPORTS

#### INCREASED DEMAND AND HIGH PRICES FORCE THE US TO INCREASE LNG IMPORTS FROM THE GLOBAL MARKET.

**ATTA 7**. [Lee Van, Senior Director, “The ethanol facilities as a driver for new natural gas pipeline construction in the “corn belt” where the majority of ethanol Impact of Ethanol on Natural Gas: Could ethanol’s expansion be at risk from high natural gas prices?” 6-29-2007 http://rwbeck.com/insights/insightpdfs/EthanolandNG.pdf]

The demand growth from ethanol refineries is coming at a challenging time for the natural gas industry. U.S. natural gas prices have increased over 60% since the start of this decade. The U.S. Energy Information Administration reports that natural gas wellhead prices averaged less than $4/MMBtu from 2001 to 2003 and from 2004 to 2006 have averaged approximately $6.40/MMBtu. In response to higher prices, drilling rig counts and gas well completions have increased dramatically but U.S. natural gas production has barely changed. U.S. natural gas producers say that they face difficult challenges and may not be able to increase U.S. natural gas production very much even with higher prices. They report that costs are increasing even faster than natural gas prices, new fields tend to produce far less gas per well than old areas, and decline rates across the board are getting steeper every year. It seems certain that the U.S. will be forced to rely on increasing imports of natural gas but Canada – our “go to” source for incremental supply during the 1990’s - is facing the same difficulty with flat or declining domestic gas production and growing demand. The growing global market for liquefied natural gas (LNG) is certainly a promising source of supply given that 96% of the world’s proven natural gas reserves are located outside of North America. However, just as with the global oil market, there needs to be recognition that LNG suppliers will look to sell to the highest price market and European and Asian demand for natural gas is expected to be strong. Furthermore, a quick review of the top LNG export countries notes several in the top 10 with recent security or instability issues (including Indonesia, Algeria, and Nigeria). A similar review of the top countries in terms of natural gas reserves (#1- Russia, #2 - Iran, # 9-Venezuela) highlights that reliance on LNG will bring its own set of geopolitical risks.

#### HIGH PRICES CAUSE DRILLING AND SHIFT TO LNG.

**GIH 6**. [Global Investment House, a firm regulated by the Central Bank of Kuwait, “GCC Natural Gas Outlook: The Fizz on Natural Gas” October]

High natural gas prices encourage continued high drilling activity and investments necessary to develop gas supply from new regions in North America. High prices also help support the expected growth of LNG imports required to meet North American demand. Nonetheless, there is a cost consequence of high natural gas prices to consumers and energy-intensive industries in North America.

#### NATURAL GAS SPIKES MAKE LNG COST COMPETITIVE -- CREATES MASS INFLUX IN IMPORTS.

Robert **Pirog**, Specialist in Energy Economics and Policy Resources, Science, and Industry Division, Congressional Research Service, 12/8/**4** http://bartlett.house.gov/uploadedfiles/Natrual%20Gas%20Price.pdf

As discussed earlier in this report, when the ECUR is 90% or above, the ability of the industry to respond to increased demand with expanded supply from existing wells is limited, causing price to increase quickly. However, the higher prices do provide an incentive to begin the process of drilling new wells and exploring for new supplies. The resulting supply increase will tend to cause price to fall as productive capacity is enhanced, reducing the ECUR. The nature of this relationship in the natural gas industry can, under some circumstances, lead to a cycle of unstable boom and bust feared by those investing in gas production. Taken to its extreme, this could lead to chronic under-investment in gas production and stagnant supply. Higher prices for natural gas justify investment in exploratory drilling by increasing the value of the expected cash flow derived from the new production. In an efficiently operating market, a sustained, marginal increase in price is supposed to elicit a marginal increase in production. In natural gas, when the price rises, hundreds of extra rigs drill thousands of additional wells. Historical averages suggest that about 80% of these efforts will be successful and yield some new production. Once a well is brought into production, there is little economic rationale for not producing at full capacity. As a result, the market moves to a condition of excess supply as new production begins, causing a fall in the price. The reduced price brings a disincentive to invest in exploratory drilling, which leads to a period of stable supply setting the stage for a rising ECUR a tightening market balance and rising prices. A key factor in the ability of the rate of investment in exploration to affect the ECUR is the degree to which existing wells deplete, or yield declining output levels. For example, the EIA expected that in 2003 the estimated effective productive capacity of the U.S. natural gas industry would be approximately 57 billion cubic feet per day (bcf/d). For 2003, production was expected to be approximately 51.4 bcf/d, leaving a surplus of 5.6 bcf/d, or about 10%. To demonstrate how this balance depends on new drilling and expansion of capacity, the EIA estimated that 25% of effective productive capacity comes from wells one year old or less. The two largest suppliers of U.S. natural gas, Texas and the Gulf of Mexico, derive 30% of their production from wells one year old or less. If drilling were to stop in the U.S., all surplus capacity would disappear in less than one year. In 2001, the incentive of high prices led to 22,800 well completions that resulted in increased productive capacity. Only 17,800 wells were completed in 2002 and productive capacity declined. If, as this recent data suggests, the potential for a boom/bust investment cycle may be developing in the natural gas industry, the result will be brief periods of low prices and plentiful supply followed by periods of high prices and potential physical shortages.9 Gas Imports The measures analyzed in the EIA study of effective productive capacity only refer to resources in the lower 48 states. As the U.S. natural gas market develops, this restriction will become less appropriate. The U.S. natural gas market is well integrated with the Canadian market. Imports of Canadian natural gas have long been an important supply source when U.S. consumption exceeded U.S. production and available stock draw down. Imports of natural gas from Canada, all via pipeline, reached over 3.7 tcf per year in 2001 and 2002, but declined to less than 3.5 tcf in 2003. Canadian gas fields, like those in the United States, may be unable to easily expand output without the development of new fields. An additional source of imports might be liquefied natural gas (LNG).10 The U.S. has four operational (or near operational) LNG receiving facilities with an annual operational send-out capacity of 1.4 tcf per year after all planned expansions are completed.11 The critical issue concerning LNG is cost. Although the cost of a complete LNG facility has fallen substantially (30%) due to economies of scale and enhanced technology over the last decade, LNG cost is greater than most conventional gas from wells in the lower 48 states.12 As a result, dependence on LNG may safeguard the nation from physical shortage by building a new, higher, baseline price into the market.

#### NATURAL GAS PRICE SPIKES CAUSE MASS INCREASE IN LNG IMPORTS – imports are low now proves there’s uniqueness for our turn.

**STATES NEWS SERVICE 10**. [“Jobs for Pennsylvania, clean air for everyone” June 11 -- lexis]

With easily acquired natural gas deposits beginning to run dry, energy companies started to look to foreign liquefied natural gas to make up the difference. Gas prices spiked and there were battles over where to locate new industrial facilities to import gas. Now, however, the Energy Information Agency predicts that we will decrease the percentage of natural gas imported into the U.S. from 13 percent in 2008 to 6 percent in 2035. Thats quite a turnaround, and it will happen because of hard working Pennsylvanians unlocking the Marcellus Shale that runs below much of our state.

#### LNG IMPORT LEVELS DIRECTLY CORRELATE TO U.S. CONSUMPTION TRENDS .

**KNOWLES 3**. [Gearold, partner at Schiff Hardin & Waite law firm, member of the firm’s Energy Telecommunications and Public Utilities Group, “Liquefied natural gas: Regulation in a competitive natural gas market” Energy Law Journal -- Vol 24 No 2]

The attitude of regulators and the natural gas industry changed significantly as the natural gas shortage dissipated in the late 1970s, and the price of imported LNG became significantly higher compared with the price of domestic natural gas. The Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA), which at that time was the body within the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and responsible for regulating the importation of natural gas, was of the view that the need for imported LNG to serve high priority requirements had been alleviated by the increased availability of domestic supplies of natural gas.'g

### LNG IMPORTS BAD: ACCIDENTS

#### INCREASE RELIANCE ON LNG IMPORTS CAUSES ACCIDENTS – OUTWEIGHS EVERYTHING.

**Lovins & Lovins 2001** (Hunter and Amory Lovins work together as analysts, lecturers and consultants on energy, resource and security policy in over 30 countries. Hunter Lovins has degrees in Law, Political Studies and Sociology and an honorary doctorate, and is a member of the California Bar. For six years she was assistant Director of the California Conservation project. Amory Lovins is a consultant experimental physicist, educated at Harvard and Oxford, who has published 23 books (many co-authored with Hunter) and several hundred papers. He has held various academic chairs, received six honorary doctorates, served on the US Department of Energy's senior advisory board, and consulted (often with Hunter) for scores of energy companies, manufacturing firms, governments and international organisations. The Lovineses have received numerous awards for their work. Brittle Power : Energy Strategy for National Security – Rocky Mountain Institute -- <http://www.rmi.org/images/other/S-BrPwr-Parts123.pdf> -- also available @ http://www.transitcommerce.com/Harpswell/weeks.asp)

Disasters Waiting to Happen : Liquified Natural Gas Natural gas can be sent by pipeline over long distances. For a price, it can be piped from North Sea platforms to the British mainland, from Algeria to Italy, or from Siberia to Western Europe. But pipelines are not a feasible way to send gas across major oceans—for example, from the Mideast or Indonesia to the United States. A high-technology way to transport natural gas overseas has, however, been developed in the past few decades, using the techniques of cryogenics—the science of extremely low temperatures. In this method, a sort of giant refrigerator, costing more than a billion dollars, chills a vast amount of gas until it condenses into a colorless, odorless liquid at a temperature of two hundred sixty degrees Fahrenheit below zero. This liquefied natural gas (LNG) has a volume six hundred twenty times smaller than the original gas. The intensely cold LNG is then transported at approximately atmospheric pressure in special, heavily insulated cryogenic tankers—the costliest non-military seagoing vessels in the world—to a marine terminal, where it is stored in insulated tanks. When needed, it can then be piped to an adjacent gasification plant—nearly as complex and costly as the liquefaction plant—where it is boiled back into gas and distributed to customers by pipeline just like wellhead gas. Approximately sixty smaller plants in North America also liquefy and store domestic natural gas as a convenient way of increasing their storage capacity for winter peak demands which could otherwise exceed the capacity of trunk pipeline supplying the area. This type of local storage to augment peak supplies is called "peak-shaving." Such plants can be sited anywhere gas is available in bulk; they need have nothing to do with marine LNG tankers. LNG is less than half as dense as water, so a cubic meter of LNG (the usual unit of measure) weighs just over half a ton.1 LNG contains about thirty percent less energy per cubic meter than oil, but is potentially far more hazardous.2 Burning oil cannot spread very far on land or water, but a cubic meter of spilled LNG rapidly boils into about six hundred twenty cubic meters of pure natural gas, which in turn mixes with surrounding air. Mixtures of between about five and fourteen percent natural gas in air are flammable. Thus a single cubic meter of spilled LNG can make up to twelve thousand four hundred cubic meters of flammable gas-air mixture. A single modern LNG tanker typically holds one hundred twenty-five thousand cubic meters of LNG, equivalent to twenty-seven hundred million cubic feet of natural gas. That gas can form between about twenty and fifty billion cubic feet of flammable gas-air mixture—several hundred times the volume of the Great Pyramid of Cheops. About nine percent of such a tankerload of LNG will probably, if spilled onto water, boil to gas in about five minutes.3 (It does not matter how cold the water is; it will be at least two hundred twenty-eight Fahrenheit degrees hotter than the LNG, which it will therefore cause to boil violently.) The resulting gas, however, will be so cold that it will still be denser than air. It will therefore flow in a cloud or plume along the surface until it reaches an ignition source. Such a plume might extend at least three miles downwind from a large tanker spill within ten to twenty minutes.4 It might ultimately reach much farther—perhaps six to twelve miles.5 If not ignited, the gas is asphyxiating. If ignited, it will burn to completion with a turbulent diffusion flame reminiscent of the 1937 Hindenberg disaster but about a hundred times as big. Such a fireball would burn everything within it, and by its radiant heat would cause third-degree burns and start fires a mile or two away.6 An LNG fireball can blow through a city, creating “a very large number of ignitions and explosions across a wide area. No present or foreseeable equipment can put out a very large [LNG]... fire.”7 The energy content of a single standard LNG tanker (one hundred twenty-five thousand cubic meters) is equivalent to seven-tenths of a megaton of TNT, or about **fifty-five Hiroshima bombs**.

### EXT: LNG ACCIDENTS = BAD

#### An LNG attack would be like a nuclear bomb going off, injuring many

**Providence Journal 4** (Mark Reynolds, staffwriter, "Lloyd's executive likens LNG attack to nuclear explosion" 9-21-2004, www.projo.com/massachusetts/content/projo\_20040921\_ma21lng.134600.html

A terrorist attack on an LNG tanker "would have the force of a small nuclear explosion," according to the chairman of Lloyd's, a British insurer of natural gas port facilities like the ones being proposed in Fall River and Providence. The assertion, which is contested by industry experts, was in a speech that the chairman, Peter Levene, delivered last night to business leaders in Houston. Levene described Texas as a "state at risk" and said that securing its remote oil facilities is a "particular challenge." "Gas carriers too, whether at sea or in ports, make obvious targets," said Levene. "Specialists reckon that a terrorist attack on an LNG tanker would have the force of a small nuclear explosion."

#### LNG explosions could lead to massive fires and intense burns, even from far distances

**Providence Journal 4** (Mark Reynolds, staffwriter, "Lloyd's executive likens LNG attack to nuclear explosion" 9-21-2004, www.projo.com/massachusetts/content/projo\_20040921\_ma21lng.134600.html

One report does describe hypothetical fires that might erupt if gas leaks from a tanker in its liquid form changes into a gaseous form and ignites when it comes into contact with a flame. In one instance, the blaze, in less than a minute, would be capable of inflicting third-degree burns a little less than a mile away. Bryan Lee, a spokesman for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, said federal regulators have not changed their analysis. "Just about any expert will come up with a different assessment regarding LNG depending on the parameters and assumptions they have," said Lee, who emphasized the LNG shipping industry's safe track record. Regulators, he said, will review the safety of different LNG proposals on a case-by-case basis. "We stand by all of our analysis on this matter," he said.

#### AFF STUDIES ARE WRONG – DATA CONFIRMS A SMALL LNG SHIPPING ACCIDENT WOULD RESULT IN A SPILL OF LNG AT DANGEROUS LEVELS.

**RAINES AND FINCH 3**. [Ben & Bill – of Border Power Plants Workign Group – a thinktank for energy issues. Quoting the highly-qualified Lloy’d s Report – 12/7 – http://www.borderpowerplants.org/pdf\_does/LNG\_disaster.pdf]

A confidential study commissioned by the owner of Boston's liquefied natural gas terminal suggests that an accident involving an LNG tanker could quickly evolve into a chain reaction of explosions and fires. Such a scenario would almost inevitably lead to a catastrophic failure of the ship and a spill of LNG that would be much larger and much more dangerous than anything so far considered in federal studies and assessments of LNG hazards. Virtually every study used by federal regulators considers the loss of less than one-fifth of the cargo onboard a typical LNG tanker to be the "worst-case" accident scenario. Most published scientific studies estimate that such a limited spill could result in a fire a half-mile wide. By contrast, the confidential study -- commissioned by Tractabel LNG North America LLC, which owns the Boston Distrigas LNG terminal -- proposes several scenarios in which even a relatively small rupture in one of the five cargo tanks onboard a ship could "escalate" and lead to ruptures in multiple tanks." Described as a “generic” assessment, the study by the international maritime industry consultant Lloy’ds Register of Shipping stops short of identifying how large an area could be affected by such a catastrophic failure of the ship. LNG fires are often described as more dangerous than fires involving gasoline or other hydrocarbons, in part because natural gas burns so efficiently and intensely, and in part because each gallon of LNG has several hundred times the energy potential of a gallon of gasoline.

#### LNG ACCIDENT OUTWEIGHS 55 HIROSHIMAS.

**BOWMAN 95**. [Stephen, published author, “US still ripe for terror” Denver Post -- May 28 -- lexis]

The destruction, or perhaps even the disruption, of energy supplies could bring on the loss of millions of jobs virtually overnight, the starvation of hundreds of thousands and to at least some extent an environmental catastrophe. And there is another reason why energy sources should be a top priority on our national-defense list: They are so simple to destroy that it is ridiculous to even imagine they are not at the top of the list of terrorist targets. As one Department of Defense official explained in the wake of the World Trade Center bombing, the terrorist strives to get the most bang for his buck by achieving the most efficient kill ratio. He can spend $ 5,000 and explode a bomb in the World Trade Center. Or he can spend $ 1 on a bullet and wipe out the electricity of a whole city. Or maybe kill millions of people with a small vial of cheap but lethal chemicals. If the option is left open, sooner or later the terrorist will respond. According to a General Accounting Office report, in 1977, "Successful sabotage of an LEG (liquefied energy gas) facility in an urban area could cause a catastrophe. We found security precautions and physical barriers at LEG facilities generally aren't adequate to deter even an untrained saboteur. None of the LEG storage areas we saw are impervious to sabotage, and most are highly vulnerable." Liquefied energy gas is the generic term to describe both liquid natural gas - LNG - and liquid petroleum gas - LPG. Even though the energy content of a single LNG transport tanker is equivalent to that of 55 Hiroshima-size atomic bombs, very little has been done to assure that LNG shipments are protected from sabotage as they come and go through the ports of some of our major cities. Regardless of the government's own reports and warnings, LNG ships chug into the hearts of city harbors, and these cities are in danger of being leveled on any given day. Whereas oil contains more energy than does LNG, the liquid natural gas is actually more hazardous. Burning oil does not spread far over either water or land. LNG, on the other hand, is less than half as dense as water, so a single cubic meter of LNG weighs just over half a ton. One cubic meter of spilled LNG rapidly boils into about 620 cubic meters of natural gas, which mixes with the air - a mixture of between 5 and 14 percent is flammable. A single cubic meter of spilled LNG can make up to 12,400 cubic meters of flammable gas-air mixture.

### AT: TERRORISTS WON’T ATTACK LNG

#### WRONG – TERRORISTS ARE ATTRACTED TO LNG’S EXPLOSIVE POTENTIAL.

**KAPLAN 6**. [Eben, research associate, editorial staff, “Liquefied Natural Gas: A Potential Terrorist Target?” Council on Foreign Relations -- Feb 27 -- http://www.cfr.org/publication/9810/liquefied\_natural\_gas.html]

Are LNG ships and terminals potential terrorist targets? Yes, because of LNG's explosive potential, experts say. Al-Qaeda, for example, has specifically cited LNG as a desirable target, says Rob Knake, senior associate at Good Harbor Consulting, LLC, a homeland-security private consulting firm. Pipelines are not as attractive because the flow of gas can quickly be cut off and an explosion easily contained. Terminals make better targets because an attack could result in a massive fire that could potentially kill scores of people. They are also good targets because "if you take out those terminals, you could have a significant disruption [in the U.S. gas supply,]" Knake says.

#### LNG shipments inherently dangerous— terrorism or accidents proves

**Ewall 2006** (Mike Ewall of ActionPA, Liquid Natural Gas: A new evil – Feb 1st -- re-posted @ <http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:8I3iMn7-a7MJ:philadelphia.metblogs.com/archives/2006/02/liquid_natural_1.phtml+%22LNG+Tanker%22+%22accidents%22+%22inevitable%22&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=14&gl=us&client=firefox-a>)

A May 2005 report for the Rhode Island Attorney General found that terrorist groups have the intent and ability to launch another attack on U.S. soil and that US oil and gas infrastructure is a desired target. LNG tankers and terminals are vulnerable to attack and cannot be cost-effectively secured. GAO, the investigatory arm of Congress, recommended in 1979 that the government prohibit any additional large-scale LNG facilities in or LNG tanker transit through urban areas. In Boston, flights are halted while an LNG ship moves through the harbor, as is traffic on the Tobin Bridge. Will flights be halted at Philadelphia area airports when shipments come in? Will I-95 and all of the bridges be closed? There will be major economic impacts to the region when the river traffic is shut down every 10 days for a 12 hour tanker trip up the Delaware. ACCIDENTS Terrorism isn't the only risk. **LNG carries an inherent risk of accidents,** as do all industrial facilities. LNG's properties make it uniquely dangerous if there were to be a spill or fire. According to a December 2004 report by Sandia National Laboratory, an accident or terrorist attack on a liquefied natural gas tanker could cause "major injuries and significant damage to structures" a third of a mile away and could cause second-degree burns on people more than a mile away. A "worst case scenario" could set structures aflame out to 2,067 feet and burn people as far as 6,949 feet away. The report's idea of "worst case" didn't include the actual worst case, failing to study larger ships that are planned and assuming that only some of the LNG tanker contents are released.

#### Terrorist groups have the plans needed to carry out attacks on LNG tankers

**Daily Star 4.** “Tanker terror: Gulf's oil routes under threat” http://jihadwatch.org/archives/2004\_04.php

According to one Western counterterrorism official, Nashiri's interrogation after his arrest produced a lot of information on Al-Qaeda's operational planning for attacks on supertankers, "particularly their vulnerability to suicide attacks and the economic impact of such operations." He told The Daily Star: "They actually have a naval manual on this. It tells them the best places on the vessels to hit, how to employ limpet mines, fire rockets or rocket-propelled grenades from high-speed craft and turn liquefied natural gas (LNG) tankers into floating bombs. They are also shown how to use fast craft packed with explosives and the use of trawlers, or ships like that, that can be turned into bombs and detonated beside bigger ships or in ports where there are often petroleum or gas storage areas that could go up as well. They even talk of using underwater scooters for suicide attacks." Last year the London-based International Maritime Bureau (IMB), which monitors security on the world's oceans, reported a suspiciously high number of tugboats were being hijacked in the Malacca Strait. The agency warned shipping authorities that these could be packed with explosives and rammed into tankers carrying gas or petroleum products, or into port facilities close to large cities. The burgeoning trade in LNG, much of which goes through the Straits of Malacca, heightens both the threat of such maritime terrorism and the devastation it could produce.

### LNG IMPORTS BAD: TERRORISM

#### INCREASED LNG IMPORTS WILL HURT THE ABILITY OF THE COAST GUARD TO RESPOND TO TERRORIST THREATS

**Lloyd’s List, 2008** (“Coast Guard lacks resources to ensure security of LNG vessels,” January 11, 2008, lexis)

THE US Coast Guard lacks the resources to meet its own security standards for tasks such as escorting ships carrying liquefied natural gas, the country's congressional auditors warn. And the report\* by the Government Accountability Office concludes that the rapid expansion of LNG imports could result in this state of affairs persisting. The report, which examines the challenges raised by the possibility of terrorist action against tankers and gas carriers, says a successful attack would have substantial public safety, environmental, and economic consequences. There is no "specific credible" threat to tankers or terminals in US waters, the GAO says. However, it adds that "the threat of seaborne terrorist attacks on maritime energy tankers and infrastructure is likely to persist", with the greatest risks being at shipping chokepoints, such as the straits of Hormuz and Malacca, far from US shores, but which could damage the country's economic interests. Despite international agreements calling for protective measures, "substantial disparities" exist in overseas implementation. However, the report does not excuse the US's own performance. "Domestically, units of the Coast Guard, the lead federal agency for maritime security, report insufficient resources to meet its own self imposed security standards, such as escorting ships carrying LNG." The report highlights LNG because of the tremendous growth in imports: by 2015, crude oil imports are forecast to increase by nearly 4%, while those for LNG will grow more than 400%. Increased workload demands relating to LNG "could cause the Coast Guard to continue to be unable to meet the standards it has set for keeping US ports secure". The GAO recommends that the US Homeland Security Department directs the Coast Guard to "develop a national resource allocation plan that will balance the need to meet new LNG security responsibilities with other existing security responsibilities". It also recommends that the Coast Guard and the Federal Bureau of Investigation work together to "help ensure that a detailed operational plan has been developed that integrates the different spill and terrorism response sections of the National Response Plan". The report identifies three main types of threats ndash; suicide attacks such as explosive-laden boats, "standoff" attacks with weapons launched from a distance, and armed assaults. Of greatest concern, it says, is a suicide attack, such as the 2002 speedboat attack on the tanker Limburg off the coast of Yemen. The Limburg attack killed one person, injured 17, and spilled 90,000 barrels of oil.

#### THE IMPACT TO TERRORISM IS EXTINCTION

**SID-AHMED 4**. [Mohamed, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction!” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.hml]

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

### EXT: LNG IMPORTS 🡪 TERRORISM

#### INCREASED LNG IMPORTS MAKE AN ACCIDENT OR TERRORIST ATTACK INEVITABLE.

**KAPLAN 6**. [Eben, research associate, editorial staff, “Liquefied Natural Gas: A Potential Terrorist Target?” Council on Foreign Relations -- Feb 27 -- http://www.cfr.org/publication/9810/liquefied\_natural\_gas.html]

What are the security implications of the rising demand for LNG? Simply put, more LNG means more targets, which require more security. Rising demand and economies of scale are likely to put larger quantities of LNG in a single place. Fay expects the size of LNG tankers to double in the coming years, which could make an attack even more catastrophic. As the number of incoming tankers continues to rise, experts question whether the Coast Guard can continue the intimidating display of force it currently provides for all incoming shipments. According to Stephen Flynn, CFR Senior Fellow for National Security Studies and a retired Coast Guard Officer, the service's fleet of vessels and aircraft ranks among the oldest in the world and have been operating at a far higher tempo since 9/11. The number of emergency repairs and the cost of maintaining this fleet are growing significantly, yet the program to replace them will take an estimated twenty-five years to complete based on the current acquisition budget model. Flynn adds that the time to detect and intercept a rapidly moving small boat in a harbor could be as little as two to three minutes. "A 'bolt-out-of-the-blue' fast boat loaded with explosives and suicide bombers is likely to evade most small Coast Guard patrol crafts, which were designed primarily for safety patrols, not armed combat," he says.

### EXT: COAST GUARD KEY

#### The coast guard is vital to the war on terror.

**Gilmore 8**. (Gerry, writer for the American Forces Press Service “Coast Guard Essential to Victory Against Terrorism, Cheney Says,” May 21, 2008, http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/library/news/2008/05/sec-080521-afps01.htm]

WASHINGTON, May 21, 2008 – The efforts of the men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard are essential to victory in the war against terrorism, Vice President Richard B. Cheney told graduating cadets at their academy commencement today in New London, Conn. “When you stepped forward to serve the United States, it was already clear that these are decisive times in the life of our country,” Cheney told members of the Class of 2008 at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. “It’s rare for an academy class to begin during a war and then graduate during that same war.” The challenges that came to the United States as a result of the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks “will be the defining issue of your career,” Cheney told the more than 200 graduating cadets. “The Coast Guard will be essential to the fight, and the Coast Guard will be essential to victory” against terrorism, Cheney said, as America’s armed forces continue to battle transnational terrorists in places like Afghanistan and Iraq. The terrorists have vowed to attack again, and America is taking the threat seriously, Cheney said. The United States, he said, has bolstered security at its airports and maritime entry points, increased intelligence capacity to track enemy movements and plans, and organized a global coalition that is taking the fight to overseas-based terrorists. “This nation has kept the commitment declared by President Bush after 9/11: to wage this battle on the offensive, to track the enemy down until he has no place left to hide, and to stay in the fight until the fight is won,” Cheney observed. The Coast Guard is one of 22 federal agencies that were merged five years ago to form the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Cheney recalled. The Coast Guard, he noted, is the only military element in that organization. “In its five years as part of DHS, the Coast Guard has undertaken the largest commitment at port security operation since the Second World War,” Cheney noted. “That, alone, is an enormous task, given the many foreign vessels that arrive in our ports every single day.” The Coast Guard also is improving America’s coastal defenses through implementation of better tracking technology, establishing security zones among major U.S. ports, Cheney explained, and is taking many other steps critical to keeping the American maritime domain free of terrorists. The Coast Guard also is heavily involved in overseas anti-terrorism operations, Cheney said. Coast Guard members, he said, “are providing port security, on-and-off loading of military hardware and patrol forces to secure assets in the Persian Gulf.”

### LNG IMPORTS BAD: WAR

#### INCREASING LNG IMPORTS CAUSES MULTIPLE SCENARIOS FOR GLOBAL WAR.

**EWALL 7**. [Mike, director of Energy Justice Network. Nov 2007 “FACT SHEET:Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)” http://www.energyjustice.net/naturalgas/lngfact sheet.pdf]

FACT SHEET: Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Why LNG? 97% of natural gas consumed in the U.S. is from the U.S. and Canada, transported via pipeline. However, natural gas production has peaked in North America. Over time, we’re drilling more and more, but finding less and less. Between 1998 and 2007, natural gas prices more than tripled as imports from Canada slowed and domestic production failed to keep up with demand. To feed the increasing demand, more liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminals are being proposed, to increase imports from overseas. How Many? The U.S. has five existing LNG terminals – in Massachusetts, Maryland, Georgia, Louisiana and a newer one in the Gulf of Mexico. Approximately 60 additional LNG terminals have been proposed in North America (45 of which would be in the U.S.), though the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has estimated that only 10 LNG terminals are needed to meet short-term demand (of which two are in Mexico and two are in Eastern Canada). Thirty-one proposals have been approved by federal regulators already. Many are being fought by local opposition groups, but fighting them is difficult in the U.S. since local and state rights to block such projects are largely overridden by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Peak Gas Globally, the demand for natural gas is increasing faster than it can be met. Global production is going to peak around 2020, meaning that supply will start to drop as demand continues to rise. This will drastically increase costs and will exacerbate global conflict, as China, India and other growing economies compete with the U.S. for the world’s limited gas supplies. China has plans for 8-9 LNG terminals. Bad Economics An LNG terminal will be an economic nightmare. Gas prices have already tripled since their historical average, which was fairly constant from 1976 through 1998. The push for LNG won’t help in the long-run, since these new terminals wouldn’t be built until around 2010. Companies will have to compete with India, China and the rest of the world for competitive contracts to secure LNG supplies (or the U.S. will use military force – also very expensive – to control the supply). Since natural gas production is going to peak globally around 2020, any new LNG import terminals will only have around 10 good years of economic life (propped up by excessive use of U.S. tax dollars to support military ventures to secure foreign sources of gas) before global prices start to skyrocket. LNG = More Wars Globalization of gas markets increases global conflict over gas supplies. Liquefied natural gas would be imported from Qatar, Algeria, Nigeria, Trinidad and Tobago, Australia and Indonesia. Iraq, Iran, central Asia and Russia are also have major gas resources and are likely to remain the focus of US military ventures. The U.S. has a long-standing history of conflict with oil-producing nations, to control oil supplies. Now, as natural gas markets globalize, our military conflicts are starting to be about natural gas as well.

### IMPACT: NAT GAS SPIKES

#### EPA REGULATIONS WILL CAUSE MASSIVE NATURAL GAS PRICE SPIKES.

**BERG 8**. [Amanda, legislative assistant @ NCPA, “Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency” National Center for Policy Analysis -- Oct Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency -- http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba634]

Effects of Regulations on Energy Costs. As with other pollutants, if the EPA finalizes these findings, the agency could go beyond regulating CO 2 emissions from automobiles to regulating greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources as well. The EPA would likely implement an emissions permit program covering stationary sources emitting 250 tons per year of any regulated pollutant. This would subject thousands of new sources to EPA regulations — including small businesses, hospitals and even large single-family homes. It would require costly new technology or retrofits to meet stringent emissions criteria. Furthermore, the proposed EPA rule would cause a shift from coal — currently used to generate half of the domestic electricity supply — to natural gas. Due to the limited domestic supply of natural gas and the moratorium on production from reserves on the Outer Continental Shelf, more natural gas would be imported, reducing U.S. energy security. According to a study by Science Applications International Corporation, an increase in demand for natural gas would cause its price to skyrocket, raising electricity prices: Natural gas prices could increase by as much as 146 percent. Electricity prices could increase 129 percent. A two-thirds reduction in coal-fired electric power generation would lower gross domestic product (GDP) by $371 billion annually, say Pennsylvania State University researchers.

#### HIGH ENERGY COSTS KILL THE US ECONOMY

**LAMMEY 7**. [Alan, Energy Market Analyst @ Energy Intelligence Group, “High Oil, Gas Prices that Cause Recession Often Crushed in Turn” Natural Gas Week, April 2 -- LEXIS]

Alarm bells are going off everywhere regarding the state of the economy, from the crumbling subprime mortgage market to growing concern from the US Federal Reserve over stout energy prices. And a sluggish economy could take a toll on oil, and ultimately natural gas prices in the near future. "There's been a lot of concern that troubles in the US housing sector could infect the broader domestic economy and dent demand for energy," a gas futures trader in Houston said. "Historically, when the country slips into recession, the price for oil and natural gas tends to fall." A direct link exists between energy costs and the economy. When prices go up, businesses and consumers put more of their money into keeping the lights on and keeping their gas tanks filled. That leaves less to spend on other goods and services, stifling growth. Currently, high energy costs, growing consumer indebtedness, and now big troubles in the US housing market are the main catalysts of concern. The most recent signal: A huge fallout in the mortgage industry, as alarming numbers of subprime mortgage foreclosures were reported. While some economists think that the economy will weather this storm, others think recession is now inevitable; but almost all view recent economic events and intractably high energy costs with trepidation. "Last year, we saw prompt-month gas futures fall down to the $4 area, and we weren't even in recession during that time. So if a full-blown recession emerges, then that would seem reasonable. However, supply and demand issues for natural gas will ultimately drive prices just like we've seen over years; but now we just have to add the recession element to the equation."

### EXT: NAT GAS SPIKES KILL ECON

#### HIGH GAS PRICES DEVASTATE THE ECONOMY

**SOVACOOL AND COOPER 7**. [Dr. Benjamin, Senior Research Fellow for the Network for New Energy Choices in New York Christopher Executive Director of the Network for New Energy Choices Renewing America: The Case for Federal Leadership on a National Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), Network for New Energy Choices • Report No. 01-07, June]

Natural-gas induced price spikes have been devastating to the U.S. economy. Because natural gas accounts for nearly 90 percent of the cost of fertilizer, escalating natural gas prices in 2005 created significant economic hardships for U.S. farmers. As well, some manufacturing and vindustrial consumers that relied heavily on natural gas moved their facilities overseas. The U.S. petrochemical industry, for example, relies on natural gas as a primary feedstock as well as for fuel. On February 17, 2004, the Wall Street Journal reported that the petrochemical sector had lost approximately 78,000 jobs to foreign plants where natural gas was much cheaper.76

#### MORE EV.

**WARREN 7**. [Matthew, “The Hottest of Topics” Weekend Australian, 9-29 -- lexis]

''If you put a cap in America ... on the electrical utility sector today, and it's very substantial, the only choice the utility has actually is to go to natural gas and expand their renewable portfolio, but that will be relatively incremental,'' Connaughton told journalists in Washington. ''America gobbling up even more natural gas on the global marketplace is not just bad for our economy, it's bad for the global economy, especially in countries many of which import a lot of natural gas and rely on that for their economic growth because they don't have coal. What we need to do on power generation in America ... is pursue the research agenda and with massive incentives.''

### NAT GAS SPIKES BAD: AGRICULTURE

#### HIGH NATURAL GAS PRICES CRUSH AGRICULTURE.

**BURNS 4**. [Conrad, Montana Senator, “EPA Registration of Canadian Pesticides” FDCHC Testimony -- June 23 -- lexis]

S. 1406 is important to our farmers. This bill is supported by the National Association of State Directors of Agriculture, the National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, and many more organizations committed to serving our American farmers, including Montana farm organizations. Grain prices are as low as they've been in years. High natural gas prices are causing skyrocketing fertilizer costs. And another year of drought looms on the horizon. Our farmers are facing a serious economic recession, multiplied by the fact that they're being forced to pay twice as much for chemicals that almost always have the exact same chemical make-up as those sold in Canada.

#### US AG KEY TO ECON, HEGEMONY, AND SOLVES GLOBAL HUNGER

**National Defense University 3** [Agribusiness Group Paper, Roundtable with 16 military leaders, http://www.ndu.edu/icaf/industry/reports/2003/pdf/2003\_AGRIBUSINESS.pdf]

 “Agribusiness is to the United States what oil is to the Middle East.” This single statement encapsulates the criticality of agribusiness to the United States - to our economy, our way of life, and our national Power, No other industry crosses such a broad and diverse constituency . everyone living in the US is touched by and benefits from agribusiness.
History demonstrates that a nation able to feed its own citizens is inherently stronger and thus able to provide a safer and more secure socicty. Convcrscly, a nation dcpendcnt on other nations for food is inherently more vulnerable and subject to the whims of external forces. Agribusiness is a key component of our national power, and is one of the few industries that produces net exports each year. Further, the abundance of American agriculture provides food for much of the world through our foreign aid and humanitarian assistance programs.Agribusiness is a source of great strength for our nation**.**

### NAT GAS SPIKES BAD: CHEM INDUSTRY

#### EPA REGULATIONS WILL CAUSE MASSIVE NATURAL GAS PRICE SPIKES.

**BERG 8**. [Amanda, legislative assistant @ NCPA, “Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency” National Center for Policy Analysis -- Oct Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency -- http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba634]

Effects of Regulations on Energy Costs. As with other pollutants, if the EPA finalizes these findings, the agency could go beyond regulating CO 2 emissions from automobiles to regulating greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources as well. The EPA would likely implement an emissions permit program covering stationary sources emitting 250 tons per year of any regulated pollutant. This would subject thousands of new sources to EPA regulations — including small businesses, hospitals and even large single-family homes. It would require costly new technology or retrofits to meet stringent emissions criteria. Furthermore, the proposed EPA rule would cause a shift from coal — currently used to generate half of the domestic electricity supply — to natural gas. Due to the limited domestic supply of natural gas and the moratorium on production from reserves on the Outer Continental Shelf, more natural gas would be imported, reducing U.S. energy security. According to a study by Science Applications International Corporation, an increase in demand for natural gas would cause its price to skyrocket, raising electricity prices: Natural gas prices could increase by as much as 146 percent. Electricity prices could increase 129 percent. A two-thirds reduction in coal-fired electric power generation would lower gross domestic product (GDP) by $371 billion annually, say Pennsylvania State University researchers.

#### High natural gas prices will crush the petrochemical industry

**Richards ’01** (Don,- writer for ICB Americas, Health Industry “Rising Natural Gas Costs Threaten US Chemical Growth” http://www.icis.com/Articles/2001/03/12/134126/rising-natural-gas-costs-threaten-us-chemical-growth.html.)

The current spike in natural gas costs "may be the most critical issue our industry has ever faced in this state and nation." This is what Jim Woodrick, president of Texas Chemical Council, told comissioners of the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC) at a recent agency hearing in Austin. Last week benchmark gas prices hovered around $5.27 per 1,000 cubic feet (mcf) at the Henry Hub in Louisiana and on the Houston Ship Channel after having soared to $10.65 per mcf on January 2. In January 2000, the Henry Hub price was only $2.32 per mcf. RRC's hearing was designed to find price relief for industrial, business and home consumers. Mr. Woodrick says that high natural gas prices are posing serious near-term economic disruptions for chemical manufacturers. What's more, he projects that continuation of these conditions long-term will force the migration of production facilities out of Texas and this country. "Within the last few months," he says, "high natural gas prices have made many chemical businesses painfully unprofitable. Some production units have been forced to shut down or slow down while overseas plants operate at full capacity. Other units are losing money but are still operating to honor their supply commitments to their customers."

#### Extinction

**Baum ’99** (Rudy M,- Editor-in-Chief of Chemical & Engineering News and Senior Vice President of the C&EN Magazine Group 12-6 “Millenium Special Report” http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html)

Here is the fundamental challenge we face: The world's growing and aging population must be fed and clothed and housed and transported in ways that do not perpetuate the environmental devastation wrought by the first waves of industrialization of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we increase our output of goods and services, as we increase our consumption of energy, as we meet the imperative of raising the standard of living for the poorest among us, we must learn to carry out our economic activities sustainably. There are optimists out there, C&EN readers among them, who believe that the history of civilization is a long string of technological triumphs of humans over the limits of nature. In this view, the idea of a "carrying capacity" for Earth—a limit to the number of humans Earth's resources can support—is a fiction because technological advances will continuously obviate previously perceived limits. This view has historical merit. Dire predictions made in the 1960s about the exhaustion of resources ranging from petroleum to chromium to fresh water by the end of the 1980s or 1990s have proven utterly wrong. While I do not count myself as one of the technological pessimists who see technology as a mixed blessing at best and an unmitigated evil at worst, I do not count myself among the technological optimists either. There are environmental challenges of transcendent complexity that I fear may overcome us and our Earth before technological progress can come to our rescue. **Global climate change**, the accelerating destruction of terrestrial and oceanic habitats, the catastrophic loss of species across the plant and animal kingdoms—these are problems that are not obviously amenable to straightforward technological solutions. But I know this, too: Science and technology have brought us to where we are, and only science and technology, coupled with innovative social and economic thinking, can take us to where we need to be in the coming millennium. Chemists, chemistry, and the chemical industry—what we at C&EN call the chemical enterprise—will play central roles in addressing these challenges. The first section of this Special Report is a series called "Millennial Musings" in which a wide variety of representatives from the chemical enterprise share their thoughts about the future of our science and industry. The five essays that follow explore the contributions the chemical enterprise is making right now to ensure that we will successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century. The essays do not attempt to predict the future. Taken as a whole, they do not pretend to be a comprehensive examination of the efforts of our science and our industry to tackle the challenges I've outlined above. Rather, they paint, in broad brush strokes, a portrait of scientists, engineers, and business managers struggling to make a vital contribution to humanity's future. The first essay, by Senior Editor Marc S. Reisch, is a case study of the chemical industry's ongoing transformation to sustainable production. Although it is not well known to the general public, the chemical industry is at the forefront of corporate efforts to reduce waste from production streams to zero. Industry giants DuPont and Dow Chemical are taking major strides worldwide to manufacture chemicals while minimizing the environmental "footprint" of their facilities. This is an ethic that starts at the top of corporate structure. Indeed, Reisch quotes Dow President and Chief Executive Officer William S. Stavropolous: "We must integrate elements that historically have been seen as at odds with one another: the triple bottom line of sustainability—economic and social and environmental needs." DuPont Chairman and CEO Charles (Chad) O. Holliday envisions a future in which "biological processes use renewable resources as feedstocks, use solar energy to drive growth, absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, use low-temperature and low-pressure processes, and produce waste that is less toxic." But sustainability is more than just a philosophy at these two chemical companies. Reisch describes ongoing Dow and DuPont initiatives that are making sustainability a reality at Dow facilities in Michigan and Germany and at DuPont's massive plant site near Richmond, Va. Another manifestation of the chemical industry's evolution is its embrace of life sciences. Genetic engineering is a revolutionary technology. In the 1970s, research advances fundamentally shifted our perception of DNA. While it had always been clear that deoxyribonucleic acid was a chemical, it was not a chemical that could be manipulated like other chemicals—clipped precisely, altered, stitched back together again into a functioning molecule. Recombinant DNA techniques began the transformation of DNA into just such a chemical, and the reverberations of that change are likely to be felt well into the next century. Genetic engineering has entered the fabric of modern science and technology. It is one of the basic tools chemists and biologists use to understand life at the molecular level. It provides new avenues to pharmaceuticals and new approaches to treat disease. It expands enormously agronomists' ability to introduce traits into crops, a capability seized on by numerous chemical companies. There is no doubt that this powerful new tool will play a major role in feeding the world's population in the coming century, but its adoption has hit some bumps in the road. In the second essay, Editor-at-Large Michael Heylin examines how the promise of agricultural biotechnology has gotten tangled up in real public fear of genetic manipulation and corporate control over food. The third essay, by Senior Editor Mairin B. Brennan, looks at chemists embarking on what is perhaps the greatest intellectual quest in the history of science—humans' attempt to understand the detailed chemistry of the human brain, and with it, human consciousness. While this quest is, at one level, basic research at its most pure, it also has enormous practical significance. Brennan focuses on one such practical aspect: the effort to understand neurodegenerative diseases like Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease that predominantly plague older humans and are likely to become increasingly difficult public health problems among an aging population. Science and technology are always two-edged swords. They bestow the power to create and the power to destroy. In addition to its enormous potential for health and agriculture, genetic engineering conceivably could be used to create horrific biological warfare agents. In the fourth essay of this Millennium Special Report, Senior Correspondent Lois R. Ember examines the challenge of developing methods to counter the threat of such biological weapons. "Science and technology will eventually produce sensors able to detect the presence or release of biological agents, or devices that aid in forecasting, remediating, and ameliorating bioattacks," Ember writes. Finally, Contributing Editor Wil Lepkowski discusses the most mundane, the most marvelous, and the most essential molecule on Earth, H2O. Providing clean water to Earth's population is already difficult—and tragically, not always accomplished. Lepkowski looks in depth at the situation in Bangladesh—where a well-meaning UN program to deliver clean water from wells has poisoned millions with arsenic. Chemists are working to develop better ways to detect arsenic in drinking water at meaningful concentrations and ways to remove it that will work in a poor, developing country. And he explores the evolving water management philosophy, and the science that underpins it, that will be needed to provide adequate water for all its vital uses. In the past two centuries, our science has transformed the world. Chemistry is a wondrous tool that has allowed us to understand the structure of matter and gives us the ability to manipulate that structure to suit our own purposes. It allows us to dissect the molecules of life to see what makes them, and us, tick. It is providing a glimpse into workings of what may be the most complex structure in the universe, the human brain, and with it hints about what constitutes consciousness. In the coming decades, we will use chemistry to delve ever deeper into these mysteries and provide for humanity's basic and not-so-basic needs.

### NAT GAS SPIKES BAD: MANUFACTURING

#### EPA REGULATIONS WILL CAUSE MASSIVE NATURAL GAS PRICE SPIKES.

**BERG 8**. [Amanda, legislative assistant @ NCPA, “Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency” National Center for Policy Analysis -- Oct Regulating Global Warming: Expanding the Authority of the Environmental Protection Agency -- http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba634]

Effects of Regulations on Energy Costs. As with other pollutants, if the EPA finalizes these findings, the agency could go beyond regulating CO 2 emissions from automobiles to regulating greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources as well. The EPA would likely implement an emissions permit program covering stationary sources emitting 250 tons per year of any regulated pollutant. This would subject thousands of new sources to EPA regulations — including small businesses, hospitals and even large single-family homes. It would require costly new technology or retrofits to meet stringent emissions criteria. Furthermore, the proposed EPA rule would cause a shift from coal — currently used to generate half of the domestic electricity supply — to natural gas. Due to the limited domestic supply of natural gas and the moratorium on production from reserves on the Outer Continental Shelf, more natural gas would be imported, reducing U.S. energy security. According to a study by Science Applications International Corporation, an increase in demand for natural gas would cause its price to skyrocket, raising electricity prices: Natural gas prices could increase by as much as 146 percent. Electricity prices could increase 129 percent. A two-thirds reduction in coal-fired electric power generation would lower gross domestic product (GDP) by $371 billion annually, say Pennsylvania State University researchers.

#### HIGH NATURAL GAS PRICES COLLAPSE MANUFACTURING – JACKS THE ECONOMY.

**BENZDEK AND WENDLING 4**. [Roger, Robert, work for Management Information Services,“The Case Against Gas Dependence” Public Utilities Fortnightly – April]

Moreover, two articles last year in Public Utilities Fortnight- ly that addressed natural gas supply, demand, and price issues seemed to confuse the solution with the problem. Robert Lin- den noted that high gas prices would lead to “demand destruc- tion” in the industrial sector, which would, in part, counter- balance increasing power sector demand.17 He further stated, “This price-induced demand destruction can be added to the other causes of reduced gas demand, including the closure of industrial facilities using natural gas as a feedstock.”18 Similar- ly, John Herbert, after noting that high natural gas prices have forced U.S. fertilizer plants to shut down, stated, “As fertilizer and other chemical plants continue to shut down, this will reduce demand for natural gas and increase overall supplies.”19 Both authors are correct in pointing out that high natural gas prices will tend to reduce industrial natural gas demand as industrial plants shut down, and that this will temper future natural gas price increases. However, the “destruction” of the nation’s industrial sector is an extremely serious problem for the United States; it is not a “solution” to the natural-gas pric- ing problem. We should be very concerned with the strongly negative impact high natural gas prices are having on the U.S. industrial sector and the potential implications of this for the U.S. economy. Despite all of the hype in recent years about the new econ- omy, the information economy, the service economy, etc., manufacturing is, by far, the most critical sector of the U.S. economy, and it creates the broad foundation upon which the rest of the economy grows.20 Manufacturing drives the rest of the economy, provides a disproportionate share of the nation’s tax base, generates innovation, and disseminates new technol- ogy throughout the economy. The average manufacturing job creates 4.2 jobs directly and indirectly throughout the econ- omy, whereas the average service and retail job generates about one other job, directly and indirectly. The manufacturing sector uses 40 percent of the natural gas consumed in the United States, and virtually every manu- facturing industry is heavily dependent on natural gas as a fuel, feedstock, and, increasingly, as a source of electricity gen- eration. Price spikes in the cost of natural gas and electricity in the fall of 2000 precipitated the current manufacturing reces- sion. During the past three years, this sector has been severely affected, losing more than 2.5 million jobs.21 The current manufacturing recovery is slower than the first year of any recovery in 40 years.22 Manufacturing is suffering from intense global competition and cannot pass though increased energy costs via product price increases. Reliance on low-cost natural gas has been an often-unrec- ognized factor in the U.S. manufacturing sector’s global com- petitiveness, and an ample supply of reasonably priced natural gas is critical to its competitiveness. This sector is bearing the brunt of the energy impacts of the natural gas crisis and is suf- fering from a triple whammy: High natural gas prices are caus- ing industrial electricity prices to increase, the cost of natural gas as a feedstock and fuel is greatly increasing manufacturing costs, and industrial operations are the first to be cut off from natural gas supplies when winter emergencies occur. The nat- ural gas crisis has become a matter of exporting profits and jobs to countries with cheaper natural gas. Thus, the impact of high natural gas prices is, indeed, to destroy the U.S. industrial sector. However, instead of view- ing this as an effect that will serve to moderate future natural gas price increases, this must be viewed as a very serious prob- lem resulting from high natural gas prices. To the extent natu- ral gas demand and prices are being driven by the increasing use of gas for electric power generation, the solution should be to substitute other fuels, such as nuclear and coal in this sector, and not to accept demand destruction in the nation’s industrial sector.

### NAT GAS SPIKES BAD: METHANE DRILLING

#### High prices cause methane hydrate drilling

**Ruppel ’07** (Carolyn,- Associate Professor of Geophysics, School of Earth and Atmospheric. Sciences June “Tapping Methane Hydrates for Unconventional Natural Gas” http://elements.geoscienceworld.org/cgi/content/abstract/3/3/193)

Methane hydrate is an icelike form of concentrated methane and water found in the sediments of permafrost regions and marine continental margins at depths far shallower than conventional oil and gas. Despite their relative accessibility and widespread occurrence, methane hydrates have never been tapped to meet increasing global energy demands. With rising natural gas prices, production from these unconventional gas deposits is becoming economically viabl**e**, particularly in permafrost areas already being exploited for conventional oil and gas. This article provides an overview of gas hydrate occurrence, resource assessment, exploration, production technologies, renewability, and future challenges

#### Extinction.

**LAMBERT 8**. [Alan Lambert, PHD, University of Illinois, 2008 http://www.theseventhearth.com/GW\_09.htm]

The Permian extinction, 251 million years ago, was the worst episode the Earth has so far endured. With less oxygen dissloving into warm water, oxygen breathing water dwelling life forms faced suffocation. Warm water also expands, raising sea levels by 20 metres. The ensuing ‘'super hurricanes' would have triggered flash floods that nothing could survive. But the biggest monster was the Methane Hydrate beneath the oceans, the same that would bring devastation to the Paleocene nearly 200 million years later, and that still lies there today. Mark Lynas, author of ‘'Six Degrees: Our Future on a Hotter Planet', describes the release of Methane Hydrate. “"First, a small disturbance drives a gas-saturated parcel of water upwards. As it rises, bubbles begin to appear, as dissolved gas fizzles out with the reducing pressure … these bubbles make the parcel of water still more buoyant, accelerating its rise through the water. As it surges upwards, reaching explosive force, it drags surrounding water up with it. At the surface, water is shot hundreds of metres into the air as the released gas blasts into the atmosphere. Shockwaves propagate outwards in all directions,” triggering more eruptions nearby." Unlike CO2, methane is flammable. “"Even in air-methane concentratons as low as 5%"” says Lynas, “" the mixture could ignite from lightning or some other spark and send fireballs tearing across the sky". Effectively, the atmosphere itself would become combustilbe. Methane air clouds from oceanic eruptions could destroy terrestrial life almost entirely. It has been estimated that a large eruption could release energy equivalent to 10/8 megatonnes of TNT, 100,000 times more than the world's entire stockpile of nuclear weapons.

### NAT GAS SPIKES BAD: RUSSIA

#### High natural gas prices cause Russian expansionism- kills heg

**Schiffer ’08** (Mike,- program officer in Policy Analysis and Dialogue at the Muscatine, Iowa-based Stanley Foundation, a nonpartisan, private foundation that focuses primarily on peace and security issues “Russia resurgence underscores need for our leadership” lexis)

Given its position at the end of the Cold War, Russia's resurgence as a major power comes as something of a surprise. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russia bore little resemblance to the feared global competitor it had been With an economy in shambles, a second-class military and an aging populace, it seemed destined to be a second-tier power whose only option was to cooperate with the United States. Yet today, high energy prices and Russia's vast wealth in reserves of oil and natural gas have fueled a revival of Russian Great Power nationalism. It has allowed Russia to rebuild its military and assert itself as a great power - not to be challenged in what it calls its "near abroad." Despite this significant power shift, U.S. policy toward Russia in the Putin years has been remarkably disengaged at times. Washington seems not to have noticed Russia's accumulating power and wealth, simmering resentments, democratic backsliding and growing ambitions - or at least not responded very effectively. As a result, recent events not only signal a resurgent Russia, they also give a clear indication of the limits of U.S. power and influence. The situation in Georgia and, on a more positive note, the many China lessons we have received through the prism of the Olympics coverage serve as a stark wake-up call about the changing nature of power in today's global order. If nothing else, the lessons should be that the United States cannot go it alone and that the United States needs to build effective and inclusive multilateral architecture to manage global problems. In the wake of the Second World War, the United States and its friends and partners labored mightily to create a rules-based order for the international community. It was not a perfect system, to be sure, but it offered a way to embed states in a web of laws, norms and institutions and bind them in dispute resolution and arbitration mechanisms that would prevent them from taking actions they might otherwise feel free to pursue. The United States built that system not out of altruism - although it was the right thing to do - but because it served our interests. It has anchored U.S. leadership in an uncertain world and created an international system and environment that has allowed us to safeguard our interest effectively. Russia's actions in Georgia are not the way of the future, but a return to the 19th century. We need to ensure that the way forward expands on the post-World War system we worked so hard to create and doesn't take us back to the broken approaches of the past. Despite the growing diffusion of world power during the past few years and some erosion of U.S. influence, it is certainly not too late.

#### Natural gas, not oil is key

**Golden ‘07** (Gary,- professionally trained futurist and strategy consultant based in Brooklyn, New York. He holds a Masters Degree from the Futures Studies program based at the University of Houston http://garrygolden.net/2007/04/19/research-notes-31207-energy-txukkr-artificial-photosyn-thin-film-solar/)

Europe needs Russia to meet its future hydrocarbon energy supplies – maybe more so than the Middle East. Natural gas is the foundation of this future. Pipelines are being built across the continent… For Gazprom – natural gas flowing into the homes of Europeans could result in enormous growth. Despite the contrary, I believe that oil and natural gas companies will embrace a hydrogen-electricity economy without reservation. The long-term resource asset base of nearly every major energy company is in natural gas- not oil. Beyond natural gas we should expect that the massive sea floor based methane deposits will fall within their area of expertise in energy development.

#### The impact is global WMD conflict

**Cohen ’96** (Ariel, PhD and Senior Policy Analyst – Heritage, Heritage Foundation Reports, 1-25, Lexis)

Much is at stake in Eurasia for the U.S. and its allies. Attempts to restore its empire will doom Russia's transition to a democracy and free-market economy. The ongoing war in Chechnya alone has cost Russia $6 billion to date (equal to Russia's IMF and World Bank loans for 1995). Moreover, it has extracted a tremendous price from Russian society. The wars which would be required to restore the Russian empire would prove much more costly not just for Russia and the region, but for peace, world stability, and security. As the former Soviet arsenals are spread throughout the NIS, these conflicts may escalate to include the use of weapons of mass destruction. Scenarios including unauthorized missile launches are especially threatening. Moreover, if successful, a reconstituted Russian empire would become a major destabilizing influence both in Eurasia and throughout the world. It would endanger not only Russia's neighbors, but also the U.S. and its allies in Europe and the Middle East. And, of course, a neo-imperialist Russia could imperil the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf.15

### AT: NEW SOURCES SOLVE

#### NO NEW SOURCES – HARD TO FIND AND ACCESS, TOO EXPENSIVE.

**EDWARDS ET AL 9**. [Steve, IBM Global Industry Leader for the Chemicals and Petroleum industries, David Haake, Chemical a nd Petroleum Industry Solutions Executive in IBM Global Business Services, Omar Ishag, Chemicals and Petroleum Leader in IBM Institute for Business Value, “Are investors prepared to capture the opportunity of LNG that emerges from the recession?” Pipeline & Gas Journal -- Nov 1 – lexis]

Yet, the demand for LNG--perhaps more than other energy sources--is characterized by unpredictability. There are inherent uncertaintiesin any industry based on constrained natural resources. New natural gas sources are increasingly difficult and expensive to find and develop, more and more remote, and production volumes are harder to anticipate and realize.

### IMPACT: STEEL INDUSTRY -- ECON

#### EPA REGS COLLAPSE 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.

#### Weak steel industry collapses the U.S. economy and military readiness

**Shaiken 2.** [Harley, Prof of Global Economy, Cal-Berkeley, Detroit News, 3-22, 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.

### IMPACT: STEEL INDUSTRY -- HEG

#### EPA REGS COLLAPSE 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.

#### STEEL INDUSTRY KEY TO MILITARY READINESS AND HEG.

**AISI 8**. [7/1 American Iron and Steel Institute, U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY CRITICAL TO KEEPING US FREE, 2008, http://www.steel.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=2008&TEMPLATE=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=24325]

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- As we reflect on our country’s independence this Fourth of July, we should pause to recognize those who fought for our freedom more than 230 years ago. But we should also recognize those who continue to keep our country free today: the men and women in uniform who offer their noble service in order to preserve America’s national security. “Members of the United States Navy, Marine Corps, Army, Air Force and Coast Guard, both at home and overseas, risk their lives everyday to ensure that Americans continue to have the freedoms that our country is founded upon. It is their commitment to our country that has made America what it is today – a beacon for freedom and democracy, “Andrew G. Sharkey, III, president and CEO, American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI), said. “Our veterans represent the very best of America and the U.S. steel industry is continuously working to serve the military in their efforts to defend our nation.” Sharkey said domestically-produced steel is important to “improve our military platforms, strengthen the nation’s industrial base and harden our vital homeland security infrastructure.” Congressman Peter J. Visclosky (D-IN), Chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, has noted that “to ensure that our national defense needs will be met, it is crucial that we have a robust and vibrant domestic steel industry. It is poor policy to rely on foreign steel for our national security – instead, we need a long-term investment in domestically-produced, high-quality and reliable steel that will serve and strengthen our national security interests.” Protecting the nation’s vast infrastructure is essential to our homeland security. This became an issue in recent times when it was discovered that substandard steel imported from China was being used by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to construct the border fence between the United States and Mexico. Members of the Congressional Steel Caucus, including Congressman Visclosky (D-IN), have worked to introduce legislation that will help strengthen the domestic steel industry in order to address issues of substandard steel imports. “AISI and its members greatly appreciate the Congressional Steel Caucus’ support for the steel industry and their vigilance on behalf of America’s national security,” Sharkey said. In addition, thousands of skilled men and women of the U.S. steel industry work to produce high quality, cost-competitive products that are used by the military in various applications ranging from aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines to Patriot and Stinger missiles, Sharkey said. Land based vehicles, such as the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, Abrams Tank and the family of Light Armored Vehicles, also utilize significant tonnage of steel plate per vehicle. The up-armored Humvee, in use by the U.S. Army, includes steel plating around the cab of the vehicle, offering improved protection against small arms fire and shrapnel. In fact, the steel plating underneath the cab is designed to survive up to eight pounds of explosives beneath the engine to four pounds in the cargo area. These critical applications require consistent, high quality domestic sources of supply. “We as a country need to make sure that our national defense needs will be met, making it critical for the United States to have a robust and vibrant domestic steel industry that will serve to strengthen our national security interests,” Sharkey noted. Historically, American-made steel and specialty metals have been integral components of U.S. military strength and they continue in this role today. The Department of Defense’s (DOD’s) primary use of steel in weapons systems is for shipbuilding, but steel is also an important component in ammunition, aircraft parts, and aircraft engines. DOD’s steel requirements are satisfied by both integrated steel mills and EAF producer mills. “With the desire never to be dependent on foreign nations for the steel used in military applications, it is critical that U.S. trade laws be defended, strengthened and enforced so that American-made steel can continue to play a vital role in our nation’s security,” Sharkey said. “On this Independence Day, let’s pledge to work to uphold that ideal.” AISI serves as the voice of the North American steel industry in the public policy arena and advances the case for steel in the marketplace as the preferred material of choice. AISI also plays a lead role in the development and application of new steels and steelmaking technology. AISI is comprised of 29 member companies, including integrated and electric furnace steelmakers, and 138 associate and affiliate members who are suppliers to or customers of the steel industry. AISI's member companies represent approximately 75 percent of both U.S. and North American steel capacity. For more information on safety tips for consumers, visit AISI’s Web site at www.steel.org.

#### GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

**KHALILZAD 95**. [ZALMAY, Zalmay, Rand Corporation, The Washington Quarterly]

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.

#### (Optional) STRONG MILITARY READINESS DETERS ALL CONFLICT.

**Spencer 00**. [Jack, MA from Limerick, Policy Analyst @ Heritage Foundation, The Facts About Military Readiness, 9-15, http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/BG1394.cfm]

The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America's national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives, 3 concludes that the United States "must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames." 4 According to some of the military's highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services' ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy. 5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America's ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War. 6 Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

### EXT: STEEL KEY TO HEG

#### Domestic Steel key to hegemony and power projection

**Waller 1**. [J. Michael, PhD @ Institute for Study of Conflict, Ideology and Policy, Insight on the News, Lexis]

That's also the argument of many U.S. steel producers, who find it unprofitable to upgrade their own blast furnaces but profitable to roll out finished products using imported semifinished steel. Those closest to the mining sector agree, but hope to persuade decisionmakers in Washington that they perform a unique national-security function. Part of that function is assured production of steel during protracted conflict. Another part concerns U.S. power projection. "It is a tenet of U.S. policy that the national, economic and military security of the United States depends on its position as a maritime power and the strength of its national maritime infrastructure," says George J. Ryan, president of the Lake Carriers Association, which represents 12 U.S. companies operating ships on the Great Lakes.

#### Domestic steel key to merchant marines

**Waller 1**. [J. Michael, PhD @ Institute for Study of Conflict, Ideology and Policy, Insight on the News, Lexis]

 Indeed, decisionmakers in Washington seem to have abdicated the country's maritime role completely. Apart from the shrinking Navy, the Pentagon has watched as the Merchant Marine -- the force of experienced civilian sailors called into active duty to man the Navy's cargo fleet during wartime -- dwindle almost beyond repair. The Navy needs more than 3,500 merchant sailors in wartime, but there simply aren't enough any more to operate military sealift while keeping the civilian shipping systems going. Vice President Dick Cheney learned a decade ago as secretary of defense during Operation Desert Shield how severely handicapped the Navy's sealift capacity had become with the erosion of the Merchant Marine. Many of the merchant sailors called up for the Persian Gulf War were in their 70s. The problem only has become worse in the decade since. As the Baltimore Sun recently discovered in a lengthy investigation, the fleet, with some 3,500 sailors, no longer is capable of servicing a modest conflict the size of the Persian Gulf War. New government regulations are causing the pool of qualified retirees to disappear and lose their certifications. That is, if the Pentagon can even find the sailors it needs during a crisis, since no database exists to locate qualified merchant seamen The shippers of the Great Lakes say that their endangered industry makes an important contribution to the active-duty pool of merchant sailors. They have benefited from the Jones Act, a law passed after World War I that requires ships transporting cargo and passengers between U.S. ports to be owned by U.S. citizens, built in U.S. shipyards and manned by U.S. citizen crews. "Without the critical mass represented by the domestic fleet, the United States would be unable to sustain the maritime infrastructure essential to national defense," says Ryan. "In a crisis, nearly 95 percent of arms and materiel is moved by ship. In the Bosnian conflict, 70 percent of the U.S. seafarers activated for military service had served on Jones Act vessels, including those operating on the Great Lakes. This is not surprising since 87 percent of all U.S.-flag shipboard-employment opportunities are in the Jones Act fleets." Kill the last U.S. iron mines on which Great Lakes shipping depends, advocates say, and the United States is killing off an important part of the Merchant Marine -- another point in favor of rescuing U.S. steel.

### AT: REGS 🡪 GREEN JOBS

#### OUR IMPACT OUTWEIGHS ANY BENEFIT FROM GREEN JOBS

**Kreutzer and Campbell 8**. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

The new ANPR regulations will force consumers to pay more for energy as well as for other goods. Furthermore, the increased regula tions and subsequent high energy prices throw a monkey wrench into the production side of the economy. Contrary to claims of an economic boost from "green invest ment" and "green collar" job creation, more EPA regulation reduces economic growth, GDP, and employment opportunities. While there are some initial years in the period of our analysis during which CAA regulation of GHG could spur additional investment, this investment was completely undermined by the higher energy prices. Investment contributes to the economy when it increases future productivity and income. The greater and more effective the investment, the greater the increase in future income. Since income (as measured by GDP) drops as a result of new reg ulation, it is clear that more capital is destroyed than created. The cumulative GDP losses for 2010 to 2029 approach $7 trillion with single-year losses of nearly $650 billion. The anticipated "green-collar" jobs meet a similar fate. It may well be that some businesses will experi ence an increase in employment. But, overall, companies are saddled with significantly higher energy costs, as well as increased administrative costs, that will be reflected in their product prices. The higher prices make their products less attractive to consumers and thus less competitive. As a result, total employment drops along with the drop in sales.

#### More evidence – green jobs impact is minimal

**Kreutzer and Campbell 8**. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

With increased regulation through the CAA, there is a small initial increase in employment as businesses build and purchase the newer, more CO2-friendly plants and equipment. However, any "green-collar" jobs created are more than offset by the hundreds of thousands of lost jobs in later years. Chart 2 illustrates the projections of overall employment losses from these restrictions on CO2 emissions.

### AT: WARMING

#### The impact on overall warming is negligible

**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]

Last June, America's Climate Security Act was withdrawn by its Senate supporters after only three days of debate. A Heritage Foundation analysis de tailed the costs of the bill, which included a 29 per cent increase in the price of gasoline, net job losses well into the hundreds of thousands, and an overall reduction in gross domestic product of $1.7 to $4.8 trillion by 2030.[[2]](#_ftn2) At the time of the debate, gasoline was approaching $4 per gallon for the first time in history, and signs of a slowing economy were begin ning to emerge. Economically speaking, the bill was one of the last items on the agenda that Americans wanted, and its Senate sponsors recognized that. Beyond the costs, the bill would have--even assum ing the worst case scenarios of future warming-- likely reduced the earth's future temperature by an amount too small to verify.[[3]](#_ftn3)

#### Other nations won’t model EPA regulations

**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]

The impact on the overall econ omy, as measured by gross domestic product (GDP), is substantial. The cumulative GDP losses for 2010 to 2029 approach $7 trillion. Single-year losses exceed $600 billion in 2029, more than $5,000 per house hold. (See Chart 1.) Job losses are expected to exceed 800,000 in some years, and exceed at least 500,000 from 2015 through 2026. (See Chart 2). Note that these are net job losses, after any jobs created by compliance with the regulations--so-called green jobs--are taken into account. Hardest-hit are man ufacturing jobs, with losses approaching 3 million. (See Chart 3). Particularly vulnerable are jobs in durable manufacturing (28 percent job losses), machinery manufacturing (57 percent), textiles (27.6 percent), electrical equipment and appli ances (22 percent), paper (36 percent), and plastics and rubber products (54 percent). It should be noted that since the EPA rule is unilateral and few other nations are likely to follow the U.S. lead, many of these manufacturing jobs will be out sourced overseas.

#### Causes Carbon leakage and LDC shift – guts econ and competitiveness without reducing CO2

**Institute for 21st Century Energy, 9** (Institute for 21st Century Energy, US Chamber of Commerce, 4/21, http://energyxxi.org/sites/default/files/ClimateChange101.pdf

What would happen if the cap on carbon is too stringent? The price of energy and nearly all consumer goods would skyrocket. Companies could decide to move to a different country that does not regulate carbon dioxide emissions. For instance, if the U.S. were to regulate carbon emissions, an American company may decide to shut down its domestic operations and instead relocate to a country like China or India that does not regulate emissions. So-called “carbon leakage” could undermine the effectiveness of cap and trade because it would harm the U.S. economy by sending jobs overseas and would fail to reduce global emissions, thereby mitigating any environmental benefits to the program.

#### Even with co2 cuts, can’t prevent warming

**Times Online 8** [5/23, Copenhagen Consensus: global warming, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article3992368.ece]

There is unequivocal evidence that humans are changing the planet’s climate. We are already committed to average temperature increases of about 0.6°C, even without further rises in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. The world has focused on mitigation — reducing carbon emissions — a close look at the costs and benefits suggests that relying on this alone is a poor approach. Option One: Continuing focus on mitigation Even if mitigation — economic measures like taxes or trading systems — succeeded in capping emissions at 2010 levels, then the world would pump out 55 billion tonnes of carbon emissions in 2100, instead of 67 billion tonnes. It is a difference of 18 per cent: the benefits would remain smaller than 0.5 per cent of the world’s GDP for more than 200 years. These benefits simply are not large enough to make the investment worthwhile.

#### Too much co2 has already been released – can’t prevent warming

**Longley 8** [Robert, as worked closely with federal agencies including the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Census Bureau, “Global Warming Inevitable This Century, NSF Study Finds”, http://usgovinfo.about.com/od/technologyandresearch/a/climatetochange.htm]

Despite efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, global warming and a greater increase in sea level are inevitable during this century, according to a new study performed by a team of climate modelers at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, Colo. Indeed, say the researchers, whose work was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), globally averaged surface air temperatures would still rise one degree Fahrenheit (about a half degree Celsius) by the year 2100, even if no more greenhouse gases were added to the atmosphere. And the resulting transfer of heat into the oceans would cause global sea levels to rise another 4 inches (11 centimeters) from thermal expansion alone. The team's findings are published in this week's issue of the journal "Science." “This study is another in a series that employs increasingly sophisticated simulation techniques to understand the complex interactions of the Earth,” says Cliff Jacobs of NSF’s atmospheric sciences division.

## \*\*\*Obama Good EPA Regs Good\*\*\*

### EXT: MODELLING

#### U.S. ACTION IS CRUCIAL FOR LEADERSHIP AND FOR OTHER COUNTRIES TO FOLLOW.

**WIRTH et al 03** (Timothy E, President of the UN Foundation – along with C. Boyden Gray and John D. Podesta – also of the UN Foundation, “The Future of Energy Policies,” Foreign Affairs, July/August, p. 132, lexis).

Energy is a common thread weaving through the fabric of critical American interests and global challenges. U.S. strategic energy policy must take into account the three central concerns outlined above -- economic security, environmental protection, and poverty alleviation -- and set aggressive goals for overcoming them. Leadership from Washington is critical because the [U.S.] United States is so big, so economically powerful, and so vulnerable to oil shocks and terrorism. This is a time of opportunity, too -- a major technological revolution is beginning in energy, with great potential markets. And finally, the reality is that where the [U.S.] United States goes, others will likely follow. America's example for good or for ill sets the tempo and the direction of action far beyond its borders and far into the future.

#### AND US CLIMATE POLICY IS MODELLED INTERNATIONALLY.

**Paltsev et al 7** (Sergey, Assessment of US Cap-and-trade proposals, research of MIT’s Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, a joint center sponsored by the Center for Global Change Science and the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research, http://tisiphone.mit.edu/RePEc/mee/wpaper/2007-005.pdf)

Also at issue is the equitable sharing of the cost burden of emissions reduction. Such equity concerns are inextricably linked to the strategic objective of getting other countries to mitigate their own greenhouse gas emissions. Poorer countries see a U.S. and developed world that has freely emitted CO2 over the history of fossil use, and are thus responsible for the level of concentrations we see today. And they see economies with far higher incomes that are in a better position to afford the burden of mitigation. Thus, a perception of the U.S. taking on an equitable share of the burden of abatement is probably essential if the U.S. policy is going to serve the strategic goal of moving climate policy forward elsewhere. These issues are well beyond the scope of this analysis but consideration of them is essential in determining the best policy for the U.S.

### EXT: EPA REGS SOLVE WARMING

#### EPA regulations limit industrial pollution – solve warming

**Smith et al 7.** [Brian, Earth Justice, EPA Petitioned to Reduce Global Warming Pollution from Ships, DA 7-15-2010, http://www.earthjustice.org/news/press/007/epa-petitioned-to-reduce-global-warming-pollution-from-ships.html]

The April 2007 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court clearly established that the Clean Air Act gives the EPA authority to address global warming. The EPA must act immediately and issue regulations to limit pollution that contributes to global warming. The petitions filed today begin the process of imposing mandatory regulations on the marine transportation sector. The petitioners asked the EPA to respond within 180 days. The Climate Change Problem The science is unequivocal. Global climate change is real, occurring at an alarming rate with catastrophic consequences, and is caused primarily by human activity. Ships are major sources of greenhouse gas emissions. The global fleet of marine vessels releases almost three percent of the world's carbon dioxide, an amount comparable to the emissions of Canada. Because of their huge number and inefficient operating practices, marine vessels release a large volume of global warming pollutants, particularly carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and black carbon (or soot). Despite their impact on the global climate, greenhouse gas emissions from ships are not currently regulated by the United States government.  In addition, these emissions are not limited under the Kyoto Protocol or other international treaties that address global warming. Ships' Contribution to the Climate Change Problem Global shipping activity has increased by three percent per year for the last three decades and this rate of growth is projected to increase. If fuel use remains unchanged, shipping pollution will increase substantially, potentially doubling from 2002 levels by 2020 and tripling by 2030. "Global warming pollution from ships is a substantial problem. But fortunately, it's one that can be solved," said Danielle Fugere of Friends of the Earth. "Slower speeds, cleaner fuels, better ships -- the steps that the shipping industry must take are clear. It's up to the EPA to ensure these steps are taken." Why We Should Care Climate change is already causing widespread melting of Arctic glaciers and sea ice, shortening the snow season and raising global temperatures.   The resulting sea level rise could eliminate up to 22 percent of the worlds coastal wetlands and as much as 43 percent of U.S. wetlands. Wetlands provide habitat, protect against floods and storm surges and contribute to local economies. Our oceans and freshwater environments, including organisms at the bottom of the aquatic food chain, are already under stress from climate change. Ranges of algae, plankton and fish have shifted in response to changes in water temperature, ice cover, oxygen content, salinity and circulation. If they die off, entire aquatic ecosystems will follow. Among the species that are struggling to adapt to rapidly changing habitats are cold-water fish, such as salmon and cod, polar bears, walruses, seals, whales, caribou, reindeer, corals, turtles and countless species of migrating sea birds. "If we're going to slow the Arctic melt-down and save Arctic species, we must control global warming pollution from ships," said Kassie Siegel, Climate Program Director for the Center for Biological Diversity. "Implementing the solutions in the petition is the first step toward slowing warming and protecting these species' future." Human health is also impacted by climate change caused by global warming pollution. Climate-related illnesses include air-quality related heart and lung disease, heat-stroke, malnutrition, and casualties from fires, storms and floods. "Climate change is threatening ocean life from the Arctic to the tropics. Shipping pollution has been given a free pass so far and it's way past time to fix that," said Dr. Michael Hirshfield, Oceana's Senior Vice President for North America and Chief Scientist.

#### EPA regulations solve global warming

**SNAPE 10**. [Bill, Senior Counsel, Center For Biological Diversity, 3/8/2010, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/03/whats-the-upshot-of-blocking-e.php]

Global warming and associated climate change is the most serious current threat to our planet. Our addiction to fossil fuels, furthermore, catalyzed a now seemingly endless war that has had disastrous consequences for the U.S. budget, the ability of the developed world to focus on meaningful economic challenges, and the countless number of innocent global citizens who have perished for no good reason. Atmospheric heating has already started and will likely accelerate rapidly over the coming years. EPA and other federal agencies already possess the tools under the Clean Air Act and other statutes to begin addressing the problem. There is no reason to wait. If Congress wants to add some progressive mechanisms, such as tax and dividend, into the mix, then so be it. But the federal and state agencies with legal authority must make their move, transparently and objectively, without delay.

#### EPA regulation is key to solve warming

**McGowan,** 6/30/**2010** (“Clean Air Act Proving Effective in CO2 Regulation, Lawyers Tell Their Corporate Clients” http://solveclimate.com/blog/20100630/clean-air-act-proving-effective-co2-regulation-lawyers-tell-their-corporate-clients)

Under the Obama administration, the subtext at EPA is that Congress should be crafting climate change legislation but that the agency will move ahead in the meantime, McKinstry explained. While progress was snail-like after the spring of 2007 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that EPA has the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, the agency picked up the pace after Lisa Jackson took over as administrator. Since issuing the endangerment finding in December 2009—which officially found emissions of mobile sources to threaten human health and welfare—EPA has taken several steps forward with insider-baseball names such as the mobile source rule, the trigger rule, the tailoring rule and the reporting rule. Briefly, these rules mean industrial sources of greenhouse gases will be regulated through a process that rolls out gradually over the coming years. For example, the tailoring rule will require about 550 large industrial manufacturers and landfills to obtain permits for emissions beginning in January 2011, with about 900 additional polluters coming under regulatory review each year thereafter.

### EXT: WARMING – MAND. REPORT RULE SOLVES

#### MANDATORY REPORTING RULE KEY TO LIMIT EMISSIONS – INCENTIVIZES INDUSTRY COMPLIANCE.

**FRENKIL 10**. [David, JD @ George Washington Law, assistant editor of Carbon and Climate Law Review, “Making Sense of EPA’s Climate Regulations” Energy Efficiency & Climate Change Law -- http://www.efficiencylaw.com/2010/02/making-sense-of-epas-climate-regulations/]

Mandatory Reporting Rule This rule establishes an economy-wide system for mandatory reporting of GHGs that provides much broader scope and detail than a previous EPA rule requiring reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from electric generation facilities (see 40 C.F.R. Part 75.13 and 75.64). The EPA anticipates that the new rule will apply to approximately 10,000 facilities that account for approximately 85% of GHG emissions in the United States. Facilities subject to the rule consist of entities from a wide spectrum of industries. The industries with the most number of covered entities include utilities, waste treatment, natural gas suppliers, manufacturers of paper, steel and cement, and oil refineries. These facilities were required to begin emissions monitoring in January 2010. The information accumulated during this mandatory monitoring is required to be submitted in detailed annual reports to the EPA beginning in 2011 and will be made available to the public, while other data submitted to EPA (e.g., production and process data) may be protected under the agency’s procedures governing confidential business information. Although the EPA Mandatory Reporting Rule will provide consistent information among covered entities, many public companies will not qualify for the EPA program because only approximately 10,000 entities will be covered by the new EPA rule. This means that more than 70,000 entities emitting at least 1,000 million tons of GHGs will be without consistent reporting standards. However, this rule is expected to create new opportunities for industry and government policy. (i) New Opportunities for the Private Sector It is expected that such reporting standards will create incentives for these facilities to reduce their GHG emissions because monitoring of a company’s emissions might expose opportunities for reducing energy consumption and, thus, operating expenses. The rule creates an opportunity for many facilities to identify major sources of emissions along with potential emission reduction options. It also prescribes a separate GHG monitoring and reporting methodology for each affected sector. Additionally, many affected facilities will be required to sample and test fuel, or install accurate devices to measure facility output and emissions. The proposed rules regarding New Source Review and Title V Permits, as discussed below, will also provide opportunities for reducing energy consumption, GHG emissions and cost because it requires large emitters to acquire permits that would demonstrate they are using the best practices and technologies to minimize GHG emissions. Further, as with companies that rank high on the EPA’s Toxic Release Inventories (TRI) list, companies that report a high level of GHG emissions under the new EPA rule may face public scrutiny and pressure to reduce emissions. This would certainly create incentives for public companies to improve their management of GHGs because the stock market reacts negatively to evidence of poor environmental management.

### 2NC ENVIRO. LEADERSHIP IMPACT

#### U.S. CLIMATE ACTION KEY TO PREVENT THE COLLAPSE OF OVERALL LEADERSHIP.

**Walter 2** (Norbert, Chief Economist @ Deutsche Bank Group, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9907E7DE1F3CF93BA1575BC0A9649C8B63>)

At present there is much talk about the unparalleled strength of the United States on the world stage. Yet at this very moment the most powerful country in the world stands to forfeit much political capital, moral authority and international good will by dragging its feet on the next great global issue: the environment. Before long, the administration's apparentunwillingness to take a leadership role -- or, at the very least, to stop acting as a brake -- in fighting global environmental degradation will threaten the very basis of the American supremacy that many now seem to assume will last forever. American authority is already in some danger as a result of the Bush administration's decision to send a low-level delegation to the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg -- low-level, that is, relative to America's share of both the world economy and global pollution. The absence of President Bush from Johannesburg symbolizes this decline in authority. In recent weeks, newspapers around the world have been dominated by environmental headlines: In central Europe, flooding killed dozens, displaced tens of thousands and caused billions of dollars in damages. In South Asia, the United Nations reports a brown cloud of pollution that is responsible for hundreds of thousands of deaths a year from respiratory disease. The pollution (80 percent man-made) also cuts sunlight penetration, thus reducing rainfall, affecting agriculture and otherwise altering the climate. Many other examples of environmental degradation, often related to the warming of the atmosphere, could be cited. What they all have in common is that they severely affect countries around the world and are fast becoming a chief concern for people everywhere. Nobody is suggesting that these disasters are directly linked to anything the United States is doing. But when a country that emits 25 percent of the world's greenhouse gases acts as an uninterested, sometimes hostile bystander in the environmental debate, it looks like unbearable arrogance to many people abroad. The administration seems to believe it is merely an observer -- that environmental issues are not its issues. But not doing anything amounts to ignoring a key source of world tension, and no superpower that wants to preserve its status can go on dismissing such a pivotal dimension of political and economic -- if not existential -- conflict. In my view, there is a clear-cut price to be paid for ignoring the views of just about every other country in the world today.The United States is jettisoning its hard-won moral and intellectual authority and perhaps the strategic advantages that come with being a good steward of the international political order. The United States may no longer be viewed as a leader or reliable partner in policymaking: necessary, perhaps inevitable, but not desirable, as it has been for decades. All of this because America's current leaders are not willing to acknowledge the very real concerns of many people about global environmental issues.

#### U.S. environmental leadership prevents global environmental destruction that risks planetary extinction

**Harris ’01** (Paul G., Lecturer @ Lignan U, Hong Kong And Associate Fellow at the Oxford Center for Environment, Ethics, and Society at Mansfield College, Oxford University, The Environment, International Relations, and U.S. Foreign Policy, p. 241-2)

Environment, Equity, and U.S. Foreign Policy: Normative Implications In addition to promoting U.S. global interests, a more robust acceptance by the U.S. government of international equity as an objective of global environmental policy—and indeed of foreign policy generally—has potentially **beneficial implications for humankind.** Implementation of the equity provisions of international environmental arrangements may reduce human suffering by helping to prevent changes to local, regional, and global environmental commons that would adversely affect people, most notably the many poor people in the economically developing countries who are least able to cope with environmental changes. Insofar as environmental protection policies focus on sustainable economic development, human suffering may be mitigated as developing countries—especially the least-developed countries—are aided in meeting the basic needs of their citizens. Economic disparities within and between countries are growing. At least one-fifth of the world’s population already lives in the squalor of absolute poverty.59 This situation can be expected to worsen in the future. If this process can be mitigated or reversed by international policies focusing on environmentally sustainable economic development, human well-being on a global scale will rise. ‘What is more, international cooperative efforts to protect the environment that are made more likely and more effective by provisions for international equity will help governments protect their own environment and the global environment if they are successful. Insofar as the planet is one biosphere—that it is in the case of ozone depletion and climate change seems indisputable-persons in every local and national community are simultaneously members of an interdependent whole. Most activities, especially widespread activities in the United States and the rest of the industrialized world, including the release of ozone-destroying chemicals and greenhouse gases, are likely to adversely affect many or possibly all persons on the planet. Efforts to prevent such harm or make amends for historical harm (i.e., past pollution, which is especially important in these examples because many pollutants continue doing harm for years and often decades) require that most communities work together. Indeed, affluent lifestyles in the United States, ‘Western Europe, and other developed areas may harm people in poor areas of the world more than they will harm those enjoying such lifestyles because the poor are ill-equipped to deal with the consequences.6° Furthermore, by concerning themselves with the consequences of their actions on the global poor and polluted, Americans and the citizens of other developed countries will be helping their immediate neighbors—and themselves—in the long run. Actualization of international equity in conjunction with sustainable development may help prevent damage to the natural environment worldwide, thereby promoting human prosperity. The upshot is that the United States has not gone far enough in actively accepting equity as an objective of global environmental policy. It ought to go further in doing so for purely self-interested reasons. But there are more than self-interested reasons for the United States to move in this direction. It ought to embrace international equity as an objective of its global environmental policy for ethical reasons as well. We can find substantial ethical justification for the United States, in concert with other developed countries, to support politically and financially the codification and implementation of international equity considerations in international environmental agreements. The United States ought to be a leader in supporting a fair and just distribution among countries of the benefits, burdens, and decision-making authority associated with international environmental relations.61 To invoke themes found in the corpus of ethical philosophy (but without here assuming the burden of philosophical exegesis!), the United States ought to adopt policies that engender international equity in at least the environmental field (1) to protect the health and well-being of the human species; (2) to promote basic human rights universally; (3) to help the poor be their own moral agents (a Kantian rationale); (4) to help right past wrongs and to take responsibility for past injustices (i.e., past and indeed ongoing U.S. pollution of the global environment); (5) to aid the world’s least-advantaged people and countries (a Rawlsian-like conception); (6) and to fhlflll the requirement of impartiality (among other ethical reasons)62—all in addition to the more dearly self-interested justification that doing so will bolster U.S. credibility and influence in international environmental negotiations and contemporary global politics more generally. One might argue, therefore, that the United States ought to be aiding the developing countries to achieve sustainable development because to do so may simultaneously reduce human suffering and reduce or potentially reverse environmental destruction that could otherwise threaten the healthy survival of the human species**.** Insofar as human-caused pollution and resource exploitation deny individuals and their communities the capacity to survive in a healthy condition, the United States, which consumes vastly more than necessary, has an obligation to stop that unnecessary consumption. From this basic rights perspective,63 the U.S. government should also take steps to reduce substantially the emissions of pollutants from within the United States that harm people in other countries.64 The United States ought to refrain from unsustainable use of natural resources and from pollution of environmental commons shared by people living in other countries—or at least make a good effort toward that end—because the people affected by these activities cannot reasonably be expected to support them (we would not be treating them as independent moral agents, to make a Kantian argument65).

### EXT: EPA SOLVES CLIMATE LEADERSHIP

#### EPA REGS KEY TO CLIMATE LEADERSHIP.

**CHAPIN 10**. [Terry, Professor of Ecology, Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 3/8/2010, “It's time for U.S. leadership,” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/03/whats-the-upshot-of-blocking-e.php]

It is time for the United States to provide international leadership in reducing rates of climate change rather than to continue being a major international contributor to the problem. The current role assigned to EPA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources will keep the pressure on Congress to consider alternative solutions. Without this pressure, I fear that climate change will continue to be a political football and that the United States will never take the strong actions that are needed.

### --- ECON IMPACT ---

### 2NC ECON/COMPETITIVENESS IMPACT

#### EPA regs key to econ and competitiveness – green jobs, regulatory certainty, innovation, lead in energy tech market

Senator Kirsten **Gillibrand**, a member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee,, 1/21 **2010**, ‘Gillibrand: For New York, This Amendment Stands For More Air Pollution In Our Communities, More Acid Rain Devastating Natural Treasures Like The Adirondacks, Ever-Increasing Asthma Rates For Our Children,” http://gillibrand.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/?id=c7e97140-cf14-4772-bf27-cd0c3a210db1

“Mr. President, I rise today to speak against the proposed Amendment from the Senator from Alaska. Mr. President, this resolution of disapproval goes against good public health policy and poses a serious threat to my constituents in New York - and all Americans – undermining our ability to advance efforts to clean our air and water and leave our world a better, healthier place. “This assault on the Clean Air Act would handcuff the Environmental Protection Agency, stripping it of its authority to regulate dangerous greenhouse gases. Mr. President, this amendment would let large scale polluters off the hook by scrapping requirements for electric generation facilities to use modern technology to reduce emissions and produce cleaner energy. “If passed, this amendment would send a message that the United States will remain reliant on outdated and inefficient energy technologies and delay investment in new, clean technologies that would spur innovation and create good-paying, American jobs, all across this great nation. “For my constituents in New York, this amendment stands for more air pollution in our communities, more acid rain devastating natural treasures like the Adirondacks, ever-increasing asthma rates for our children, and a failure to take action when action is long overdue. “Mr. President, regulatory uncertainty is undermining our national interests and giving countries like China and India the ability to eclipse our nation in developing the next generation of energy technologies - that we, the United States, should be leading the way on. “Supporters of this amendment are essentially saying that they do not believe the worldwide scientific consensus regarding climate change, and that they don’t believe greenhouse gases pose a threat to human health - despite decades of world-class science that predate it, and the clarion call from public health advocates across the country.

### EXT: SOLVES ECON/COMP

**Emissions cap key to rapid renewable development – key to competitiveness, business profits in massive markets and low cost emission cuts– gutting their internal links**

**Hawkins 7** (David -- director of the Climate Center at the National Resources Defense Council. Gristmill – November 28th -- http://gristmill.grist.org/story/2007/9/28/11254/2676)

Between now and 2030 over $17 trillion will be invested globally to meet the growing demand for energy services. Nearly all of this will be spent on fuels and conversion methods selected by private sector actors chasing profitability. The challenge is to focus the incredible power of these private sector actors on energy investments that minimize carbon emissions. To move at the pace and scale required to prevent the worst impacts of global warming we need policies that make clean energy products and services a superior business proposition. Policies that require a clear and steady reduction in emissions will move the private sector in the right direction faster than any government funded program by itself. With a schedule of declining caps on emissions as the law of the land, entrepreneurs in firms large and small will know there is a growing market for clean energy innovations. They will help the nation meet targeted emissions reduction at the lowest possible cost. Nordhaus and Shellenberger ignore the reality of the energy marketplace when they argue that the most important policy to drive new technology is a large government funded program. While incentive funding measures can be an important complementary strategy for clean energy deployment, by themselves they will not move the private sector at the required pace. In arguing for "breakthrough" technologies rather than deployment of today's clean energy solutions, Nordhaus and Shellenberger are peddling the same false choice the Bush administration has used to justify its retrograde policies for the past seven years. The convenient truth is that with intelligent policies to make clean energy more profitable we can get started today and we can set in motion the forces that will deliver the additional breakthroughs we need in the coming decades. This is not an "environmentalist" pipe dream. It is the judgment of the leaders of 27 of the largest American businesses, who have joined with NRDC and others in the U.S. Climate Action Partnership (USCAP), calling for a mandatory declining cap on U.S. global warming emissions. Its members include large energy producers and consumers such as Shell, Rio Tinto, Duke Energy, and Alcoa. These Fortune 500 companies recognize that their future business model depends upon the shift to low carbon technologies and efficiencies made possible through a national program of required emission reductions.

#### GHG restrictions create new green jobs – reduces energy costs

Keith **Benman**, 12/9 **2009**, Writer for BusINess, “EPA greenhouse gas ruling could bring big changes to region,” http://nwitimes.com/app/inbusiness/?p=2902

Environmentalists generally cheered Monday’s ruling, saying it will provide the hammer that will finally make business understand climate change has to be addressed. “I think it’s going to help Northwest Indiana catch up with the rest of the world,” said Lee Botts, a longtime environmentalist and a founder of the Alliance for the Great Lakes. “I think it will create new job possibilities as well as reduce utility costs and energy costs for existing businesses and improve the environment.” Green jobs, such as those of builders who weatherize homes, will grow once regulations are in place limiting greenhouse gas emissions, Botts said. The EPA said the scientific evidence surrounding climate change clearly shows that greenhouse gases “threaten the public health and welfare of the American people” and that the emissions—mainly carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels—should be regulated under the Clean Air Act.

#### EPA emissions rollback crushes jobs and creates business uncertainty – destroys clean energy development

Larry **Schweiger** President and CEO, National Wildlife Federation, 1/25 **2010**, “Preserve the Clean Air Act's Protections,” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/01/should-congress-stop-epa.php

Just last week, NASA announced 2009 was the 2nd-hottest year on record, with the 2000s being the hottest decade on record. That leaves Sen. Murkowski and her supporters in a delicate position. With climate science looking more dire by the day, why would they try to direct the Environmental Protection Agency to ignore scientific climate findings about global warming’s threat to human health? Sen. Murkowski’s effort would allow unlimited emissions of carbon pollution from the biggest corporate polluters and could stall the growth in clean energy jobs by creating uncertainty about our government’s commitment to a cleaner energy future. Clean Energy Works has rightly called it a Dirty Air Act.

### AT: HURTS THE ECONOMY

#### EPA regulations would be phased in – ensures business stability

**NYT** 2/22 **2010**, “E.P.A. Plans to Phase in Regulation of Emissions,” http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/23/business/energy-environment/23epa.html

Facing wide criticism over their recent finding that greenhouse gases endanger the public welfare, top Environmental Protection Agency officials said Monday that any regulation of such gases would be phased in gradually and would not impose expensive new rules on most American businesses. The E.P.A.’s administrator, Lisa P. Jackson, wrote in a letter to eight coal-state Democrats who have sought a moratorium on regulation that only the biggest sources of greenhouse gases would be subjected to limits before 2013. Smaller ones would not be regulated before 2016, she said. “I share your goals of ensuring economic recovery at this critical time and of addressing greenhouse gas emissions in sensible ways that are consistent with the call for comprehensive energy and climate legislation,” Ms. Jackson wrote.

#### EPA regulations will be cost effective – claims of harsh regulation, economic or industry collapse are scare tactics

**Sierra Club 2009**, Q&A for EPA Endangerment Determination, “http://action.sierraclub.org/site/PageServer?pagename=adv\_bigpicture\_endangerment\_qa

This action is part of President Obama's comprehensive clean energy jobs plan. It will help shift U.S. energy production toward cleaner, cheaper sources like the wind and the sun and spur the creation of millions of new clean energy jobs. Building the clean energy economy is the key to getting our economy back on track and reducing our dependence on oil and coal. EPA will only issue the same kind of common sense regulations for carbon dioxide as it has for dozens of other pollutants for decades-regulations that protect both the environment and help grow the economy. In fact, the law only allows EPA to impose regulations that can be implemented on a cost-effective basis. Suggestions that these regulations will bankrupt companies and devastate the economy are merely scare tactics used by people who will say anything to protect Big Oil, Big Coal, and other polluters.

### AT: HURTS SMALL BIZ

#### New EPA rules will only regulate the biggest industries

Frances **Beinecke** President, Natural Resources Defense Council, 1/25 **2010**, “It's Not the Dirty Air Act,” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/01/should-congress-stop-epa.php

Senator Murkowski also claims that her disapproval resolution “has nothing to do with the science of climate change.” Yet this too is incorrect. The resolution explicitly overturns the EPA’s science-based finding that global warming pollution is dangerous to Americans’ health and environment. This is the equivalent of Congress vetoing the Surgeon-General’s report that smoking causes lung cancer. Murkowski and others also claim that the EPA’s rules would cover hospitals, hotels, and other small sources. This also is mistaken. Last September the EPA proposed to tailor its existing rules to make sure that only the biggest pollution sources such as power plants, oil refineries, and cement kilns have to install the “best available control technology” for carbon dioxide and the other global warming pollutants. This is nothing fancy. It's what they've done for years for other dangerous pollutants like sulfur dioxide. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson explained the extent of the regulations this way: “We can begin reducing emissions from the nation's largest greenhouse gas emitting facilities without placing an undue burden on the businesses that make up the vast majority of our economy.” She added: “The corner coffee shop is not a meaningful place to look for carbon reductions.”

#### And, wouldn’t regulate small businesses

**Sierra Club** 12 **2009**, “The Importance of Copenhagen and EPA’s Endangerment Finding,” http://sierraclub.typepad.com/compass/2009/12/the-importance-of-copenhagen-and-epas-endangerment-finding.html

And do not listen to the naysayers of the Clean Air Act, claiming that this ruling means small businesses, churches, schools and hospitals are subject to regulation from the proposed Big Polluters rule now. EPA has addressed that already – only those who emit more than 25,000 tons of carbon annually are subject to that proposed rule. My focus is on the huge coal industry in the U.S., they need to clean up their dated power plants and stop blocking progress. And in looking at Copenhagen, the need to move beyond coal stretches well beyond our borders. Numerous countries rely on coal power and we must all take steps away from this dirty energy source if we are to be serious about fighting global warming.

#### Regs will be designed to not hurt small businesses

**Walsh** 2/23/**2009** (Brian, “EPA Prepares to Take the Lead on Regulating CO2” Time Magazine http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1967585,00.html)

Jackson has already begun to outline how greenhouse-gas regulations might work. Responding to the concerns of Democrats, she emphasized in a letter on Monday that only major sources of greenhouse-gas emissions would be subject to regulation before 2013, and that smaller emitters wouldn't be regulated before 2016. That decision seemed designed to blunt criticism that top-down regulations could negatively impact small-business owners, not just major power plants and factories. "I share your goals of ensuring economic recovery at this critical time and of addressing greenhouse-gas emissions in sensible ways that are consistent with the call for comprehensive energy and climate legislation," wrote Jackson.

#### More ev

**Sierra Club 2009**, Q&A for EPA Endangerment Determination, “http://action.sierraclub.org/site/PageServer?pagename=adv\_bigpicture\_endangerment\_qa

This is simply a dishonest scare tactic used by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and others. While the "endangerment determination" triggers regulatory action by EPA, nobody, including environmentalists, is calling for regulating anything but large emitters (approximately 25,000 tons or more of CO2 per year). When asked about this scare tactic, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said: "It's a myth that we're at a horrible fork in the road, where the EPA is going to regulate cows, Dunkin' Donuts, Pizza Huts, and baby bottles." (<http://tinyurl.com/dbc89x>)

### AT: HURTS AG INDUSTRY

#### EPA regs needed to stop climate change – that kills crops

Christian Christian **Parenti** is a contributing editor at The Nation and a visiting scholar at the Center for Place, Culture and Politics, at the CUNY Grad Center., April 20, **2010**, “The Nation: The Case for EPA Action,” http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126129216

"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.

#### Emissions hurt more – warming will destroy crop yields

Lynn **Bergeson**, Regulatory Editor at chemical processing, **2010**, “Prepare to Report Climate Risks,” http://www.chemicalprocessing.com/articles/2010/002.html

There’s no serious question that climate change is real. The Supreme Court directed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to determine whether greenhouse gas emissions threaten public health and welfare within Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act in Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007). Earlier this year, EPA issued a proposed “endangerment finding” accompanied by an extensive Technical Support Document (see http://epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/downloads/TSD\_Endangerment.pdf) containing its analysis of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions. “Pressure on industries with energy-sensitive operations and green house gas emissions will likely increase.” They include substantial economic effects such as crop losses associated with flooding and diminished farmer profits linked to delayed spring planting; forest losses due to warmer temperatures and elevated insect activity; property losses; significant losses in the energy sector; increasing cost associated with water infrastructure; and adverse affects on tourism, among others. EPA issued a final rule in October 2009 requiring large sources of greenhouse gas emissions to report them to EPA each year beginning in 2010.

### AT: HURTS CHEM INDUSTRY

#### Emissions limits increase demand for chemical industry products – offsets losses

**CAMPOY 9**. [ANA, journalist, “Chemical makers poised to gain in new cap and trade system” Wall Street Journal – Jun 5]

With legislation pending in Congress that could put a price on greenhouse-gas emissions, the energy-gulping chemical industry is trying to position itself to emerge as an unlikely winner. Chemical makers are one of the biggest energy users among manufacturers, expelling about 5% of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions, according to government data. They face heavy costs under a proposed system to cap emissions that would require the industry to purchase permits to pollute. But a so-called cap-and-trade system would also boost demand for some chemical companies' products, from insulation to solar-panel components, because those products would help others cut back on the energy use. "This is really our sweet spot," said Calvin Dooley, chief executive of the American Chemistry Council, an industry trade group.

### AT: LNG IMPORTS BAD

#### -- No accidents –

#### A) Double hulls

**Quoddy 8** (Bay LLC, “Safety & Security”, http://www.quoddylng.com/safety.html)

The ships will employ both double containment of their contents and double hulls, ensuring a **very low risk of any** **spills or accidents**. This full containment ensures that if leaks or spills do occur, the LNG will be contained and isolated. The double hulls ensure a very low risk that any breach would even reach the hull containment tanks. The vessels are designed with a double hull to ensure minimization of leakage in the event of a collision or grounding, as well as separate ballast.

#### B) Safety systems

**Quoddy 8** (Bay LLC, “Safety & Security”, http://www.quoddylng.com/safety.html)

LNG facilities have extensive, state-of-the-art warning systems, including gas detectors, ultraviolet or infrared fire detectors, smoke or combustion product detectors, low temperature detectors, and detectors to monitor LNG levels and vapor pressures. Codes and standards from state, national, and international agencies and institutions insure the chances of any releases are **very small**, and if there are releases, the volume of the release is minimal. In addition to warning systems, LNG facilities have **automated firefighting systems**, including foam, dry chemical, or water dispersal and **automatic shutdown** **systems**.

#### -- Multiple checks prevent LNG terrorism

**Quoddy 8** (Bay LLC, “Safety & Security”, http://www.quoddylng.com/safety.html)

Are LNG tankers and storage facilities likely terrorist targets?

All parts of our critical energy infrastructure have been reassessed since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Security consciousness throughout the United States is heightened. Shippers have redoubled their already-stringent efforts to ensure security of transportation and the safety of terminals. There is **no indication** that LNG facilities or ships are more likely terrorist targets than other cargo ships or higher visibility political targets such as federal or state landmarks, public gatherings or bridges and tunnels. Nonetheless, LNG suppliers work closely with U.S. agencies charged with national security, and many developers contract with international experts who test their plans, procedures, people, and training to ensure they are sound. First, stringent access controls exist at both the point of origin and the point of destination. Both the liquefaction and re-gasification terminals have gated security access and continuous surveillance monitoring. Next, highly specialized, well-trained personnel serve as crewmembers. Before an LNG ship enters U.S. waters, the immigration service validates the crew. There is a buffer zone required between tankers and other traffic, and tugboats control the direction of tankers as they approach a terminal. Oversight is handled by the U.S. Coast Guard and host port authority pilots. Finally, the Coast Guard boards ships before they enter U.S. waters if it deems the ship a security risk.

#### -- No impact to LNG explosion

**Styles 4** (Geoffrey SW, Managing Director – GSW Strategy Group, LLC, “Energy Outlook”, 5-14, http://energyoutlook.blogspot.com/2004/05/lng-disaster-movie-front-page-of-last.html)

The other remarkable feature of this situation is the degree of fear being instilled by those opposed to the LNG terminals. Although I don't fault communities for wanting a say in the kind of industrial facilities that will be in close proximity to them, those discussions should still be based on fact and not wild ravings. The Wall Street Journal cited one LNG opponent who claimed that the destructive potential of an LNG tanker was equivalent to 55 Hiroshima bombs (see analysis below). This reflects an **irrational fear**, bolstered by **junk science**. It's hard to argue with, but we cannot base the nation's energy policies on **paranoia**. Many have picked up on the [explosion](http://www.energy.ca.gov/lng/news_items/2004-01_algeria_factsheet.html) at the LNG plant in Skikda, Algeria (see my blog of [January 21](http://energyoutlook.blogspot.com/2004_01_01_energyoutlook_archive.html)) as evidence of the risks of handling LNG, but even if that were a fair comparison--and there are good reasons why it is not--it is actually a pretty good illustration that the risks are similar to those associated with many kinds of industrial facilities and not orders of magnitude greater, as activists assert. Having recently seen prosaic and trusted objects turned into deadly weapons, it is natural to worry a bit more about LNG than we might have a few years ago. Every LNG tanker--along with every crude oil or gasoline tanker, tank truck, or rail car--has the potential for destructive misuse. Yet we have not grounded all airplanes for fear they will be turned into cruise missiles, nor can we shun every link in the energy chain on which we all rely. While we can minimize risk, we cannot eliminate it. And if you don't want the LNG terminal in your neighborhood, for reasons that seem perfectly valid to you, just exactly whose neighborhood are you proposing as an alternative? Or are you and your neighbors prepared to take your houses off the gas grid and heat them with something else?
Finally, for anyone interested in the atomic bomb comparison, a few facts: 1. A fully loaded LNG tanker of 120,000 cubic meters capacity holds about 50,000 tons of methane. 2. The yield of the Hiroshima bomb was equivalent to 21,000 tons of TNT. 3. Conservatively assuming that TNT and methane have the same energy content gives you a ratio of 2.5, not 55, but we are not done yet. 4. An atomic bomb releases its energy (from the conversion of matter into energy, via our old friend e=mc^2) in 1/1000th of a second. This makes for a stupendous flash and explosion, with a surface temperature comparable to that of the sun. This is why every H-bomb has an A-bomb trigger.5. A chemical explosion of methane requires a narrow range of air/fuel mix (5-15%) that could not be achieved all at once for the entire volume of an LNG tanker. In the real world, it would take many seconds and probably minutes to consume all the available fuel. 6. **The difference** between points 4 and 5 above **is analogous to the difference between going from 60-0 mph by hitting a brick wall, compared to a panic stop using the brakes.** The same energy is released, but in very different ways. 7. If it were easy to liberate nuclear weapon yields from large quantities of fuel, people would be doing this routinely. The closest we get is something like [this](http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/dumb/fae.htm). And note that there is an **enormous distinction** between achieving A-bomb-like overpressures in a very limited radius with a fuel/air device vs. the kind of wide-scale effects of an actual nuclear explosion.

#### Accidents won’t cause LNG explosions

**Quoddy 8** (Bay LLC, “Safety & Security”, http://www.quoddylng.com/safety.html)

What is the likelihood of explosion at the storage tanks?

An explosion is **highly unlikely** because LNG is stored under atmospheric pressure. LNG is never flammable and natural gas cannot explode if it is not confined under pressure. Immediately after being released into the surrounding air, LNG starts to warm up and convert into a gas. Since initially the gas is colder and heavier than the surrounding air, it creates an icy fog - freezing the moisture in the air, as when a freezer door is opened. However, as the gas warms up, it blends with the air and begins to disperse and rise upward. The cloud could ignite close to the ground only if there is something to ignite it during a narrow window when the right mixture of gas and air exists for combustion. If released on water, LNG floats and vaporizes, leaving no residue.

### --- AT: AFF ARG’S ---

### AT: LEGISLATION KEY

#### Congress is not necessary to solve

**Parenti ’10** (Christian Parenti, a contributing editor at The Nation and a visiting scholar at the Center for Place, Culture and Politics, at the CUNY Grad Center, 4-20-10, “The Nation: The Case for EPA Action,” http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126129216)

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.

### AT: COMMAND AND CONTROL FAILS

#### MARKET BASED SOLUTIONS RISK HOT SPOTS AND ARE IMPOSSIBLE TO MONITOR – COMMAND AND CONTROL BEST

**Stewart**, Professor of Law, New York University, **2001**(Richard, Capital University Law Review, 29 Cap. U.L. Rev. 21, p. LN)

The defense of the current command regulatory system is also well known. It "works." Its proponents contend that it has achieved and will continue to achieve substantial improvements in environmental quality through a combination of technology based controls and ambient environmental quality standards. These regulatory requirements have pushed firms to develop and adopt pollution controls and sound waste reduction and management practices. For example, emissions reductions from automobiles have fallen dramatically over the past thirty years and will be reduced much further as a result of current federal requirements. Proponents of the regulatory status quo also argue that there are insufficient assurances that the proposed alternatives to the current system will perform better. Indeed, they may well inhibit further environmental [I\*22] progress. For example, proposals to require regulatory agencies to conduct additional cost-benefit and risk analyses before they can act threaten to impose intolerable delay and undermine environmental goals. Market-based and other flexibility mechanisms, if used on a broad scale, threaten to create serious loopholes and undermine the legal and public accountability of the regulatory system. It is claimed that market-based mechanisms are not suited for dealing- with most environmental problems because they can lead to local pollution " hot spots and are subject to monitoring and other administrative difficulties.

### AT: COMMAND & CONTROL KILLS PREDICTABILITY

#### Command and control comparatively more effective and better for business predictability – inevitable inefficiencies undermine market approach

**Fordham Environmental Law Journal**, Spring **2000** (Isabel Rauch, Law Degree, Pace University School of Law, 11 Fordham Envtl. Law J. 307, p. LN)

Whether economic incentives are, on the whole, more efficient compared with regulatory approaches, and more specifically, whether tradeable permits are preferential to environmental taxes, is highly controversial. Some commentators are generally against economic incentives. n64 They doubt that the expected economic mechanism really works efficiently. An incentive to continuously reduce emissions would require a continuously increasing demand for allowances. An increasing demand for allowances, on the other hand, would not occur without an increase in environmental pollution through economic growth. n65 Sources would not start selling their credits just because credit prices are rising. As there is always the possibility that other creditholders hoard their credits, sources might want to be careful and keep their own credits should they need them later on. All these potential imponderables would make the market more unpredictable. n66

### AT: MARKET SCHEME KEY TO MODELING/ACTION

#### Command and control facilitates developing country participation and compliance better than market schemes

**Journal of International Law and Politics**, Fall **2003** (Emily Richman, JD, NYU Law School, 36 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 133, p. LN)

Command-and-control regulation and carbon taxation would also require enforcement and administration by developing nations. However, emissions trading schemes may require more structure developed by the developing nations themselves. In a world of command-and-control regulations or carbon taxation an international regulatory body likely would set maximum emissions levels or tax rates. Developing nations may be responsible for enforcing these regulations, and this, like emissions trading programs, will certainly draw on the limited resources of developing nations. The most significant difference between the programs is the allocation of the costs of developing countries' inferior administrative capabilities. If developing countries cannot adequately enforce command-and-control regulations or levy taxes, the burden likely will fall on the world as a whole. Either developing countries will emit more carbon than allowed or the international regulatory body will have to expend resources to aid developing country enforcement. It is possible that international regulators somehow would penalize developing countries, but if these nations simply lack the capacity to do what regulators have requested, penalties seem illogical. On the other hand, if developing countries lack the resources to properly administer an emissions trading scheme, they may bear the losses exclusively: Their lack of administrative capability may allow other nations (or their own firms) to take advantage of them in trading-. Thus, in emissions trading schemes, developing countries bear all the costs of their lack of administrative capacity, whereas in command-and-control or carbon taxation systems the international coalition as a whole will share the burden. The latter burden allocation may give the coalition an incentive to aid developing nations in developing necessary administrative capacity.

## \*\*\*Iran Strike Internals\*\*\*

### Ext - Yes October Surprise

#### Obama will strike Iran if he starts to lose the election- prefer our evidence- media reports underestimate this risk

J. D. **Longstreet** is a thirty-year veteran of the broadcasting business, as an “in the field” and “on-air” news reporter (contributing to radio, TV, and newspapers) and a conservative broadcast commentator. **1-14**-2012 <http://www.federalobserver.com/2012/01/14/war-clouds-continue-to-gather/>

So when will this war begin. Well, let me put it this way: The Iranians should carefully watch Obama’s poll numbers. If those numbers continue their slide downwards, the Iranians are going get the heck bombed out of them. Americans are extremely reluctant to change Presidents in the middle of a war. Obama knows this and is expected to act accordingly. Some conservative writers and commentators expect that war in the Middle East is currently scheduled for October 2012. That would be the famed “October Surprise.” On the other hand, those in my camp believe the Iranians, in all their hyped-up passion, will do something stupid like firing on a tanker or a US warship or aircraft, or even worse, make an attempt to close the Straits of Hormuz by sewing it with mines and other hazards to maritime traffic. That would be the spark that would bring down the considerable wrath of that naval armada lying off their shores. Then there are the Israelis. They have had enough of Iran’s threats and Iran’s war on Israel by proxy. Israel’s secret war of sabotage in Iran can only deliver limited success at delaying and derailing Iran’s race to build or acquire a nuclear bomb. Israel could decide, at any moment, that enough is enough and launch their fighter-bombers and cruise missiles at Iran’s nuclear facilities. Even if it only buys a few months or a couple of years of breathing space for Israel, it is becoming clear there is no other way to effectively deter Iran from building their coveted Islam Bomb. The situation in the Middle East today is far, far, more dangerous than the US media is reporting. A single spark will ignite a devastating war that will affect practically every nation on earth to some degree or other. Those of us who continue to sound the warning bell of a huge war in the Middle East are being compared to the boy Peter in the story of “Peter and the Wolf.” An article at Haaretz.com noted that those who make such public comparisons seem always to leave out the end of Aesop’s famous tale of the boy who called wolf too much. In the end, the wolf actually DID come — and the sheep were slaughtered. (SOURCE) So, with that ending in mind, I have no concern about continually pointing to those dark, foreboding, clouds gathering in the east. Since the mainstream media seems to be ignoring a certain war to protect Obama’s prospects in the coming election, someone must stand as a watchman on the ramparts and sound the alarm when clouds of dust from the approaching armies of the enemy is sighted and when the sound of distant war drums is heard. Today those dust clouds are clearly seen over the horizon and the pounding of the drums can be heard in the distance — and we are sounding the alarm.

#### October surprise possible- election fate and Jewish vote determine strikes

Paul R. **Pillar**, in his 28 years at the Central Intelligence Agency, rose to be one of the agency’s top analysts. He is now a visiting professor at Georgetown University for security studies. **3-7**-2012 <http://consortiumnews.com/2012/03/07/an-israeli-october-surprise-on-obama/>

The greatest danger the United States (and any peace-loving person in the Middle East) currently faces is that Barak and Prime Minister Netanyahu will spring an October surprise (or a surprise in any month between now and the first Tuesday of November) in the form of an armed attack on Iran. [For more on a historical precedent, see Consortiumnews.com’s “The CIA/Likud Sinking of Jimmy Carter.”] A key consideration for them is the possibly different reactions of a U.S. president facing a fight for reelection (while also facing that political muscle represented at the convention center) and a newly reelected president who knows he never would be running for anything again.

#### Obama will strike Iran if he gets behind in the polls- sees it as his get out of jail free card

Jeremy **Slate**, Bachelor's Degree in Judaism and Catholic Theology, and a Master's Degree in European History, 2-12-**2012** <http://www.jeremyrslate.com/2012/02/art-of-october-surprise.html>

This time of year we are all looking for surprises. However, this Christmas season, I would like you consider a different type of surprise; an October Surprise. This probably conjures up mental images of ghosts, Goblins and pumpkins, but this line of thinking is completely off track. Typically, elections in the US take place the Tuesday after the first Monday in November; making events in October politically expedient. It is fitting the first October Surprise was conducted by Richard Nixon, a very "surprising" individual. Nixon is involved in two October Surprises, the second, in 1972, coining the phrase. In 1968, peace was a real possibility in Vietnam. It caused democrat, Hubert Humphrey to surge past Nixon in the polls. Nixon advisory, Henry Kissinger, spoke to the North Vietnamese, causing them to walk away from the peace treaty. Nixon would benefit again from Vietnam in 1972, when 12 days before the election, peace was announced, once again propelling Nixon to victory. Reagan had his own October Surprise fears due to Jimmy Carter in 1980. Carter believed the Iranian hostages safe return would cement his own campaign. The surprise was not to be; the hostages were not released until January 20, 1981, the day of Reagan's inauguration. In the 2000 election, George W. Bush almost lost the election due to October accusations of DWI. An October 2004 reduction of Saudi oil prices helped to cement Bush's reelection campaign. This is very interesting because there is a new October Surprise on the way. Barack Obama fears he will not win his reelection bid, seeing we is losing to "generic republican" in the polls. Mr. Obama has an ace in the hole, an October Surprise. The United States and Iran have been doing a lot of posturing. There was even a recent Daily Caller article blaming Iran for 9/11. Apparently, that card worked so well with Iraq and Afghanistan, so its being played again with Iran. Obama's Keynesian policies have failed and he is looking for a get out of jail free card. General Wesley Clark warned citizens in 2003 that the ultimate goal of the US was open war with Iran. Obama would even sway some of the war hungry Neo-Cons to his side. Israel will go to war with Iran around August, and the US will come in October to aid. It is important that it happens in October, so the media has no time to cover the story. A sitting president has never lost a reelection campaign during a time of war.

#### More ev

**The Daily Caller, 3-5**-2012 <http://times247.com/articles/trump-predicts-war-as-obama-re-election-strategy>

During an appearance on the “Jay Severin Show” on Boston’s Talk 1200, real estate mogul and media personality Donald Trump predicted that President Barack Obama would start a war with Iran for the sole purpose of winning re-election in November. Trump said starting a war worked for former President George W. Bush, giving him temporary high approval ratings, and he said Obama is almost certainly eyeballing a similar polling bump. “I’m a man that said that Obama will have a war Iran because I think it’s politically a positive for him,” Trump said.

#### More ev

Jason **Ditz** Antiwar.com, 2-17-**2012** <http://news.antiwar.com/2012/02/17/obama-officials-iran-sanctions-will-fail-leading-to-war/>

The new reports come just one day after Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta conceded that Iran isn’t actually developing a nuclear weapon, and DIA chief Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess said that Iran was unlikely to start any war on their own. Officials say Obama has been telling Israel he wants to “give sufficient time” to the current round of sanctions before starting the war, though they say that in the end the result will start be a war because Iran is “behaving like sanctions don’t matter.” It does seem to have pushed back the start of the war a bit, however, as Panetta had previously predicted Israel would launch an attack between April and June, but Obama advisors are now calling September or October the “sweet spot.” This could mean a literal October surprise, with President Obama either starting a huge war with Iran just ahead of the 2012 presidential election, or having Israel do so and jumping in immediately thereafter. Such a timing for the war could be seen as politically desirable for the president, with several of the Republican candidates condemning him for not being more hawkish against Iran, and likely to center a foreign policy debate on his not starting this particular war.

### AT: Obama Will Never Strike

#### Obama willing to do it for political reasons- private comments and recent statements

**News Max, 12-31**-2011 <http://www.newsmax.com/InsiderReport/October-Surprise-Against-Iran/2011/12/31/id/422683>

Recent statements from the Obama administration have led at least one Israeli observer to suspect that the president is preparing for an attack on Iran — and political considerations would dictate an assault in October. Writing in the Israeli newspaper Haaretz, Chemi Shalev notes that on Dec. 16, Obama switched his rhetoric from "a nuclear Iran is unacceptable" to the assertive "we are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons." On Dec. 19, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, who had previously warned about the pitfalls of an attack on Iran, declared that the United States "will take whatever steps necessary to deal with" the Iranian nuclear threat. The next day, Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "My biggest worry is that [the Iranians] will miscalculate our resolve." Shalev observes that with the withdrawal of American troops from Iraq, there is no longer fear that an attack on Iran would endanger U.S. forces there. And he discloses that people who have heard Obama speak about Iran in closed sessions believe he would order an attack if he is convinced that a nuclear-armed Iran poses a clear danger to America's national security.

#### More ev

Jeffrey T. **Kuhner** is a columnist at The Washington Times and president of the Edmund Burke Institute. **3-9**-2012 <http://www.worldnewstribune.com/2012/03/09/obamas-october-surprise/>

Is President Obama planning to launch military strikes against Iran in order to ensure re-election? Is there an October surprise being hatched by the White House? All the signals are: yes. Recently, Mr. Obama told an audience at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee’s (AIPAC) annual policy conference in Washington, D.C. that a nuclear-armed Iran is “unacceptable.” He said that all options—including military force — are “on the table.” And he warned Teheran’s mullahs not to “call my bluff.” In short, the clouds of war are looming on the horizon. Yet, at the same time, Mr. Obama is strongly pressuring Israel not to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. The administration argues that diplomacy, sanctions and covert operations are starting to take their toll on the Islamic Republic. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has warned Mr. Obama that Jerusalem cannot wait much longer; Iran is about to enter the “zone of immunity” where it will acquire the capacity to build a nuclear weapons program — crossing the threshold whereby the ayatollahs cannot be stopped from getting the bomb. Mr. Obama has assured Mr. Netanyahu not to worry; America will destroy Iran’s nuclear program if necessary. The president vowed at AIPAC that “I have Israel’s back.” He doesn’t. Mr. Obama is playing a cynical game, using the existential fate of the Jewish state as a political trump card to guarantee his re-election in November. He is the most anti-Israel president in U.S. history. Mr. Obama doggedly opposed the sanctions imposed on Iran — especially, on its central bank. The only reason he begrudgingly signed on was because they were embedded as part of the defense bill. Yet, he now claims credit for their impact. He has repeatedly called for diplomatic engagement with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. In 2009, when millions of pro-democracy protesters poured onto the streets of Tehran and other Iranian cities to protest the rigged elections, Mr. Obama did the unthinkable: He remained silent. He refused to lift a finger or say a word of encouragement to help the brave democrats seeking to overthrow the clerical fascist regime. Mr. Ahmadinejad is the Hitler of our time. He has repeatedly called for the destruction of Israel, pledging to wipe the Jewish state off the map. The Iranian strongman is a radical Shi’ite revolutionary, who hopes to erect a world Muslim empire on the ashes of the Jews. In short, he is not just the mortal enemy of Israel — and the West — but a genocidal madman. Mr. Obama’s dithering and feckless diplomacy has given the mullahs the one thing they desperately crave: time. They are running out the clock in order to achieve an Islamic bomb. Instead of stopping them, Mr. Obama has only emboldened their nuclear ambitions. Moreover, the administration has called for Israel to enter peace talks with the Palestinians based on a return to the pre-1967 borders. This would effectively force Jerusalem to accept territorial boundaries that would leave it defenseless against any future Palestinian or Arab invasion. Mr. Obama also withdrew support for Egypt’s pro-American dictator, Hosni Mubarak. The result is that the Muslim Brotherhood has come to power. Mr. Mubarak was many things — venal, corrupt and brutal. But he kept the peace with Israel and helped to advance America’s national interests in the region, especially, in fighting Islamic terrorists. This has now changed. The Muslim Brotherhood aims to forge a Sunni theocracy, transforming Egypt into an anti-Semitic, anti-Western hotbed. Hence, under Mr. Obama’s leadership, the Jewish people find themselves encircled by dangerous Islamists. Providing Mr. Obama with control over Israel’s future is like trusting Dracula with a blood bank. It is an act of folly. Mr. Obama refuses to give Israel the green light to launch military strikes on Iran. Israeli intelligence officials admit that, privately, the White House has warned Mr. Netanyahu that in the event of an attack Israel — and not Iran — will be blamed by the administration. In short, Mr. Obama is trying to tie Mr. Netanyahu’s hands, coercing him to wait for Washington to take decisive action. The record, however, is clear: sanctions have not — and will not — work. Russia and China continue to prop up Teheran. Moreover, the mullahs are not driven by economic considerations; a messianic theocracy is not concerned about growth rates or improving living standards. It cares about cementing its grip on power. A bomb will ensure the survival of the Islamic Republic. It will be untouchable. This is why a regional showdown is inevitable. Mr. Obama is blatantly attempting to maximize his political capital. He is hoping to keep the charade of diplomacy and sanctions going until the summer or early fall. And then, when he believes Iran is on the cusp of going nuclear, Mr. Obama will order an American — not Israeli — air strike on Teheran’s key facilities. The result will be a temporary boost in his popular approval, as Americans rally around their commander-in-chief. It will make Mr. Obama look decisive, strong and presidential. It will propel him to victory, riding a wave of patriotic emotion.

### Romney = Iran Strikes

#### GOP win causes Iran strikes

**Dilek 9-20**-11 (Emine, addicting info, “All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran” http://www.addictinginfo.org/2011/09/20/all-republican-candidates-favor-war-with-iran/, jj)

All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran Prepare yourself my fellow Americans. If you elect a Republican President in the 2012 elections, more than likely we will be at war with Iran before his or her Presidency is over. In a disturbing new article written by Trita Parsi, a columnist for Salon.com, he expertly connects the dots on which single foreign policy issue is uniting all GOP candidates: Iran. He writes that when it comes to Arab Spring and all other foreign policy issues, GOP candidates are all over the place. But when it is about Iran, they all agree; USA must be tougher. Parsi asserts that “Republicans will present a narrative that diplomacy was tried and failed, sanctions are tough but insufficient, and the only remaining option is some form of military action. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.” Although I agree with Parsi’s claim that Iran is the only foreign policy matter that unites all GOP candidates, I do not believe the memory of Iraq invasion is slowly fading. Contrary to his assertion, I believe Americans are fed up with the unending wars.

#### GOP win causes Iran strike

Jon **Swaine**, 11-13-**2011**, “Republican hopefuls would go to war with Iran,” Telegraph, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/republicans/8887247/Republican-hopefuls-would-go-to-war-with-Iran.html>

Republican hopefuls would go to war with Iran Republican presidential hopefuls have promised to go to war to stop Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon, painting Barack Obama's handling of Tehran as the most serious of a string of overseas failures. Mitt Romney, the favourite to clinch the party's candidacy, said that he would direct US forces to pre-emptively strike Iran's nuclear facilities if "crippling sanctions" failed to block their ambitions. "If all else fails, if after all of the work we've done, there's nothing else we could do besides take military action," Mr Romney said at a debate on foreign policy in South Carolina on Saturday night. The former Massachusetts governor's pledge was echoed by Newt Gingrich, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, who over the weekend rose to second place in some national opinion polls. "You have to take whatever steps are necessary to break its capacity to have a nuclear weapon," said Mr Gingrich, who also proposed covert actions such as "taking out their scientists," to applause. Rick Santorum, a former Senator for Pennsylvania, said the US should support an Israeli intervention. Their remarks came at the end of a week of heightened tensions following the UN nuclear watchdog's confirmation that Iran had acquired the expertise and material required to build its first nuclear weapon. Related Articles The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) also acknowledged for the first time that Tehran was conducting secret experiments whose only purpose could be the development of weaponry. As his potential Republican rivals spoke, Mr Obama was being rebuffed by Presidents Hu Jintao of China and Dmitry Medvedev of Russia as he sought international support for sanctions against Tehran. After meetings at an Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) summit in Hawaii, Mr Obama said that Russia had agreed to "work to shape a common response" to Iran's threatening manoeuvres, and that China wanted Tehran to obey "international rules and norms".

#### More ev

**National Journal Subscriber, 3-4**-2012 <http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-plays-hawk-in-chief-on-iran-20120304>

On the campaign trail, Republican candidates Mitt Romney and Rick Santorum have both come close to promising U.S. preemptive war against Iran—and soon—if elected. At the most recent GOP presidential debate in Arizona, Romney said that for him, military action wouldn't be merely "an option." Obama, Romney said, has "made it clear through his administration and almost every communication we've had so far that he does not want Israel to take action, he opposes military action. He should have instead communicated to Iran that we are prepared, that we are considering military options. They're not just on the table. They are in our hand."

## \*\*\*Obama Bad - Iran Strikes Good\*\*\*

### Laundry List

#### Only strikes now solve iran prolif, nuclear war, global prolif and Israeli strikes which fail and are worse

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

STRIKE NOW OR SUFFER LATER Attacking Iran is hardly an attractive prospect. But the United States can anticipate and reduce many of the feared consequences of such an attack. If it does so successfully, it can remove the incentive for other nations in the region to start their own atomic programs and, more broadly, strengthen global nonproliferation by demonstrating that it will use military force to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. It can also head off a possible Israeli operation against Iran, which, given Israel's limited capability to mitigate a potential battle and inflict lasting damage, would likely result in far more devastating consequences and carry a far lower probability of success than a U.S. attack. Finally, a carefully managed U.S. attack would prove less risky than the prospect of containing a nuclear-armed Islamic Republic -- a costly, decades-long proposition that would likely still result in grave national security threats. Indeed, attempting to manage a nuclear-armed Iran is not only a terrible option but the worst. With the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq winding down and the United States facing economic hardship at home, Americans have little appetite for further strife. Yet Iran's rapid nuclear development will ultimately force the United States to choose between a conventional conflict and a possible nuclear war. Faced with that decision, the United States should conduct a surgical strike on Iran's nuclear facilities, absorb an inevitable round of retaliation, and then seek to quickly de-escalate the crisis. Addressing the threat now will spare the United States from confronting a far more dangerous situation in the future.

#### Only Strikes solve heg, multiple scenarios for mid east war, nuclear terrorism, miscalc and nuclear war drawing in US

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

Some states in the region are doubting U.S. resolve to stop the program and are shifting their allegiances to Tehran. Others have begun to discuss launching their own nuclear initiatives to counter a possible Iranian bomb. For those nations and the United States itself, the threat will only continue to grow as Tehran moves closer to its goal. A nuclear-armed Iran would immediately limit U.S. freedom of action in the Middle East. With atomic power behind it, Iran could threaten any U.S. political or military initiative in the Middle East with nuclear war, forcing Washington to think twice before acting in the region. Iran's regional rivals, such as Saudi Arabia, would likely decide to acquire their own nuclear arsenals, sparking an arms race. To constrain its geopolitical rivals, Iran could choose to spur proliferation by transferring nuclear technology to its allies -- other countries and terrorist groups alike. Having the bomb would give Iran greater cover for conventional aggression and coercive diplomacy, and the battles between its terrorist proxies and Israel, for example, could escalate. And Iran and Israel lack nearly all the safeguards that helped the United States and the Soviet Union avoid a nuclear exchange during the Cold War -- secure second-strike capabilities, clear lines of communication, long flight times for ballistic missiles from one country to the other, and experience managing nuclear arsenals. To be sure, a nuclear-armed Iran would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. But the volatile nuclear balance between Iran and Israel could easily spiral out of control as a crisis unfolds, resulting in a nuclear exchange between the two countries that could draw the United States in, as well.

#### Strikes are key to solve nuclear terrorism, global proliferation, the destruction of Israel and Iranian rise as a hostile rival, which collapses hege and independently causes 100 million deaths and world war

**Muravchik, 2006** (Joshua, scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 11-19, lexis)

It is now clear that neither Moscow nor Beijing will ever agree to tough sanctions. What's more, even if they were to do so, it would not stop Iran, which is a country on a mission. As President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad put it: "Thanks to the blood of the martyrs, a new Islamic revolution has arisen.... The era of oppression, hegemonic regimes and tyranny and injustice has reached its end.... The wave of the Islamic revolution will soon reach the entire world." There is simply no possibility that Iran's clerical rulers will trade this ecstatic vision for a mess of Western pottage in the form of economic bribes or penalties. So if sanctions won't work, what's left? The overthrow of the current Iranian regime might offer a silver bullet, but with hard-liners firmly in the saddle in Tehran, any such prospect seems even more remote today than it did a decade ago, when students were demonstrating and reformers were ascendant. Meanwhile, the completion of Iran's bomb grows nearer every day. Our options therefore are narrowed to two: We can prepare to live with a nuclear-armed Iran, or we can use force to prevent it. Former ABC newsman Ted Koppel argues for the former, saying that "if Iran is bound and determined to have nuclear weapons, let it." We should rely, he says, on the threat of retaliation to keep Iran from using its bomb. Similarly, Newsweek International Editor Fareed Zakaria points out that we have succeeded in deterring other hostile nuclear states, such as the Soviet Union and China. And in these pages, William Langewiesche summed up the what-me-worry attitude when he wrote that "the spread of nuclear weapons is, and always has been, inevitable," and that the important thing is "learning how to live with it after it occurs." But that's whistling past the graveyard. The reality is that we cannot live safely with a nuclear-armed Iran. One reason is terrorism, of which Iran has long been the world's premier state sponsor, through groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah. Now, according to a report last week in London's Daily Telegraph, Iran is trying to take over Al Qaeda by positioning its own man, Saif Adel, to become the successor to the ailing Osama bin Laden. How could we possibly trust Iran not to slip nuclear material to terrorists? Koppel says that we could prevent this by issuing a blanket warning that if a nuclear device is detonated anywhere in the United States, we will assume Iran is responsible. But would any U.S. president really order a retaliatory nuclear strike based on an assumption? Another reason is that an Iranian bomb would constitute a dire threat to Israel's 6 million-plus citizens. Sure, Israel could strike back, but Hashemi Rafsanjani, the former president who was Ahmadinejad's "moderate" electoral opponent, once pointed out smugly that "the use of an atomic bomb against Israel would totally destroy Israel, while [the same] against the Islamic world would only cause damage. Such a scenario is not inconceivable." If that is the voice of pragmatism in Iran, would you trust deterrence against the messianic Ahmadinejad? Even if Iran did not drop a bomb on Israel or hand one to terrorists, its mere possession of such a device would have devastating consequences. Coming on top of North Korea's nuclear test, it would spell finis to the entire nonproliferation system. And then there is a consequence that seems to have been thought about much less but could be the most harmful of all: Tehran could achieve its goal of regional supremacy. Jordan's King Abdullah II, for instance, has warned of an emerging Shiite "crescent." But Abdullah's comment understates the danger. If Iran's reach were limited to Shiites, it would be constrained by their minority status in the Muslim world as well as by the divisions between Persians and Arabs. But such ethnic-based analysis fails to take into account Iran's charisma as the archenemy of the United States and Israel and the leverage it achieves as the patron of radicals and rejectionists. Given that, the old assumptions about Shiites and Sunnis may not hold any longer. Iran's closest ally today is Syria, which is mostly Sunni. The link between Tehran and Damascus is ideological, not theological. Similarly, Iran supports the Palestinian groups Islamic Jihad and Hamas, which are overwhelmingly Sunni (and as a result, Iran has grown popular in the eyes of Palestinians). During the Lebanon war this summer, we saw how readily Muslims closed ranks across the Sunni-Shiite divide against a common foe (even as the two groups continued killing each other in Iraq). In Sunni Egypt, newborns were named "Hezbollah" after the Lebanese Shiite organization and "Nasrallah" after its leader. As Muslim scholar Vali Nasr put it: "A flurry of anti-Hezbollah [i.e., anti-Shiite] \o7fatwas\f7 by radical Sunni clerics have not diverted the admiring gaze of Arabs everywhere toward Hezbollah." In short, Tehran can build influence on a mix of ethnicity and ideology, underwritten by the region's largest economy. Nuclear weapons would bring regional hegemony within its reach by intimidating neighbors and rivals and stirring the admiration of many other Muslims. This would thrust us into a new global struggle akin to the one we waged so painfully with the Soviet Union for 40-odd years. It would be the "clash of civilizations" that has been so much talked about but so little defined. Iran might seem little match for the United States, but that is not how Ahmadinejad sees it. He and his fellow jihadists believe that the Muslim world has already defeated one infidel superpower (the Soviet Union) and will in time defeat the other. Russia was poor and weak in 1917 when Lenin took power, as was Germany in 1933 when Hitler came in. Neither, in the end, was able to defeat the United States, but each of them unleashed unimaginable suffering before they succumbed. And despite its weakness, Iran commands an asset that neither of them had: a natural advantage in appealing to the world's billion-plus Muslims. If Tehran establishes dominance in the region, then the battlefield might move to Southeast Asia or Africa or even parts of Europe, as the mullahs would try to extend their sway over other Muslim peoples. In the end, we would no doubt win, but how long this contest might last and what toll it might take are anyone's guess. The only way to forestall these frightening developments is by the use of force. Not by invading Iran as we did Iraq, but by an air campaign against Tehran's nuclear facilities. We have considerable information about these facilities; by some estimates they comprise about 1,500 targets. If we hit a large fraction of them in a bombing campaign that might last from a few days to a couple of weeks, we would inflict severe damage. This would not end Iran's weapons program, but it would certainly delay it. What should be the timing of such an attack? If we did it next year, that would give time for U.N. diplomacy to further reveal its bankruptcy yet would come before Iran will have a bomb in hand (and also before our own presidential campaign). In time, if Tehran persisted, we might have to do it again. Can President Bush take such action after being humiliated in the congressional elections and with the Iraq war having grown so unpopular? Bush has said that history's judgment on his conduct of the war against terror is more important than the polls. If Ahmadinejad gets his finger on a nuclear trigger, everything Bush has done will be rendered hollow. We will be a lot less safe than we were when Bush took office. Finally, wouldn't such a U.S. air attack on Iran inflame global anti-Americanism? Wouldn't Iran retaliate in Iraq or by terrorism? Yes, probably. That is the price we would pay. But the alternative is worse. After the Bolshevik takeover of Russia in 1917, a single member of Britain's Cabinet, Winston Churchill, appealed for robust military intervention to crush the new regime. His colleagues weighed the costs -- the loss of soldiers, international derision, revenge by Lenin -- and rejected the idea. The costs were avoided, and instead the world was subjected to the greatest man-made calamities ever. Communism itself was to claim perhaps 100 million lives, and it also gave rise to fascism and Nazism, leading to World War II. Ahmadinejad wants to be the new Lenin. Force is the only thing that can stop him.

### Nuclear War

#### Strikes solve prolif – prevents global nuclear war

**Denenberg, 2007** (Herb,- professor at the Wharton School, is a longtime Philadelphia journalist http://www.thebulletin.us/site/news.cfm?newsid=18414050&BRD=2737&PAG=461&dept\_id=576361&rfi=6

U.S. Needs To Bomb Iran Now To Prevent A Global Nuclear War. Strange as it may seem to those who are infected with the disease of negotiate/appease/retreat/surrender and who are unaware of where we are and what is happening as we face World War IV, the only way to prevent almost certain international catastrophe and global nuclear war, is to bomb Iran and take out its nuclear capability. If we don't do that, Iran will get a nuclear weapon and, with leadership of madmen, they will do what they have promised. They will use nukes for war and terror. Remember that their first objectives are to control the Middle East and to blackmail Europe into further submission (it has already virtually surrendered to the oncoming tide of Islamofascism). With nukes, which they will soon have, and with missiles, which they are developing with the help of North Korea, they will be able to threaten the world. They intend to do that, so as to impose Islamofascism on the world.

#### More ev

**Denenberg, 2007** (Herb,- professor at the Wharton School, is a longtime Philadelphia journalist http://www.thebulletin.us/site/news.cfm?newsid=18414050&BRD=2737&PAG=461&dept\_id=576361&rfi=6

Our fate is in the balance. It is no exaggeration to say the survival of the U.S. and the free world depend on whether Bush is willing to act boldly in the face of the Iranian threat or whether the forces of appeasement and surrender will prevail. We will have to see whether, for once, we have learned the lessons of history, or whether we are about to repeat the 1938 scenario with Ahmadinejad instead of Hitler, and our domination by Islamofascism rather than the miraculous escape from domination by Nazism. We better start playing our cards right and right now, or we will soon have no cards to play.

### Ext – Israel Strikes if we don’t

#### Israel will strike Iran if we don’t – official statements and war game-planning.

**Katzman -11** (Kenneth Katzman, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, June 9, 2011, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32048.pdf)

Some experts express greater concern over the potential for a strategic strike on Iran by Israel as compared to strikes by the United States. The debate over this possibility increased following the publication by the September 2010 issue of The Atlantic magazine of an article by Jeffrey Goldberg entitled “Point of No Return.”64 As noted in the piece, Israeli officials view a nuclear armed Iran as an existential threat and have repeatedly refused to rule out the possibility that Israel might strike Iran’s nuclear infrastructure. Speculation about this possibility increased in March and April 2009 with statements by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to The Atlantic magazine stating that “You don’t want a messianic apocalyptic cult controlling atomic bombs.” This and other Israeli comments generated assessments by then CENTCOM Commander General Petraeus that Israel might well decide to launch a strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities. Adding to the prospects for this scenario, in mid-June 2008, Israeli officials confirmed reports that Israel had practiced a long-range strike such as that which would be required. Taking a position similar to that of the George W. Bush Administration, senior U.S. officials visited Israel throughout 2010 (including Vice President Biden in March 2010) in part to express the view that the Obama Administration is committed to strict sanctions on Iran—with the implication that Israeli military action should not be undertaken. Others say that Israeli urgency has abated as of the end of 2010 because of shared U.S.-Israeli assessments that an Iranian nuclear weapons capability is not imminent.

### On Balance Strikes Best

#### On balance strikes are best – critics underestimate current risks and turns rely on flawed assumptions

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

But skeptics of military action fail to appreciate the true danger that a nuclear-armed Iran would pose to U.S. interests in the Middle East and beyond. And their grim forecasts assume that the cure would be worse than the disease -- that is, that the consequences of a U.S. assault on Iran would be as bad as or worse than those of Iran achieving its nuclear ambitions. But that is a faulty assumption. The truth is that a military strike intended to destroy Iran’s nuclear program, if managed carefully, could spare the region and the world a very real threat and dramatically improve the long-term national security of the United States.

### Now Key/A2: Alternatives Solve

#### Iran prolif coming soon – only striking *Soon*  solves – all alternatives have failed

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

DANGERS OF DETERRENCE Years of international pressure have failed to halt Iran's attempt to build a nuclear program. The Stuxnet computer worm, which attacked control systems in Iranian nuclear facilities, temporarily disrupted Tehran's enrichment effort, but a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency this past May revealed that the targeted plants have fully recovered from the assault. And the latest IAEA findings on Iran, released in November, provided the most compelling evidence yet that the Islamic Republic has weathered sanctions and sabotage, allegedly testing nuclear triggering devices and redesigning its missiles to carry nuclear payloads. The Institute for Science and International Security, a nonprofit research institution, estimates that Iran could now produce its first nuclear weapon within six months of deciding to do so. Tehran's plans to move sensitive nuclear operations into more secure facilities over the course of the coming year could reduce the window for effective military action even further. If Iran expels IAEA inspectors, begins enriching its stockpiles of uranium to weapons-grade levels of 90 percent, or installs advanced centrifuges at its uranium-enrichment facility in Qom, the United States must strike immediately or forfeit its last opportunity to prevent Iran from joining the nuclear club.

### A2: Containment Solves

#### Containment fails causing even larger war and even if successful it causes overstretch killing econ and heg

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

These security threats would require Washington to contain Tehran. Yet deterrence would come at a heavy price. To keep the Iranian threat at bay, the United States would need to deploy naval and ground units and potentially nuclear weapons across the Middle East, keeping a large force in the area for decades to come. Alongside those troops, the United States would have to permanently deploy significant intelligence assets to monitor any attempts by Iran to transfer its nuclear technology. And it would also need to devote perhaps billions of dollars to improving its allies' capability to defend themselves. This might include helping Israel construct submarine-launched ballistic missiles and hardened ballistic missile silos to ensure that it can maintain a secure second-strike capability. Most of all, to make containment credible, the United States would need to extend its nuclear umbrella to its partners in the region, pledging to defend them with military force should Iran launch an attack. In other words, to contain a nuclear Iran, the United States would need to make a substantial investment of political and military capital to the Middle East in the midst of an economic crisis and at a time when it is attempting to shift its forces out of the region. Deterrence would come with enormous economic and geopolitical costs and would have to remain in place as long as Iran remained hostile to U.S. interests, which could mean decades or longer. Given the instability of the region, this effort might still fail, resulting in a war far more costly and destructive than the one that critics of a preemptive strike on Iran now hope to avoid.

### Terrorism 2NC

#### Failure to strike incites terrorism

**Krauthammer, 2004** (Charles-Phd. Oxford, McGill, Harvard. Pulitzer Prize.) New York Daily News, July 23

There are only two things that will stop the Iranian nuclear program: revolution from below or an attack on its nuclear facilities.The country should be ripe for revolution. But the mullahs are very good at police-state tactics. The long-awaited revolution is not happening. Which makes the question of preemptive attack all the more urgent. Iran will go nuclear during the next presidential term. If nothing is done, a fanatical terrorist regime openly dedicated to the destruction of the "Great Satan" will have both nuclear weapons and the terrorists and missiles to deliver them. All that stands between us and that is either revolution or preemptive strike. Both of which, by the way, are far more likely to succeed with 146,000 American troops and highly sophisticated aircraft standing by just a few miles away - in Iraq.

#### The impact is extinction

#### Alexander 2003 (Yonah, Director, Inter-University for Terrorism Studies, Jerusalem Post, 8-25, Lexis)

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically the international community's failure, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threat to the survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than as a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned to witness the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al-Qaida terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military centers. Likewise Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Accords of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack. Why are the US and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism, continually shocked by terrorist surprises? There are several reasons: \* A misunderstanding of the manifold factors contributing to the expansion of terrorism, such as the absence of a universal definition of terrorism; \* The religionization of politics; \* Double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear that we have entered an Age of Super-Terrorism - biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear, and cyber - with its serious implications for national, regional, and global security concerns. Two myths in particular must be debunked immediately if an effective counterterrorism strategy can be developed; for example, strengthening international cooperation. THE FIRST illusion is that terrorism can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated completely, provided the root causes of conflicts - political, social, and economic - are addressed. The conventional illusion is that terrorism used by "oppressed" people seeking to achieve their goals is justified. Consequently, the argument advanced by so-called freedom fighters - "give me liberty and I will give you death" - is tolerated, if not glorified. This traditional rationalization of "sacred" violence often conceals the fact that the real purpose of terrorist groups is to gain political power through the barrel of the gun, in violation of fundamental human rights of the noncombatant segment of societies. For instance, Palestinian religious movements, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and secular entities, such as Fatah's Tanzim and the Aksa Martyrs Brigade, wish not only to resolve national grievances such as settlements, the right of return, and Jerusalem, but primarily to destroy the Jewish state. Similarly, Osama bin Laden's international network not only opposes the presence of American military in the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq; its stated objective is to "unite all Muslims and establish a government that follows the rule of the Caliphs." The second myth is that initiating strong action against the terrorist infrastructure - leaders, recruitment, funding, propaganda, training, weapons, operational command and control - will only increase terrorism. The argument here is that law enforcement efforts and military retaliation will inevitably fuel more brutal revenge acts of violence. Clearly, if this perception continues to prevail, particularly in democratic societies, the danger is that such thinking will paralyze governments into inaction, thereby encouraging further terrorist attacks. Past experience provides useful lessons for a realistic strategy. The prudent application of force has demonstrated that it is an effective tool in deterring terrorism in the short and long terms. For example, Israel's targeted killing of Mohammed Sider, the Hebron commander of the Islamic Jihad, defused a ticking bomb. The assassination of Ismail Abu Shanab, a top Hamas leader in the Gaza Strip, directly responsible for several suicide bombings including the latest bus attack in Jerusalem, disrupted potential terrorist operations. Similarly, the US military operation in Iraq eliminated Saddam Hussein's regime as a state sponsor of terror. Thus it behooves those countries victimized by terrorism to understand a cardinal message communicated by Sir Winston Churchill to the House of Commons on May 13, 1940: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory however long and hard the road may be: For without victory there is no survival."

### Ext - Terrorism Lx

#### Winning in Iran will destroy the Global Terror Network ands Stabilize the Middle East

**Ledeen, 2002** (Michael, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, Financial Times, 9/24)

The fall of the radical Islamic Republic would eliminate the terrorists' greatest source of support and the subsequent joy of the Iranian people would cut the heart out of Islamic fundamentalism, demonstrating to an entire generation of Muslims that such regimes fail utterly, whether in their (Iranian) Shiite or (Afghan) Sunni versions. And the successful overthrow of the Tehran regime would inspire great public support for similar revolutions in Baghdad and Damascus, which is precisely what we want. We shall have far greater success if we arrive as credible liberators than if we come as invaders; and it would be well to show the Iraqis - who have twice been betrayed by feckless US presidents in the past decade - that this time we know what we are doing.

#### Iran Strikes Key to Prevent Terrorism

**Thomas Holsinger, Guest Author, 1/19/06, Winds of Change, http://www.windsofchange.net/archives/007981.php**

Those who have considered the consequences of Iran’s open possession of nuclear weapons (as opposed to covert possession) have generally focused on its avowed threats against Israel and the United States. Those are certainly enough grounds for pre-emptive attack by both – Iran’s mullah regime is the one government in the entire world whose possession of nuclear weapons would most pose a direct and immediate threat to America and Israel.Iran’s mullahs will use nuclear weapons as a shield against foreign attack while they more openly support terrorism elsewhere. American acquiescence in Iranian nuclear weapons will lose the war on terror by ceding terrorists a “privileged sanctuary” in Iran. We’ll have let terrorists have in Iran what we invaded Iraq to stop. The invasion of Iraq will have been a complete waste of effort, and our dead in Iraq will have died in vain.

### Global Prolif 2NC

#### Iran Strikes Key to Prevent Rapid Global Proliferation and Nuclear War

**Thomas Holsinger, Guest Author, 1/19/06, Winds of Change, http://www.windsofchange.net/archives/007981.php**

Iran’s mullahs are about to produce their first home-built nuclear weapons this year. If we permit that, many other countries, some of whose governments are dangerously unstable, will build their own nuclear weapons to deter Iran and each other from nuclear attack as our inaction will have demonstrated our unwillingness to keep the peace. This rapid and widespread proliferation will inevitably lead to use of nuclear weapons in anger, both by terrorists and by fearful and unstable third world regimes, at which point the existing world order will break down and we will suffer every Hobbesian nightmare of nuclear proliferation.

#### Proliferation causes nuclear war and extinction

**Utgoff ’02** (Victor A.**,** Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

### Ext: Prolif

#### Military force vital to stop rapid proliferation in the Middle East.

**Rouse -11** (Hana Rouse, June 23, 2011, *Bolton: Administration Needs Military Option in Iran*, http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/bolton-administration-needs-military-option-in-iran-20110623?mrefid=site\_search)

Bolton said that a lack of American military action against Iran would send a signal to other countries in the area that they, too, can successfully develop nuclear programs without fear of retaliation from the United States. Bolton named Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey among states that he believed would likely do so. Robert Satloff, executive director of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, agreed that the military should play some role in the United States’ interaction with Iran, writing in his prepared testimony that “the most important contribution the United States can make is to restore the credibility of the military option.”

#### Strikes successful and solve proliferation.

**Katzman -11** (Kenneth Katzman, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, June 9, 2011, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32048.pdf)

Proponents of U.S. air and missile strikes against suspected nuclear sites argue that military action could set back Iran’s nuclear program because there are only a limited number of key targets, and these targets are known to U.S. planners and vulnerable, even those that are hardened or buried.63 Estimates of the target set range from 400 nuclear and other WMD-related targets, to potentially a few thousand targets crucial to Iran’s economy and military. Those who take an expansive view of the target set argue that the United States would need to reduce Iran’s potential for retaliation by striking not only nuclear facilities but also Iran’s conventional military, particularly its small ships and coastal missiles.

### Strikes Solve Prolif

#### Strikes solve – overcome every barrier

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

Even if the United States managed to identify all of Iran's nuclear plants, however, actually destroying them could prove enormously difficult. Critics of a U.S. assault argue that Iran's nuclear facilities are dispersed across the country, buried deep underground and hardened against attack, and ringed with air defenses, making a raid complex and dangerous. In addition, they claim that Iran has purposefully placed its nuclear facilities near civilian populations, which would almost certainly come under fire in a U.S. raid, potentially leading to hundreds, if not thousands, of deaths. These obstacles, however, would not prevent the United States from disabling or demolishing Iran's known nuclear facilities. A preventive operation would need to target the uranium-conversion plant at Isfahan, the heavy-water reactor at Arak, and various centrifuge-manufacturing sites near Natanz and Tehran, all of which are located aboveground and are highly vulnerable to air strikes. It would also have to hit the Natanz facility, which, although it is buried under reinforced concrete and ringed by air defenses, would not survive an attack from the U.S. military's new bunker-busting bomb, the 30,000-pound Massive Ordnance Penetrator, capable of penetrating up to 200 feet of reinforced concrete. The plant in Qom is built into the side of a mountain and thus represents a more challenging target. But the facility is not yet operational and still contains little nuclear equipment, so if the United States acted quickly, it would not need to destroy it.

#### Strikes Solve prolif -

#### Superior air power and bunker busters

**Robbins and Jaffe, 2006** (Carla Anne Greg “Why U.S. Wages Diplomacy With Defiant Iran Strike on Nuclear Sites Could Derail Reformers,Trigger Broad Retaliation”, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL,

http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB113888686348663212.html?mod=todays\_free\_feature)

WASHINGTON – Iran's nuclear program appears tailor-made for President Bush's doctrine of pre-emption: striking before threats fully materialize. And in recent polls, a surprisingly large number of Americans say they would support U.S. military strikes to stop Tehran from getting the bomb. So why is the White House so committed to the vagaries of diplomacy? The Pentagon has more than enough air power to turn Iran's known nuclear facilities into rubble. But there could be major blowback: in Iraq, the wider region, and especially in Iran where the White House also is eager to rally pro-reform and pro-American sentiments.And it looks like Tehran has been preparing for this. U.S. officials and outside experts say Iran has developed enough nuclear know-how and likely squirreled away enough materials and equipment that an attack would probably set back its program by no more than a few years. And it may have deployed enough forces in Iraq and Lebanon to carry out its threats of retaliation against the U.S. and Israel. Diplomats expect the International Atomic Energy Agency to refer Iran soon to the United Nations Security Council. But it could be months before possible punishments are even debated. And Iran has vowed to curtail cooperation with inspectors and start producing large batches of enriched uranium -- usable for nuclear fuel or, with more enriching, a nuclear weapon -- if its case is brought to New York. Tehran has invested billions of dollars in its nuclear facilities, which it insists are solely for generating electricity. Hitting those wouldn't be hard, military experts say. Stealthy U.S. bombers could penetrate Iranian airspace and suppress air-defense systems relatively easily. Iran's massive uranium-enrichment complex at Natanz, much of which is buried underground, could be taken out with bunker-buster bombs. Its conversion facility at Isfahan, where uranium feedstock is produced, is above ground and easier to hit, though nearby storage tunnels could be more of a challenge.

#### Solves in 48 hours – Iran concedes

**Kemp, 2003** (Geoffrey Director, Regional Strategic Programs, Nixon Center) “How to Stop the Iranian Bomb,” National Interest, Summer)

WITH THE fall of Ba'athi Iraq, there are only two targets left on the famous, or infamous, "axis of evil." And the tactfulness of the original locution aside, Iran is one of them. The Iranian regime sponsors terrorists who murder Americans and is building a very sophisticated, independent nuclear-technology infrastructure. The Bush Administration has vowed to take pre-emptive action against regimes that pose such threats, so Iran's mullahs must be wondering if they are next in line for the application of U.S. force. After all, they more resemble Ba'athi Iraq's leadership--an elite seeking but still lacking an operational nuclear weapons capability--than they do the leadership of their missile trading partner in North Korea, which appears to have put itself beyond relatively risk-free U.S. military action. The mullahs know that the United States already has sufficient military power in the region to reduce most of Iran's budding nuclear infrastructure to rubble within 48 hours. They know, too, that all international efforts, including U.S. economic sanctions, to dissuade Iran from the nuclear course short of using force have failed. They have well earned the right to be worried.

#### Cyber attacks and stealth bombers

**Babbin, 2006** (Jed, served as a deputy undersecretary of defense in the George H.W. Bush administration “Iran Showdown”, The American Spectator, http://www.spectator.org/dsp\_article.asp?art\_id=9310)

THE WAR WITH IRAN WILL have to be fought and we will, of course, defend Israel as best we can. But much bloodshed can be avoided, and Iran's nuclear objective put out of reach if we seize the advantage we gave up to Saddam in the UN. Surprise is a strategic advantage we must retain. The alternative to a large war, which no one speaks about, is a surprise attack against Iran mounted before Israel acts, and before the predicted Iranian nuclear test happens. Such an attack would employ several unconventional weapons at once and could -- if managed properly -- be over before Iran knows it has begun. The world must know that we have done it. But after, not before. It may be that Iran's Chinese allies are doing more than helping develop its missiles. It may be that Iran's Russian trading partner is doing more than providing defenses against air attack. But neither is likely to be providing Iran with the means of effectively defending against our other capabilities. It could, and should, be made one dark night. B-2 stealth bombers, each carrying twenty ground-penetrating guided munitions, can destroy much of Iran's nuclear facilities and government centers. Some might carry reported electro-magnetic pulse weapons that can destroy all the electronic circuits that comprise Iranian missiles, key military communications and computer facilities. And it may be that we have the ability to attack Iran's military and financial computer networks with computer viruses and "Trojan horses" that will make it impossible for Iran to function militarily and economically. Our strategy must be implemented before Ahmadinejad can test his nukes. Whether that test can happen next month or next year is immaterial. The time for us to act is now.

### Ext: Solve in Hours

#### We could disable iran’s nuclear weapons program in a matter of hours

**Synovitz ‘06** (Ron, January 18, pg. http://www.globalsecurity.org/org/news/2006/060118-iran-military-options.htm)

Pike is also confident of the efficacy of air strikes. He believes U.S. or Israeli forces could destroy all of Iran's main nuclear facilities within a matter of hours: "There are about half a dozen major nuclear facilities in Iran. They have the uranium facility at Isfahan, the uranium-enrichment facility at Natanz, the plutonium production facility at Arak, possibly a nuclear weapons assembly facility at Parchin. There may be a dozen, or a dozen and a half other smaller facilities. All of these facilities are vulnerable to air strikes. Stealth bombers and other [U.S.] bombers staging from Diego Garcia [an island in the Indian Ocean] would basically be able to destroy all of these within a few hours of the air strikes beginning."

### Strikes Solve – A2 No long term/They Rebuild

#### Iran can’t and won’t rebuild nuclear program after strikes

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

 ANY TIME IS GOOD TIME Critics have another objection: even if the United States managed to eliminate Iran's nuclear facilities and mitigate the consequences, the effects might not last long. Sure enough, there is no guarantee that an assault would deter Iran from attempting to rebuild its plants; it may even harden Iran's resolve to acquire nuclear technology as a means of retaliating or protecting itself in the future. The United States might not have the wherewithal or the political capital to launch another raid, forcing it to rely on the same ineffective tools that it now uses to restrain Iran's nuclear drive. If that happens, U.S. action will have only delayed the inevitable. Yet according to the IAEA, Iran already appears fully committed to developing a nuclear weapons program and needs no further motivation from the United States. And it will not be able to simply resume its progress after its entire nuclear infrastructure is reduced to rubble. Indeed, such a devastating offensive could well force Iran to quit the nuclear game altogether, as Iraq did after its nuclear program was destroyed in the Gulf War and as Syria did after the 2007 Israeli strike. And even if Iran did try to reconstitute its nuclear program, it would be forced to contend with continued international pressure, greater difficulty in securing necessary nuclear materials on the international market, and the lurking possibility of subsequent attacks. Military action could, therefore, delay Iran's nuclear program by anywhere from a few years to a decade, and perhaps even indefinitely. Skeptics might still counter that at best a strike would only buy time. But time is a valuable commodity. Countries often hope to delay worst-case scenarios as far into the future as possible in the hope that this might eliminate the threat altogether. Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked -- most recently Iraq and Syria -- have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs. Thus, what appears to be only a temporary setback to Iran could eventually become a game changer.

#### Strikes solves kill key scientists and fear of another attack prevents future prolif

**Rogers, 2006** (Paul, Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford and Global Security Consultant to Oxford Research Group “IRAN: CONSEQUENCES OF A WAR”, February)

Although the United States has a major problem of overstretch affecting its Army and Marine Corps, an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities would be undertaken almost entirely by the Air Force and the Navy. To have the maximum impact, it would be done by surprise, utilising land-based aircraft already in the region, long-range strike aircraft operating from the United States, the UK and Diego Garcia, and naval strike forces involving carrier-borne aircraft and sea-launched cruise missiles. At any one time, the US Navy keeps one aircraft carrier battle group on station in or near the Persian Gulf. Such groups rotate, and there are periods when two are on station, providing over 150 aircraft, together with several hundred cruise missiles.4 Similar numbers of land-based aircraft could be assembled with little notice, given the range of US bases in the region, and B 1B and B-2 bombers could operate from outside the region. In particular, the specialised facilities required to operate the stealth B-2 aircraft are now available at Fairford air base in Gloucestershire.5 Air strikes on nuclear facilities would involve the destruction of facilities at the Tehran Research Reactor, together with the radioisotope production facility, a range of nuclear-related laboratories and the Kalaye Electric Company, all in Tehran. The Esfahan Nuclear Technology Centre would be a major target, including a series of experimental reactors, uranium conversion facilities and a fuel fabrication laboratory. Pilot and full-scale enrichment plants at Natanz would be targeted, as would facilities at Arak (see Appendix 1).6 The new 1,000 MW reactor nearing completion at Bushehr would be targeted, although this could be problematic once the reactor is fully fuelled and goes critical some time in 2006. Once that has happened, any destruction of the containment structure could lead to serious problems of radioactive dispersal affecting not just the Iranian Gulf coast, but west Gulf seaboards in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. As well as the direct human effects, since these comprise the world’s most substantial concentration of oil production facilities, the consequences could be severe.7 All of the initial attacks would be undertaken more or less simultaneously, in order to kill as many of the technically competent staff as possible, therefore doing the greatest damage to longer-term prospects. This would be a necessary part of any military action and would probably extend to the destruction of university laboratories and technology centres that indirectly support the Iranian nuclear scientific and technical infrastructure. Such an aspect of the attack is not widely recognised outside of military planning circles but would be an essential component of the operation. Given that the aim is to set back Iranian nuclear potential for as long as possible, it would be essential to go well beyond the destruction of physical facilities that could be replaced quite rapidly. The killing of those with technical expertise would have a much more substantial impact on any efforts to redevelop nuclear capabilities. Furthermore, since such expertise is known to include foreign nationals, the killing of such people already working in the country would serve as a deterrent to the involvement of others in the future. Iran currently has limited air defences and a largely obsolete and small air force. Even so, defence suppression would be a major aspect of military action, primarily to reduce the risk of the killing or capture of US aircrew. It would involve the targeting of radar facilities and command and control centres, as well as Western Command air bases at Tehran, Tabriz, Hamadan, Dezful, Umidiyeh, Shiraz and Isfahan, and Southern Command air bases at Bushehr, Bandar Abbas and Chah Bahar.8 A particular concern for US forces is the continued deployment by Iran of 45 or more of the American F-14A Tomcat interceptors and their long-range AWG-9 radar equipment. 79 planes were originally procured before the fall of the Shah and around 30 are available operationally at any one time out of those still deployed.9 Research, development and production facilities for Iran’s medium-range ballistic missile programme would be priority targets, as would bases at which these mobile missiles are deployed. Because of their mobility, surprise would once again be essential. US forces have already used reconnaissance drones to map Iranian facilities and these, combined with satellite reconnaissance and a range of forms of electronic surveillance, have provided considerable information on the nuclear infrastructure and more general defence forces.

#### Iran has only a few scientists who are crucial to its entire program – they could be removed easily

**Inbar, 2006** (Efraim, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN” March, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html)

One variant of covert operations is to focus on the highly skilled elements of those working for the Iranian program. The Iranian nuclear program has a limited number of scientists whose contribution is critical to its successful completion. The interested intelligence services have probably already identified the key scientists who keep it moving. Removing these scientists would also affect the possibility of renewing the nuclear efforts in case a freeze of the Iranian program were to take place. Therefore, serious offers of refuge and a professional career in the West should be extended to these scientists. Alternatively, they should be intimidated from further cooperation with the Iranian nuclear program. It would not be impossible to organize a well-orchestrated campaign to do so against those who prefer the patriotic option of continuing to serve their state. In fact, the mere beginning of such a campaign of carrots and sticks may deter others from cooperating with the Iranian nuclear program and hasten their exit from Iran.

#### Strikes cause Iran to reconsider

Peter **Brooks** (a senior fellow at The Heritage Foundation, is the author of “A Devil’s Triangle: Terrorism, WMD and Rogue States”, June 8, **2006**) http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed012306a.cfm

What about *U.S.* airstrikes? These could take a range of forms, depending on policymakers' desires. Surgical strikes might limit their targets to Iran's air defenses (for access) and key nuclear sites (e.g., Bushehr, Nantanz, Arak). Or an escalated attack could nail all suspected nuke facilities — *plus* forces Tehran might use in a counterattack, such as its ballistic missiles and conventional forces. Depending on the strike's objective, think Operation Iraqi Freedom: B-2 stealth bombers carrying bunker-busters, F-117 stealth fighters and other Navy/Air Force strike assets from carriers and theater bases — plus Navy destroyers and subs loosing cruise missiles on Iranian targets. But could a raid destroy all sites? Thanks to the covert nature of the Iranian program, that's not clear. It's highly likely, though, that striking key facilities would set the program back, *possibly* causing Tehran to reconsider the folly of its proliferation perfidy.

### Strikes Solve – A2 Multiple Locations

#### Strikes solve - Only Isfahan and Natanz Matter – prefer our evidence, it cites a consensus amongst experts

**Brown, 2006**(Drew “No easy military option to stop Iran, experts say”, Knight Ridder Newspapers,

http://www.nineronline.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2006/01/26/43d8fa1950455)

Many analysts say that in that case, an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would be relatively easy to carry out. With U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and with war planes and ships scattered throughout the Persian Gulf, U.S. forces essentially have Iran hemmed in on three sides. U.S. cruise missiles and stealth aircraft with precision-guided bombs likely would overwhelm Iran's air defenses. The key questions, however, are whether such an attack would be very effective and how Iran and the rest of the world would respond. Some experts say an attack would delay, not destroy, the Iranian program and would only reinforce Iran's efforts to develop nuclear weapons. Iran, taking lessons from the Israeli air attack that destroyed Iraq's nuclear facility at Osirak in 1981, has dispersed its atomic research and development facilities in dozens, if not hundreds, of locations above and below ground. Regardless of the total number of Iran's nuclear facilities, Isfahan and Natanz are the most important because they constitute the "two weak links" in Iran's program, Cliff Kupchan, an Iran expert and former State Department official in the Clinton administration said. Isfahan, a facility that converts uranium ore into uranium hexafluoride gas, could be bombed easily, said Kupchan, now at the New York-based Eurasia Group, a political risk advisory and consulting firm. The other, Natanz, is a research facility where experts are trying to master the technique of converting uranium hexafluoride gas into enriched uranium. Low levels of enriched uranium are used for civilian nuclear plants, and more highly enriched fuel is used in nuclear weapons. International inspectors found the facility after they were tipped off by an Iranian dissident group in 2002. Iran recently resumed research at Natanz and said it was for peaceful purposes, but analysts have expressed doubt because of Natanz's size and the fact that part of it has been constructed underground. During a 2003 visit, Iran advised International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohamed ElBaradei that it had almost completed construction of a pilot uranium enrichment plant at Natanz, according to a report by the Center for Nonproliferation Studies in Monterey, Calif. The test plant will consist of 164 centrifuges, machines that spin uranium hexafluoride gas at high speeds, but it isn't fully operational, according to a January report by the Institute for Science and International Security. The group said Iran would need six months to a year to complete the process needed for enrichment. Of greater concern at Natanz are underground chambers that are expected to house an estimated 50,000 gas centrifuges, enough to produce weapons-grade uranium for several nuclear weapons per year, according to experts. While it's unclear what other capacities exist at the site, "what is obvious is that the pilot facility is above ground and would be easy to take out," Kupchan said. Bombing the facilities at the two locations "would set the Iranians back by two to three years," he said. "It wouldn't be that hard to do," said Kupchan. "You'd be picking a helluva fight, though. Iran is a sophisticated country with a very sophisticated leadership. It has a range of retaliatory options that are extremely unpleasant."

#### US Air Force can handle multiple locations

**Inbar, 2006** (Efraim, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN” March, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html)

While Iran has spread out its nuclear facilities and built a large part of the nuclear complex underground in order to protect it from conventional air strikes, technological advances in penetration of underground facilities and increased precision might allow total destruction. The difficulties in dealing a severe military blow to the Iranian nuclear program are generally exaggerated.[[38]](http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html#_edn38) A detailed analysis of the military option is beyond the scope of this paper, but the American military definitely has the muscle and the sophistication needed to perform a preemptive strike in accordance with its new strategic doctrine, as well as the capability for a sustained air campaign, if needed to prevent the reparation and reconstruction of the facilities targeted.

### Strikes Solve – A2 Can’t find

#### Intelligence solves – multiple reasons secret facilities are unlikely and Iran won’t be able to rebuild after

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

A FEASIBLE TARGET A nuclear Iran would impose a huge burden on the United States. But that does not necessarily mean that Washington should resort to military means. In deciding whether it should, the first question to answer is if an attack on Iran's nuclear program could even work. Doubters point out that the United States might not know the location of Iran's key facilities. Given Tehran's previous attempts to hide the construction of such stations, most notably the uranium-enrichment facilities in Natanz and Qom, it is possible that the regime already possesses nuclear assets that a bombing campaign might miss, which would leave Iran's program damaged but alive. This scenario is possible, but not likely; indeed, such fears are probably overblown. U.S. intelligence agencies, the IAEA, and opposition groups within Iran have provided timely warning of Tehran's nuclear activities in the past -- exposing, for example, Iran's secret construction at Natanz and Qom before those facilities ever became operational. Thus, although Tehran might again attempt to build clandestine facilities, Washington has a very good chance of catching it before they go online. And given the amount of time it takes to construct and activate a nuclear facility, the scarcity of Iran's resources, and its failure to hide the facilities in Natanz and Qom successfully, it is unlikely that Tehran has any significant operational nuclear facilities still unknown to Western intelligence agencies.

#### Satellite and other Intel is accurate - strikes can target and destroy nuclear ambitions

**Sevakis, 2006** (Dennis, wrtier for the American thinker, flew fighter jets for the USAF “Iran – to bomb or not to bomb?”, Feb. 1st http://www.americanthinker.com/articles.php?article\_id=5210)

In contrast to the facilities required to produce biological and chemical weapons, nuclear fuel cycle and reprocessing plants are not easily hidden nor built surreptitiously during the dark hours of the diurnal cycle. Detection by satellite of such projects is a near certainty. These facilities are large, expensive and**,** if hidden, still visible during the construction cycle. You can’t have a major construction site without roads, excavation debris, and a whole lot of activity. To have the building of a nuclear materials processing facility remain undetected would demand a very slow “ship in a bottle” approach to both the excavation and plant construction. Possible, but hardly likely. Also, buried facilities are not necessarily undetectable. The U.S. has long had the capability to map subsurface geological features using ground penetrating radar. Similar technology will be used to map planetary subsurface features from the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter. These underground “maps” were used to program guidance and flight path information into cruise missiles before the advent of the GPS system. Unlike surface soil and sand, the sub-surface features are stable and unlikely to be affected by natural forces or human activity. This mode of guidance may still be a backup to GPS and/or inertial systems. We may have the whole country of Iran subterraneanly scouted. A nuclear plant buried under the sand would probably already be on the charts. If a plant is buried in a mountain, well, I don’t believe we have any sensors up to that task. But the Iranians still had to build it. And that would have been extremely expensive and time consuming with the construction cycle still subject to detection. We probably know where the entrances are located. The Iranians and their foreign enablers still have to get themselves and materials in and the product out. Even if one cannot destroy a facility, denying access can be just as effective and may be easier. We can certainly obliterate any surface facilities. We’ve shown ourselves to be quite adept at that task while minimizing, though not eliminating, collateral damage. The deeply buried bits? Well, supposedly we’ve cancelled the development our mini-nuke, super-bunker-buster bomb program. However, that doesn’t necessarily mean we don’t have any.

#### Current intelligence is enough to cripple their nuclear program

**Inbar, 2006** (Efraim, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN” March, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html)

While it is probably true that intelligence services cannot provide military planners with a full and comprehensive picture of the Iranian nuclear program, what we know seems to be enough to allow identification of the main targets. The military capability to hit all targets is important, but a partial destruction would be enough to cripple Iran's ability to build a nuclear bomb in the near future. Moreover, no large-scale invasion is needed in order to do the job, but only a sustained bombing campaign with commando strikes.

### Strikes Solve – A2 Will block Hormuz

#### US Strikes can stop Iranian control of the strait

**The American Thinker, 2006** (“Iran – to bomb or not to bomb?”, http://www.americanthinker.com/articles.php?article\_id=5210)

First, as Doug Hanson pointed out in his Washington Times piece “The mullahs’ war games,” Iran has fortified the island of Abu Musa in the Straits of Hormuz and possesses the capacity to halt the passage of oil tankers through the straits. This would have an immediate and possibly catastrophic impact on oil supplies, prices and the world economy in general. This being the case, the U.S. would probably flatten Abu Musa as well as any Iranian mainland military facilities having the capability to strike shipping in the Gulf, and do so at the same time we launch strikes against the Iranian nuclear facilities. This seems an absolute necessity.

### Strikes Solve – A2 Underground Bunkers

#### US Air Force can handle it

**Inbar, 2006** (Efraim, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN” March, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html)

While Iran has spread out its nuclear facilities and built a large part of the nuclear complex underground in order to protect it from conventional air strikes, technological advances in penetration of underground facilities and increased precision might allow total destruction. The difficulties in dealing a severe military blow to the Iranian nuclear program are generally exaggerated.[[38]](http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html#_edn38) A detailed analysis of the military option is beyond the scope of this paper, but the American military definitely has the muscle and the sophistication needed to perform a preemptive strike in accordance with its new strategic doctrine, as well as the capability for a sustained air campaign, if needed to prevent the reparation and reconstruction of the facilities targeted.

### Strikes Solve – A2 Iran Air Defense

#### A US air strike against Iran would easily and quickly overwhelm Iranian defenses.

Rogers ’06(Paul,- Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford and Global Security Consultant to Oxford Research Group. *Iran: Consequences of a* War. http://www.iranbodycount.org/analysis/#pr.)

Iran currently has limited air defences and a largely obsolete and small air force. Even so, defence suppression would be a major aspect of military action, primarily to reduce the risk of the killing or capture of US aircrew. It would involve the targeting of radar facilities and command and control centres, as well as Western Command air bases at Tehran, Tabriz, Hamadan, Dezful, Umidiyeh, Shiraz and Isfahan, and Southern Command air bases at Bushehr, Bandar Abbas and Chah Bahar.8 A particular concern for US forces is the continued deployment by Iran of 45 or more of the American F-14A Tomcat interceptors and their long-range AWG-9 radar equipment. 79 planes were originally procured before the fall of the Shah and around 30 are available operationally at any one time out of those still deployed.9 Research, development and production facilities for Iran’s medium-range ballistic missile programme would be priority targets, as would bases at which these mobile missiles are deployed. Because of their mobility, surprise would once again be essential. US forces have already used reconnaissance drones to map Iranian facilities and satellite reconnaissance and a range of forms of electronic surveillance, have provided information on the nuclear infrastructure and more general defence forces. The attacks described so far would involve a strong element of surprise in relation to the core nuclear infrastructure and the air defence system, with these undertaken in a matter of hours. Up to a hundred sorties by strike aircraft, backed up by several hundred additional sorties by aerial refuelling, defence suppression and reconnaissance aircraft would be accompanied by two hundred or more cruise missile sorties. Following immediate bomb damage assessment, major targets would be revisited in the following days in parallel with attacks on less time-urgent targets. For US forces, the main period of intense military activity might extend over 4-5 days but could continue for several days more, depending on Iranian responses.

### Strikes Solve – A2 Air Defense

#### Iran can’t touch our aircraft – and conventional bunker busters would wreck their facilities

**Cordesman and Rodhan ’06** (Anthony,- holds the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS. He is also a national security analyst for ABC News Khalid,- visiting fellow @ CSIS “Iranian Nuclear Weapons? Options for Sanctions and Military Strikes” http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/060830\_iranoptionssanctions.pdf)

Iran would find it difficult to defend against US forces using cruise missiles, stealth aircraft, stand-off precision weapons, and equipped with a mix of vastly superior air combat assets and the IS&R assets necessary to strike and restrike Iranian targets in near real time. For example, each US B-2A Spirit stealth bomber could carry eight 4,500lb enhanced BLU-28 satellite-guided bunker-busting bombs – potentially enough to take out one hardened Iranian site per sortie. Such bombers could operate from flying from Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, RAF Fairford in Gloucestershire and Whiteman USAF base in Missouri.70 The US also has a wide range of other hard target killers, many of which are in development or classified. Systems that are known to be deployed include the BLU-109 Have Void “bunker busters.” a “dumb bomb” with a maximum penetration capability of 4 to 6 feet of reinforced concrete. An aircraft must overfly the target and launch the weapon with great precision to achieve serious penetration capability.71 It can be fitted with precision guidance and converted to a guided glide bomb. The Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) GBU-31 version a nominal range of 15 kilometers with a Circular Error Probable (CEP) of 13 meters in the GPS-aided INS modes of operation and 30 meters in the INS-only modes of operation.72 More advanced systems include the BLU-116 Advanced Unitary Penetrator [AUP],GBU- 24 C/B (USAF), or GBU-24 D/B (Navy) which has about three times the penetration capability of the BLU-109.73 It is not clear whether the US has deployed the AGM-130C with an advanced earth penetrating/hard target kill system. The AGM-130 Surface Attack Guided Munition was developed to be integrated into the F-15E, so it could two such missiles, one on each inboard store station. It is retargetable, precision guided standoff weapon using inertial navigation aided by Global Positioning System (GPS) satellites and has a 15 - 40 NM range.74 It is not clear such weapons could destroy all of Iran’s most hardened underground sites, although it seems likely that the BLU-28 could do serious damage at a minimum. Much depends on the accuracy of reports that Iran has undertaken a massive tunneling project with some 10,000 square meters of underground halls and tunnels branching off for hundreds of meters from each hall. Iran is reported to be drawing on North Korean expertise, and to have created a separate corporation (Shahid Rajaei Company) for such tunneling and hardening efforts under the IRGC, with extensive activity already underway in Natanz and Isfahan. The facilities are said to make extensive use of blastproof doors, extensive divider walls, hardened ceilings, 20 cm-thick concrete walls, and to use double concrete ceilings with earth fill between layers to defeat earth penetrators.75 Such passive defenses could have a major impact, but reports of such activity are often premature, exaggerated, or report far higher construction standards than are actually executed. At the same time, the B-2A could be used to deliver large numbers of precision-guided 500-lb bombs against dispersed surface targets or a mix of light and heavy precision guided weapons. Submarines and surface ships could deliver cruise missiles for such strikes, and conventional strike aircraft and bombers could deliver stand-off weapons against most suspect Iranian facilities without suffering a high risk of serious attrition. The challenge would be to properly determine what targets and aim points were actually valuable, not to inflict high levels of damage. Iran has "quantity," but its air defenses have little "quality." It has assigned some 12,000- 15,000 men in its air force to land-based air defense functions, including at least 8,000 regulars and 4,000 IRGC personnel. It is not possible to distinguish clearly between the major air defense weapons holdings of the regular air force and IRGC, but the air force appeared to operate most major surface-to-air missile systems.

#### Countermeasures will render Iranian air defense irrelevant, and their systems are uncoordinated

**Cordesman and Rodhan ’06** (Anthony,- holds the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS. He is also a national security analyst for ABC News Khalid,- visiting fellow @ CSIS “Iranian Nuclear Weapons? Options for Sanctions and Military Strikes” http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/060830\_iranoptionssanctions.pdf)

Although Iran has made some progress in improving and updating its weapons, sensors, and electronic warfare capability, and has learned much from Iraq's efforts to defeat US enforcement of the "no-fly zones" from 1992-2003, its current defenses are outdated and poorly integrated. All of its major systems are based on technology that is now more than 35 years old, and all are vulnerable to US use of active and passive countermeasures. Iran’s air defense forces are too widely spaced to provide more than limited air defense for key bases and facilities, and many lack the missile launcher strength to be fully effective. This is particularly true of Iran’s SA-5 sites, which provide long-range, medium-to-high altitude coverage of key coastal installations. Too few launchers are scattered over too wide an area to prevent relatively rapid suppression. Iran also lacks the low altitude radar coverage, overall radar net, command and control assets, sensors, resistance to sophisticated jamming and electronic countermeasures, and systems integration capability necessary to create an effective air defense net. Its land-based air defenses must operate largely in the point defense mode, and Iran lacks the battle management systems and data links are not fast and effective enough to allow it to take maximum advantage of the overlapping coverage of some of its missile systems— a problem further complicated by the problems in trying to net different systems supplied by Britain, China, Russia, and the US. Iran’s missiles and sensors are most effective at high-to-medium altitudes against aircraft with limited penetrating and jamming capability.

#### Iran’s air craft will get rocked – counter measures and lack of effective offense and coordination

**Cordesman and Rodhan ’06** (Anthony,- holds the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS. He is also a national security analyst for ABC News Khalid,- visiting fellow @ CSIS “Iranian Nuclear Weapons? Options for Sanctions and Military Strikes” http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/060830\_iranoptionssanctions.pdf)

Iran's air forces are only marginally better able to survive in air-to-air combat than Iraq's were before 2003. Iran’s command and control system has serious limitations in terms of secure communications, vulnerability to advanced electronic warfare, netting, and digital data transfer. According to the IISS, Iran does still have 5 operational P-3MP Orion and may have made its captured Iraqi IL-76 Candid AEW aircraft operational. These assets would give it airborne warning and command and control capability, but these are obsolescent to obsolete systems and are likely to be highly vulnerable to electronic warfare and countermeasures, and long-range attack, even with Iranian modifications and updates. There are some reports Iran may be seeking make a version of the Russian AN- 140 AEW aircraft but these could not be deployed much before 2015.85 Iran’s air defense aircraft consist of a maximum operational strength of two squadrons of 25 export versions of the MiG-29A and two squadrons of 25-30 F-14As. The export version of the MiG-29A has significant avionics limitations and vulnerability to countermeasures, and it is not clear Iran has any operation Phoenix air-to-air missiles for its F-14As or has successfully modified its IHawk missiles for air-to-air combat. The AWG-9 radar on the F-14 has significant long distance sensor capability in a permissive environment, but is a US-made system in a nearly 30-year old configuration that is now vulnerable to countermeasures.

### A2 Escalation/Iran Retaliation

#### Iran retaliation will stay limited – multiple factors prevent escalation

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

SETTING THE RIGHT REDLINES The fact that the United States can likely set back or destroy Iran's nuclear program does not necessarily mean that it should. Such an attack could have potentially devastating consequences -- for international security, the global economy, and Iranian domestic politics -- all of which need to be accounted for. To begin with, critics note, U.S. military action could easily spark a full-blown war. Iran might retaliate against U.S. troops or allies, launching missiles at military installations or civilian populations in the Gulf or perhaps even Europe. It could activate its proxies abroad, stirring sectarian tensions in Iraq, disrupting the Arab Spring, and ordering terrorist attacks against Israel and the United States. This could draw Israel or other states into the fighting and compel the United States to escalate the conflict in response. Powerful allies of Iran, including China and Russia, may attempt to economically and diplomatically isolate the United States. In the midst of such spiraling violence, neither side may see a clear path out of the battle, resulting in a long-lasting, devastating war, whose impact may critically damage the United States' standing in the Muslim world. Those wary of a U.S. strike also point out that Iran could retaliate by attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, the narrow access point to the Persian Gulf through which roughly 20 percent of the world's oil supply travels. And even if Iran did not threaten the strait, speculators, fearing possible supply disruptions, would bid up the price of oil, possibly triggering a wider economic crisis at an already fragile moment. None of these outcomes is predetermined, however; indeed, the United States could do much to mitigate them. Tehran would certainly feel like it needed to respond to a U.S. attack, in order to reestablish deterrence and save face domestically. But it would also likely seek to calibrate its actions to avoid starting a conflict that could lead to the destruction of its military or the regime itself. In all likelihood, the Iranian leadership would resort to its worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe, only if it felt that its very existence was threatened. A targeted U.S. operation need not threaten Tehran in such a fundamental way. To make sure it doesn't and to reassure the Iranian regime, the United States could first make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government. It could then identify certain forms of retaliation to which it would respond with devastating military action, such as attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, conducting massive and sustained attacks on Gulf states and U.S. troops or ships, or launching terrorist attacks in the United States itself. Washington would then need to clearly articulate these "redlines" to Tehran during and after the attack to ensure that the message was not lost in battle. And it would need to accept the fact that it would have to absorb Iranian responses that fell short of these redlines without escalating the conflict. This might include accepting token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships in the region -- several salvos over the course of a few days that soon taper off -- or the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels. To avoid the kind of casualties that could compel the White House to escalate the struggle, the United States would need to evacuate nonessential personnel from U.S. bases within range of Iranian missiles and ensure that its troops were safely in bunkers before Iran launched its response. Washington might also need to allow for stepped-up support to Iran's proxies in Afghanistan and Iraq and missile and terrorist attacks against Israel. In doing so, it could induce Iran to follow the path of Iraq and Syria, both of which refrained from starting a war after Israel struck their nuclear reactors in 1981 and 2007, respectively.

#### Even if that fails – US can deescalate quickly and no regional war

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

Even if Tehran did cross Washington's redlines, the United States could still manage the confrontation. At the outset of any such violation, it could target the Iranian weapons that it finds most threatening to prevent Tehran from deploying them. To de-escalate the situation quickly and prevent a wider regional war, the United States could also secure the agreement of its allies to avoid responding to an Iranian attack. This would keep other armies, particularly the Israel Defense Forces, out of the fray. Israel should prove willing to accept such an arrangement in exchange for a U.S. promise to eliminate the Iranian nuclear threat. Indeed, it struck a similar agreement with the United States during the Gulf War, when it refrained from responding to the launching of Scud missiles by Saddam Hussein.

#### Conflict is inevitable, Strikes NOW prevent war – Iran can’t retaliate

**Babbin, 2006 *(***Jed, served as a deputy undersecretary of defense in the George H.W. Bush administration “Iran Showdown”, The American Spectator, http://www.spectator.org/dsp\_article.asp?art\_id=9310)

THE WAR WITH IRAN WILL have to be foughtand we will, of course, defend Israel as best we can. But much bloodshed can be avoided, and Iran's nuclear objective put out of reach if we seize the advantage we gave up to Saddam in the UN. Surprise is a strategic advantage we must retain.The alternative to a large war, which no one speaks about, is a surprise attack against Iran mounted before Israel acts, and before the predicted Iranian nuclear test happens. Such an attack wouldemploy several unconventional weapons at once and could -- if managed properly -- be over before Iran knows it has begun. The world must know that we have done it. But after, not before. It may be that Iran's Chinese allies are doing more than helping develop its missiles. It may be that Iran's Russian trading partner is doing more than providing defenses against air attack. But neither is likely to be providing Iran with the means of effectively defending against our other capabilities. It could, and should, be made one dark night. B-2 stealth bombers, each carrying twenty ground-penetrating guided munitions, can destroy much of Iran's nuclear facilities and government centers. Some might carry reported electro-magnetic pulse weapons that can destroy all the electronic circuits that comprise Iranian missiles, key military communications and computer facilities. And it may be that we have the ability to attack Iran's military and financial computer networks with computer viruses and "Trojan horses" that will make it impossible for Iran to function militarily and economically.Our strategy must be implemented before Ahmadinejad can test his nukes. Whether that test can happen next month or next year is immaterial.The time for us to act is now.

#### No counter attack - air strikes and missiles solve

**Rogers, 2006**(Paul Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford and Global Security Consultant to Oxford Research Group “IRAN: CONSEQUENCES OF A WAR”, February)

In addition to the substantial programme of air strikes and missile attacks on nuclear, missile and defence facilities, US military operations would also be aimed at pre-empting any immediate Iranian responses. Most significant of these would be any possible retaliatory Iranian action to affect the transport of oil and liquefied natural gas through the Straits of Hormuz. On the assumption that this would be an obvious form of retaliation, it would be necessary to destroy coastal anti-ship missile batteries and Iran’s small force of warships. The main base and dockyard is at Bushehr; the operational headquarters is at Bandar Abbas which is also the base for Iran’s small flotilla of Russian-built Kilo-class submarines, although Chah Bahar is due to become the new base for these three boats. Other bases for light naval forces include Kharg Island at the head of the Gulf and islands in the Abu Musa group south-west of the Straits of Hormuz, these being heavily defended and well supplied.1 The small Iranian Navy suffered severe losses in its exchanges with the US Navy at the end of the “tanker war” in April 1988, and it is probable that the main emphasis will be on fast light forces, including speedboats crewed by those prepared to die. These would be Iranian Revolutionary Guard (IRG) forces and they would most likely place the greatest emphasis on attacking tanker traffic rather than US naval units**.** Operating bases for these forces would be priorities for attack. It would also be assumed that IRG elements would move into some parts of Iraq to link up with sympathetic militia. To demonstrate that any such moves would incite retaliation, it is probable that military action would target forward-based ground force units both of the IRG and of the regular army.Of the numerous Iranian Army bases, those close to the border with Iraq at Abadan, Khorramshahr, Ahvaz, Dezfuland and possibly Mahabad would be the most likely targets, as would major IRG centres. A range of logistical support facilities would be targeted, with this possibly extending to destruction of bridges. Given the porous nature of the border, this latter action would be primarily symbolic.

#### The initial strike would decapitate their military

**Global Security.org, 2005** (January 1 http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iran-strikes.htm)

One potential military option that would be available to the United States includes the use of air strikes on Iranian weapons of mass destruction and missile facilities. In all, there are perhaps two dozen suspected nuclear facilities in Iran. The 1000-megawatt nuclear plant Bushehr would likely be the target of such strikes. According to the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, the spent fuel from this facility would be capable of producing 50 to 75 bombs. Also, the suspected nuclear facilities at Natanz and Arak will likely be targets of an air attack. American air strikes on Iran would vastly exceed the scope of the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osiraq nuclear center in Iraq, and would more resemble the opening days of the 2003 air campaign against Iraq. Using the full force of operational B-2 stealth bombers, staging from Diego Garcia or flying direct from the United States, possibly supplemented by F-117 stealth fighters staging from al Udeid in Qatar or some other location in theater, the two-dozen suspect nuclear sites would be targeted. Military planners could tailor their target list to reflect the preferences of the Administration by having limited air strikes that would target only the most crucial facilities in an effort to delay or obstruct the Iranian program or the United States could opt for a far more comprehensive set of strikes against a comprehensive range of WMD related targets, as well as conventional and unconventional forces that might be used to counterattack against US forces in Iraq.

#### Iran will play the role of the victim to appease other countries

**Roberts, 1-17** (Paul Craig, wrote the Kemp-Roth bill and was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and Contributing Editor of National Review. He is author or coauthor of eight books. He has held numerous academic appointments, including the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University and Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. He has contributed to numerous scholar journals and testified before Congress on 30 occasions. He has been awarded the U.S. Treasury's Meritorious Service Award and the French Legion of Honor. http://baltimorechronicle.com/2007/011707Roberts.shtml)

The former national security official believes that Bush will be able to claim victory over Iran, because Iran will avoid responding militarily. Iran will not use its Russian missiles to sink our aircraft carriers, to shut down oil facilities throughout the Middle East, or to destroy US headquarters in the “green zone” in Baghdad. Instead, Iran will adopt the posture of another Muslim victim of US/Israeli aggression and let the anger seep throughout the Muslim world until no pro-US government is safe in the Middle East.

#### No backlash – naval and airpower check

**Rogers, 2006** (Paul, Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford and Global Security Consultant to Oxford Research Group “IRAN: CONSEQUENCES OF A WAR”, February)

Although the United States has a major problem of overstretch affecting its Army and Marine Corps, an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities would be undertaken almost entirely by the Air Force and the Navy. To have the maximum impact, it would be done by surprise, utilising land-based aircraft already in the region, long-range strike aircraft operating from the United States, the UK and Diego Garcia, and naval strike forces involving carrier-borne aircraft and sea-launched cruise missiles. At any one time, the US Navy keeps one aircraft carrier battle group on station in or near the Persian Gulf. Such groups rotate, and there are periods when two are on station, providing over 150 aircraft, together with several hundred cruise missiles.4 Similar numbers of land-based aircraft could be assembled with little notice, given the range of US bases in the region, and B 1B and B-2 bombers could operate from outside the region. In particular, the specialised facilities required to operate the stealth B-2 aircraft are now available at Fairford air base in Gloucestershire.5 Air strikes on nuclear facilities would involve the destruction of facilities at the Tehran Research Reactor, together with the radioisotope production facility, a range of nuclear-related laboratories and the Kalaye Electric Company, all in Tehran. The Esfahan Nuclear Technology Centre would be a major target, including a series of experimental reactors, uranium conversion facilities and a fuel fabrication laboratory. Pilot and full-scale enrichment plants at Natanz would be targeted, as would facilities at Arak (see Appendix 1).6 The new 1,000 MW reactor nearing completion at Bushehr would be targeted, although this could be problematic once the reactor is fully fuelled and goes critical some time in 2006. Once that has happened, any destruction of the containment structure could lead to serious problems of radioactive dispersal affecting not just the Iranian Gulf coast, but west Gulf seaboards in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. As well as the direct human effects, since these comprise the world’s most substantial concentration of oil production facilities, the consequences could be severe.7 All of the initial attacks would be undertaken more or less simultaneously, in order to kill as many of the technically competent staff as possible, therefore doing the greatest damage to longer-term prospects. This would be a necessary part of any military action and would probably extend to the destruction of university laboratories and technology centres that indirectly support the Iranian nuclear scientific and technical infrastructure. Such an aspect of the attack is not widely recognised outside of military planning circles but would be an essential component of the operation. Given that the aim is to set back Iranian nuclear potential for as long as possible, it would be essential to go well beyond the destruction of physical facilities that could be replaced quite rapidly. The killing of those with technical expertise would have a much more substantial impact on any efforts to redevelop nuclear capabilities. Furthermore, since such expertise is known to include foreign nationals, the killing of such people already working in the country would serve as a deterrent to the involvement of others in the future. Iran currently has limited air defences and a largely obsolete and small air force. Even so, defence suppression would be a major aspect of military action, primarily to reduce the risk of the killing or capture of US aircrew. It would involve the targeting of radar facilities and command and control centres, as well as Western Command air bases at Tehran, Tabriz, Hamadan, Dezful, Umidiyeh, Shiraz and Isfahan, and Southern Command air bases at Bushehr, Bandar Abbas and Chah Bahar.8A particular concern for US forces is the continued deployment by Iran of 45 or more of the American F-14A Tomcat interceptors and their long-range AWG-9 radar equipment. 79 planes were originally procured before the fall of the Shah and around 30 are available operationally at any one time out of those still deployed.9 Research, development and production facilities for Iran’s medium-range ballistic missile programme would be priority targets, as would bases at which these mobile missiles are deployed. Because of their mobility, surprise would once again be essential. US forces have already used reconnaissance drones to map Iranian facilities and these, combined with satellite reconnaissance and a range of forms of electronic surveillance, have provided considerable information on the nuclear infrastructure and more general defence forces.

### A2: Backlash Turns – All

#### US can minimize political fallout and avoid international crisis

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

Washington could also reduce the political fallout of military action by building global support for it in advance. Many countries may still criticize the United States for using force, but some -- the Arab states in particular -- would privately thank Washington for eliminating the Iranian threat. By building such a consensus in the lead-up to an attack and taking the outlined steps to mitigate it once it began, the United States could avoid an international crisis and limit the scope of the conflict.

### A2 Overstretch

#### Won’t Cause Overstretch – Your Evidence Only Assumes Ground Forces

**INW, ’06** (Iran Nuclear Watch, 10/18, http://irannuclearwatch.blogspot.com/2006/10/cacnp-briefing-on-us-policy-options.html)

This is the second favorite approach of American Neoconservatives. Many mistakenly believe that the U.S. is too tied down in Iraq to carry out a successful military strike against Iran. While our ground forces may be overextended, our Navy and Air Force would have no problem carrying out this operation.

### A2 Civilian Casualties

#### Civilian casualities will be limited

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

Washington would also be able to limit civilian casualties in any campaign. Iran built its most critical nuclear plants, such as the one in Natanz, away from heavily populated areas. For those less important facilities that exist near civilian centers, such as the centrifuge-manufacturing sites, U.S. precision-guided missiles could pinpoint specific buildings while leaving their surroundings unscathed. The United States could reduce the collateral damage even further by striking at night or simply leaving those less important plants off its target list at little cost to the overall success of the mission. Although Iran would undoubtedly publicize any human suffering in the wake of a military action, the majority of the victims would be the military personnel, engineers, scientists, and technicians working at the facilities

#### The alternative to strikes is prolif or strikes later, comparatively worse options

**Beres ‘07** (Louis Rene, professor @ the University of Purdue, May 8, pg. http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20070508/cm\_csm/yberes)

A more important reservation about preemption involves tactical difficulties. Due to delays, the success of strikes against certain key Iranian targets may already be in doubt. Worse, such strikes would probably entail high civilian casualties because Iran has deliberately placed sensitive military assets amid civilian populations – an international crime called "perfidy." But further delay will only multiply the number of casualties from any future operation, or – in the worst-case scenario – allow Iran to become fully nuclear.

### A2: Oil Shocks

#### No economic crisis or oil shock

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

SETTING THE RIGHT REDLINES The fact that the United States can likely set back or destroy Iran's nuclear program does not necessarily mean that it should. Such an attack could have potentially devastating consequences -- for international security, the global economy, and Iranian domestic politics -- all of which need to be accounted for. To begin with, critics note, U.S. military action could easily spark a full-blown war. Iran might retaliate against U.S. troops or allies, launching missiles at military installations or civilian populations in the Gulf or perhaps even Europe. It could activate its proxies abroad, stirring sectarian tensions in Iraq, disrupting the Arab Spring, and ordering terrorist attacks against Israel and the United States. This could draw Israel or other states into the fighting and compel the United States to escalate the conflict in response. Powerful allies of Iran, including China and Russia, may attempt to economically and diplomatically isolate the United States. In the midst of such spiraling violence, neither side may see a clear path out of the battle, resulting in a long-lasting, devastating war, whose impact may critically damage the United States' standing in the Muslim world. Those wary of a U.S. strike also point out that Iran could retaliate by attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, the narrow access point to the Persian Gulf through which roughly 20 percent of the world's oil supply travels. And even if Iran did not threaten the strait, speculators, fearing possible supply disruptions, would bid up the price of oil, possibly triggering a wider economic crisis at an already fragile moment. Cont… Finally, the U.S. government could blunt the economic consequences of a strike. For example, it could offset any disruption of oil supplies by opening its Strategic Petroleum Reserve and quietly encouraging some Gulf states to increase their production in the run-up to the attack. Given that many oil-producing nations in the region, especially Saudi Arabia, have urged the United States to attack Iran, they would likely cooperate.

#### No impact - US and Europe strategic reserves check

**Akleh, 2006** (Dr. Elias, Arab writer from a Palestinian descent) “Iran is The Next Battle Field”, March 5,

http://www.amin.org/eng/uncat/2006/mar/mar5-0.html)

The US expects this invasion to take less than 100 days. To avoid the expected oil crisis due to the shut-off of Iranian oil the American administration is planning to use its strategic petroleum reserve that has a supply of oil equals to about 175 days worth of Iranian production. Europe will also use its own strategic oil reserve. These reserves would be replenished with fresh oil after controlling Khuzestan. This war would give US total control of the largest three oil resources of the world; Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran. The Dollar’s global hegemony would be restored, and participating European countries would have some share of the cake.

#### Iran wont shut down oil facilities

**Roberts, 1-17** (Paul Craig, wrote the Kemp-Roth bill and was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and Contributing Editor of National Review. He is author or coauthor of eight books. He has held numerous academic appointments, including the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University and Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. He has contributed to numerous scholar journals and testified before Congress on 30 occasions. He has been awarded the U.S. Treasury's Meritorious Service Award and the French Legion of Honor. http://baltimorechronicle.com/2007/011707Roberts.shtml)

The former national security official believes that Bush will be able to claim victory over Iran, because Iran will avoid responding militarily. Iran will not use its Russian missiles to sink our aircraft carriers, to shut down oil facilities throughout the Middle East, or to destroy US headquarters in the “green zone” in Baghdad. Instead, Iran will adopt the posture of another Muslim victim of US/Israeli aggression and let the anger seep throughout the Muslim world until no pro-US government is safe in the Middle East.

### A2: Straits of Hormuz

#### Iran won’t close the straits – economic suicide

[**Schake**](http://www.hoover.org/bios/schake.html) **’07** (Kori,- research fellow at the Hoover Institution “Dealing with A Nuclear Iran” http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/6848072.html)

Iran could also disrupt the flow of oil by closing the Straits of Hormuz or attacking Gulf platforms or shipping. As Edward Luttwak points out, “all of the offshore oil- and gas-production platforms in the gulf, all the traffic of oil and gas tankers originating from the jetties of the Arabian peninsula and Iraq, are within easy reach of the Iranian coast.” However, this, too, seems improbable beyond a short duration, since oil accounts for 80 percent of the Iranian economy. Attacks on gcc oil facilities are a greater likelihood, since they would increase the value of Iranian oil, but if gcc states were not involved in or supporting the strikes against Iran, such attacks would have long-term detrimental consequences for Iran’s relations with the gcc states.

#### Iran Won't Shut Off Strait Of Hormuz -That'd Guarantee The Demise Of The Regime

**Bergman 5/19/2006** (Ilan, author, "Tehran Rising: Iran's Challenge to the United States," and vice president of the America Foreign Policy Council, Defense Forum Foundation Luncheon Presentation: "Taking on Tehran: America's Options," Federal News Service, l/n)

I'll give you an example. Iran has the ability to shut off the flow of oil from the Strait of Hormuz through the Strait of Hormuz from the Persian Gulf. That's two-fifths of world energy traffic on any given day. That would obviously cause prices to spike through the roof, but it's also the quickest, easiest, and most efficient way to make India, Japan, the European Union, Russia, and China regime changers, because if that happens the first logical assumption that businessmen in all those places will make is this regime in its current form cannot be trusted to control oil, even if this crisis subsides. And unlike us, the Russians and the Chinese have no problem with dealing forcefully with economic meddlers. So I don't necessarily think that that's a threat. What I do think that the Iranians are gaming very well is our degree of aversion to rising prices. I think they know that if they rattle that energy saber pretty heftily, and often, and do war games, and test Russian equipment off of freighters and things like that, we get very nervous and we begin to deter ourselves from having these discussions. So like you said, there's not a lot of discussion about that, and that's precisely what they want.

#### More ev

**Hassett ’06** (Kevin A,- scholar @ American Enterprise Institute “World Economy Would Be Casualty of Mideast War” http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24663,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

While this scenario is sobering, it remains unlikely, at least based on the economics. Oil accounts for about 10 percent of Iran's gross domestic product and comprises 80 percent of that country's exports. Take away the oil revenue in war time, and the economy would almost grind to a halt and certainly be unable to sustain a prolonged conflict. Only suicidal leaders would allow themselves to fight with Israel under such circumstances.

### A2: Strikes => Fundamentalism

#### Strikes are worth the risk

**Kittrie, 2004** (Orde, The Arizona Republic.) December 5 2004

Several factors, including Iran’s history of threats and attacks against the United States, provide strong support for the legality under international law of a preemptive strike focused on neutralizing Iran’s nuclear program. The risk of such an attack inciting the “Arab street” or insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan would be well worth taking — for an Iranian nuclear program is an existential threat and insurgents in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere are not.

#### The impact will be minimal – little support for religious warfare

**Gerecht ’06** (Reuel Marc,- resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute April 14th “To Bomb, or Not to Bomb” http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24230,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

And as explained above, anger at the United States is likely to be double-edged, cutting toward the ruling clergy as well as us. We shouldn't become paralyzed from fear of Shiite death-wish believers coming at us again. It's possible. What makes a terrorist Muslim holy warrior is usually complex and personal, and an American airstrike on Iranian nuclear facilities might provide that special explosive ingredient to some. However, it's not likely, and it's especially not likely that the clerical regime would be able to produce and export these holy warriors as an automotive company does cars. The Islamic Republic ceased to produce holy warriors by the end of the Iran-Iraq war in 1988. (The death of Khomeini in 1989 also stole a charismatic element from the brew that had produced an amazing number of young men who lived to die.) Even in Lebanon, where Hezbollah is just across the border from Israel, Shiite holy warriors have receded--at least those who want to immolate themselves and others for the cause. This disease is obviously alive among the Sunnis, but it seems extinguished among the Shiites. Blame Khomeini, the Iran-Iraq war, and nationalism. The type of millenarian hope that many faithful Iranian men had at the beginning of the revolution died out in the war and in the unjust and increasingly corrupt society the mullahs built. Millenarian despair--the recognition that God's perfect society isn't accessible on earth but just might be accessible through a gloriously violent and fraternal death--also burned itself out in the unending, pointless slaughter of the eight-year Iran-Iraq war and the increasing pettiness and deceit of an aging Islamic Republic. There are certainly diehard true believers in Iran--Ahmadinejad appears to be one--but the internal chemistry of Iranian society doesn't produce many anymore among men under 25, the key age group for marrying a killer faith with testosterone. The potential for chiliastic rapture--the fraternity of death that young men can have most easily in brutal combat--has just dried up. Something so secular and adventitious as an American airstrike on a nuclear facility is very unlikely to bring back that magic, that love of God and man, that can send young boys across minefields on motorcycles. The rise of a less religious nationalism in Iran is a sign of declining jihadism. Nationalism in the Sunni radical world has been in retreat (even if it still often defines the contours of "globalized" radical Islamic thought) as holy warriorism has been increasing. An offended God is a vastly more important element in jihadism than an offended nation-state. If Ahmadinejad declares that thousands of young men will sign up to become martyrs in terrorist attacks upon Americans if the United States bombs Iran, don't believe him. He's dreaming. He's having a flashback. If opponents of preventive bombing conjure up illusions of Sunni militants--or just the "one billion plus Muslims worldwide"--outraged at American actions against the Islamic Republic, then one should remind them of the Arab and Muslim streets that were supposed to rise in jihad a half dozen times against Westerners since 1914 but didn't. Imagining Arab and non-Arab Sunnis, particularly the truly violent Wahhabi set, who hate Shiites almost as much as they hate Americans, going on the warpath on behalf of a nuclear-defanged Shiite Iran is numbingly hard, though obviously not impossible for those who believe the Islamic Republic is only a menace because America--especially President Bush--is determined to demonize it.

### A2: Strikes => Nationalism/Empower Hardliners

#### Hardliners already have absolute control, strikes empower dissidents and there’s no impact

**Kroenig, 12** (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

Yet another argument against military action against Iran is that it would embolden the hard-liners within Iran's government, helping them rally the population around the regime and eliminate any remaining reformists. This critique ignores the fact that the hard-liners are already firmly in control. The ruling regime has become so extreme that it has sidelined even those leaders once considered to be right-wingers, such as former President Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, for their perceived softness. And Rafsanjani or the former presidential candidate Mir Hossein Mousavi would likely continue the nuclear program if he assumed power. An attack might actually create more openings for dissidents in the long term (after temporarily uniting Iran behind Ayatollah Ali Khamenei), giving them grounds for criticizing a government that invited disaster. Even if a strike would strengthen Iran's hard-liners, the United States must not prioritize the outcomes of Iran's domestic political tussles over its vital national security interest in preventing Tehran from developing nuclear weapons.

#### Strikes make the regime look weak –increases opposition. Anti-American / nationalist sentiment is not unique and will be short lived anyways

**Gerecht ’06** (Reuel Marc,- resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute April 14th “To Bomb, or Not to Bomb” http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24230,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

It's much more reasonable to assume that the Islamic Republic's loss to America--and having your nuclear facilities destroyed would be hard to depict as a victory--would actually accelerate internal debate and soul-searching. It's unlikely that many Iranians would feel any affection for an American attack--we would certainly see rampant nationalist and Muslim indignation from many quarters--but the discussion would be much more complicated than just anti-Americanism. It would be, as it was during and after the Iran-Iraq war, double-edged, and probably painful for the ruling clergy, who have not been beloved for a very long time. And the reasons they are not liked are felt each day. This would not change with an American attack against nuclear facilities. Iranians' growing criticisms of their own society, especially those criticisms advanced by folks who were, or still are, loyal to the revolution--most famously Grand Ayatollah Ali Montazeri, the "defrocked" onetime successor to Khomeini--simply cannot be blown away by foreigners' actions, any more than, in an American context, left-wing intellectuals' concern about social justice, or American blacks' revulsion at the indignities of state-sanctioned racism, could have been stopped by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It's likely that an American attack on the clerical regime's nuclear facilities would, within a short period of time, produce burning criticism of the ruling mullahs, as hot for them as it would be for us. This is not to say that American attacks would produce a counterrevolution. Not at all. It's just to say that such attacks would not make most Iranians love the mullahs more. An attack would surely introduce uncertainties into Iranian politics, something the clerical dictatorship has tried to avoid. It's worthwhile to remember what happened after the USS Vincennes accidentally shot down a civilian Iranian airliner in 1988. Iranians appeared furious. Even among those who hated the clerical regime--even among Iranian expatriates who'd been driven from their homeland by Ayatollah Khomeini and loved the United States profoundly--vengeful wishes were common. (More than a few astute folks in America's counterterrorist community have long believed that Pan Am 103's destruction above Scotland in 1989 had its origins in a clerical decision to strike back for the Vincennes action. Libya's Muammar Qaddafi, who had his own desire for vengeance against the Americans, entered the picture later.) Yet within a fairly short time, you could see that many Iranians had flipped: They were almost thankful. Most seemed to assume America had blown the airplane from the sky intentionally, yet they were now giving credit to America for helping to break Khomeini's will to continue the war against Saddam Hussein. America had chosen sides--in most Iranian eyes, atrociously in favor of the Butcher of Baghdad--but the war had been stopped. The detested war-loving mullahs had been broken. Mutatis mutandis, the emotions surrounding an American strike against the regime's nuclear facilities would be complicated. With or without an American strike on the clerics' nuclear sites, the advance of democracy in Iran will likely have many anti-American overtones (less perhaps than elsewhere in the Muslim Middle East, since theocracy has improved America's image in Iran enormously as the mullahs have failed to fulfill the promises of the Islamic revolution). A surge in anti-Americanism, even if it lasted long, would not save the regime from the intellectual aftershocks of a U.S. attack on its nuclear-weapons facilities. Iran's political and democratic dissidents, especially among the clergy and the left-wing lay crowd, have often been very anti-American. They would no doubt remain so even as they found themselves questioning whether the regime had lost its mind getting into a war with the world's only superpower.

#### And the impact to Iranian opposition is minimal – demo won’t solve prolif anyways

**Gerecht ’06** (Reuel Marc,- resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute April 14th “To Bomb, or Not to Bomb” http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24230,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

If we bomb, we will kill off the internal Iranian opposition. This is perhaps the weakest argument against a preventive strike. Although it would be nice to have Iranian society evolve quickly into something more democratic than theocracy, the odds of this happening before the regime gets a nuke aren't good. It could be decades before this happens; preventive military strikes would have the immediate benefit of delaying Iran's possession of nuclear arms for a few, perhaps several, years. In any case, it is highly unlikely that an American strike would arrest Iran's intellectual progress away from theocracy. This process has been going on since the 1980s--Iran's loss to Iraq in the Iran-Iraq war was an important catalyst to questioning and dissent.

### A2: Strikes => Radiation

#### US Can strike without releasing radiation

**Eisenstadt ‘04** (MICHAEL,- senior fellow at The Washington Institute) “CHECKING IRAN’S NUCLEAR AMBITIONS” January

While it would be preferable to target these prior to start-up to avoid exposing civilians downwind to fallout, there may be ways to disrupt operations or destroy the reactors after start-up without releasing radioactive material into the environment and creating a downwind hazard.

### A2: US-EU Relations

#### Iraq disproves your impact – relations will recover

**Gerecht ’06** (Reuel Marc,- resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute April 14th “To Bomb, or Not to Bomb” http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24230,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

The real question remains, Is a nuclear weapon under the control of Ali Khamenei "unacceptable"? If it is, then enduring the heat of hostile European opinion ought to be sustainable. Living through the Iraq war has been an unhappy experience--for those who see the world first and foremost through a transatlantic lens, downright nerve-wracking. But the sky has not fallen. It would probably not fall--at least not in Europe--if we attacked the clerics' atomic-weapons programs.

#### EU is down for strikes

**Engdahl ’06** (F William,- author of A Century of War: Anglo-American Oil Politics and the New World Order) “A high-risk game of nuclear chicken”, 31 January, http://www.sibernews.com/the-news/world-news/a-high%11risk-game-of-nuclear-chicken-200601313615/)

That statement led to a sharp acceleration of EU diplomatic efforts, led by Britain, Germany and France, the so-called EU-3**,** to avoid a war. The three told Washington they were opposed to a military solution. Since then we are told by German magazine Der Spiegel and others the EU view has changed, to appear to come closer to the position of the Bush administration.

### A2: Escalation

#### Large powers will back down

**Babbin, 2006**(Jed, served as a deputy undersecretary of defense in the George H.W. Bush administration “Iran Showdown”, The American Spectator, http://www.spectator.org/dsp\_article.asp?art\_id=9310)

THE WAR WITH IRAN WILL have to be foughtand we will, of course, defend Israel as best we can. But much bloodshed can be avoided, and Iran's nuclear objective put out of reach if we seize the advantage we gave up to Saddam in the UN. Surprise is a strategic advantage we must retain.The alternative to a large war, which no one speaks about, is a surprise attack against Iran mounted before Israel acts, and before the predicted Iranian nuclear test happens. Such an attack wouldemploy several unconventional weapons at once and could -- if managed properly -- be over before Iran knows it has begun. The world must know that we have done it. But after, not before. It may be that Iran's Chinese allies are doing more than helping develop its missiles. It may be that Iran's Russian trading partner is doing more than providing defenses against air attack. But neither is likely to be providing Iran with the means of effectively defending against our other capabilities. It could, and should, be made one dark night. B-2 stealth bombers, each carrying twenty ground-penetrating guided munitions, can destroy much of Iran's nuclear facilities and government centers. Some might carry reported electro-magnetic pulse weapons that can destroy all the electronic circuits that comprise Iranian missiles, key military communications and computer facilities. And it may be that we have the ability to attack Iran's military and financial computer networks with computer viruses and "Trojan horses" that will make it impossible for Iran to function militarily and economically.Our strategy must be implemented before Ahmadinejad can test his nukes. Whether that test can happen next month or next year is immaterial.The time for us to act is now.

### A2: Iraq

#### Iran will play the role of the victim to appease other countries

**Roberts, -07** (Paul Craig, wrote the Kemp-Roth bill and was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and Contributing Editor of National Review. He is author or coauthor of eight books. He has held numerous academic appointments, including the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University and Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. He has contributed to numerous scholar journals and testified before Congress on 30 occasions. He has been awarded the U.S. Treasury's Meritorious Service Award and the French Legion of Honor. http://baltimorechronicle.com/2007/011707Roberts.shtml)

The former national security official believes that Bush will be able to claim victory over Iran, because Iran will avoid responding militarily. Iran will not use its Russian missiles to sink our aircraft carriers, to shut down oil facilities throughout the Middle East, or to destroy US headquarters in the “green zone” in Baghdad. Instead, Iran will adopt the posture of another Muslim victim of US/Israeli aggression and let the anger seep throughout the Muslim world until no pro-US government is safe in the Middle East.

### A2: Iraq / Pakistan / Afghan Instability

#### Wrong – three reasons

[**Schake**](http://www.hoover.org/bios/schake.html) **’07** (Kori,- research fellow at the Hoover Institution “Dealing with A Nuclear Iran” http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/6848072.html)

A second potential Iranian retaliation would be fomenting further violence in Iraq and Afghanistan and attempting to destabilize pro-American governments in Pakistan. There are three reasonably strong arguments against Iran taking this approach, however. First, Iran would be incurring the enmity not just of the U.S., but also of neighbors at a time when Iran’s military ability to protect itself was being substantially reduced. A denuded Iran may pause before tangling with a nuclear-armed Pakistan that also has the ability to fight back conventionally or asymmetrically. S sectarian violence in Iraq will have political consequences of long duration for Iran, which currently has the potential for a Shi’ite ally as the Iraqi political landscape solidifies. Such outcomes are not in American interests either, I hasten to add. Countries whose help we have been cajoling in the war against terrorism and whose hearts and minds we are attempting to win will resent having to deal with a belligerent Iran, especially over an issue on which they were not principal adversaries before our military strikes. But the examples highlight that Iran, too, has second-order effects to its choices, and setting aflame neighboring countries creates its own problems for Iran. The second argument against Iran retaliating by funding and inciting violence in countries important to the U.S. is that the logic that discouraged Iranian support for terrorism in the past eight years or so will still prevail. As long as Iran is seeking international acceptance, foreign investment, and “normalization” in the international community, support for terrorism — even if justified as retaliation for a preemptive strike — will be delegitimizing. The third argument is that Iran itself is not immune to ethnic and sectarian divisions that could be exploited. Kurdish, Arab, and Azeri Iranians might be less amenable to Persian nationalism or Islamic solidarity than the government believes; likewise for Sunnis denied the religious practice of their choice. As revolutionary fervor wanes and the Ahmadinejad government continues struggling to deliver on its domestic promises, Iran could also be susceptible to the turmoil it might seek to produce elsewhere.

#### Iran does not have the resources to cause meaningful damage

**Gerecht ’06** (Reuel Marc,- resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute April 14th “To Bomb, or Not to Bomb” http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24230,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

Using its Revolutionary Guard and intelligence-ministry forces, the Islamic Republic could strike us in both countries. You don't need to imagine reborn Iranian Shiite holy warriors running amok to see cause for concern. If you had to pick one reason that the Bush administration would not strike the Islamic Republic's nuclear facilities, this would probably be it. It's impossible to overestimate the Iraq fatigue that now afflicts the administration. The American military is stressed out. Although it's difficult to say what Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's view is--his entire civilian staff seems to have recused itself from giving a forceful opinion on the Iranian nuclear issue--the military brass will likely fight any preventive military strike against Iran for fear of the repercussions in Iraq. Their views may be unfounded, but it seems likely President Bush would hesitate to dismiss these concerns. Ultimately, the clerical regime itself will determine whether the United States strikes its nuclear facilities. If it acts in a rash manner, deploying frightening language and new ballistic hardware, if it gets caught engaging in serious nastiness in Iraq or terrorism abroad before it has enough centrifuges up and running, then it's certainly possible to imagine the president, even the senior officers of the U.S. Army, deciding America has no choice. As we get closer to the "red line" for Iran's atomic-weapons programs, it's not at all unlikely we will concentrate on Iran's threat independent of Iraq. Viewed calmly, Afghanistan and Iraq shouldn't make or break the decision on whether to strike Iran's facilities. In both countries, the Iranians are only as good as their proxies. It seems highly unlikely that the clerical regime would try to deploy large numbers of Revolutionary Guards and intelligence officers in open combat in either place. The Iranians would be operating without benefit of cover. (They stick out like sore thumbs in both countries.) They would be inviting U.S. attacks on Iran--and not on nuclear facilities, but on Revolutionary Guards Corps camps, military installations, and intelligence facilities. Such things are critical to the regime's survival. The regime certainly remembers that the U.S. Navy essentially annihilated the Iranian regular and Revolutionary Guard navy in one day at the end of the Iran-Iraq war. It's doubtful the clerical regime would like to repeat the experience. Indirect terrorism is the clerical way, and that's what one would expect in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. The mullahs could certainly find Iraqi and Afghan recruits to help, but whether these attacks could reach and maintain an amplitude sufficient to change the political or military fate of either country is open to question. Terrorism against Americans in either place is likely to kill the natives as well, perhaps lots of them. If the Iraqi Shia discovered that the Iranians were blowing up their women and children, there would be hell to pay for those Iranians so unfortunate as to be working in or visiting Iraq. An Iranian offensive in Iraq would certainly stress the entire Shiite community. If the Americans were to alienate seriously the Shiites--something we have not yet done--then we could be in serious trouble. If the young radical Moktada al-Sadr were forced from the political process (there was a time for this, but that time is now past), we might see him take up arms for Iran. If he remains inside the political system, then it's unlikely he will destroy the system in which he's a player. There just isn't that level of affection, certainly not fealty, between him, his men, and the Iranians.

### A2: US-Russian Relations

#### Strikes won’t hurt US-Russian relations

**Sokov ’06** (Nikolai,- Senior research associate at the Center for Nonproliferation studies, he worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I negotiations “The Prospects of Russian Mediation of the Iranian Nuclear Crisis”http://cns.miis.edu/pubs/week/060217.htm

If the United States undertakes a military action against Iran, Russia will most likely remain on the sidelines much as it did during the 2003 war in Iraq: it will not support Iran in any way, but will not support the United States either. Instead, it will try to deny the United States the sanction of the UN Security Council and will strongly condemn US actions. The impact of such an operation on US-Russian relations - barring the above-mentioned appearance of US bases in the South Caucasus - will be short-lived, however, and, as before, Russia will rather quickly return to the status quoante in its attitude toward the United States.

#### US-Iran policy is not important to Russia – strikes won’t collapse relations

**Yaphe and Lutes ’05** (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

That is not to say that Russia is cavalier about Iranian intentions. Moscow continues to monitor Tehran’s behavior for signs of greater ambition and possible mischief. Generally, though, while Russia might object to solutions that rely on the use of force, it is unlikely to become a true obstacle to U.S. policy in the region. Russia also is unlikely ever to become a major player in dealing with an Iranian nuclear program and would probably be more reactive than proactive. Russia could play a useful role in the general framework of the international community’s response to the crisis. In doing so, Russia is more likely to use the international legal framework than to adopt a position that could leave senior policymakers vulnerable to domestic charges of caving in to U.S. pressure. For example, Russia’s agreement with Iran on spent nuclear fuel ran against U.S. policy preferences but emphasized compliance with Russian obligations under the NPT. Perhaps one collateral benefit of the agreement is that it underscores the point that Iran does not need to develop its own full nuclear fuel cycle. Russian behavior in the runup to Operation *Iraqi Freedom* could be indicative of its reaction to a future crisis involving Iran. Unwilling to jeopardize its bilateral relations with the United States or Europe, Russia would probably adopt a “wait-and-see” attitude and watch the debate unfold among allies on both sides of the Atlantic. Russia would likely shy away from a leadership position in that debate, insisting instead on keeping the issue confined to the UN–NPT framework. This would give Moscow a major decisionmaking role, shield its equities vis-à-vis the United States and Europe, maximize its leverage on Iran, and neutralize domestic anti-American sentiments.

### A2: US-Sino Relations

#### China won’t break US-Sino relation in response to any Iran crisis

**Yaphe and Lutes ’05** (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

China is another great power with growing interest in Iran and the Gulf. Its reactions to a nuclear-armed Iran are likely to be similar to Chinese responses in other post–Cold War international crises, such as the Gulf War, Kosovo, the Korean nuclear crisis, and the Iraq war. China would seek to protect its equities in the crisis region, emphasize international procedures that give it a veto or a strong voice, support peaceful diplomatic resolution of the crisis, and oppose any use of force against Iran. In our judgment, China’s focus would remain on protecting its national sovereignty, avoiding negative precedents, and preserving regional stability in order to maintain favorable conditions for Chinese economic development. If possible, China would pursue these objectives while maintaining good relations with the United States and other major powers.

### A2: US-Arab Relations

#### Strikes won’t deck US-Arab relations, they will side with us

**Yaphe and Lutes ’05** (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

Gulf Arab leaders say they are more worried that the United States is determined to pursue military confrontation with Iran, which would pose an increasing danger to their security and well being. They worry about the risk of a region-wide war between the United States, their security partner and guarantor, and Iran, their largest and most powerful neighbor. If this occurred, it would be the fourth major regional conflict since 1980, when Baghdad invaded Iran.33 They profess not to be worried about “democracy” in Iraq or a nuclear-armed Iran, and they urge Washington to open a dialogue with Iran, not rush to create democracy in Iraq, and to consult with their leaders. Gulf elites acknowledge that they are consumers rather than providers of security and that in the event the United States were to go to war with Iran, they would have no choice but to side with it. There is no apparent public debate on this issue.

#### Arab states will value cooperation with the US more than differences over Iran, plus they fear a nuclear Iran

**Yaphe and Lutes ’05** (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

In the end, the GC states believe they need a protector from outside the region to survive. They believe that their only strategic option is to side with the United States. Despite a professed dislike of the Bush administration, unease with Iraq, and unhappiness with the direction of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and Persian Gulf region, there is consensus among these Gulf Arabs that only the United States can be counted on to protect them, and that Iran—with or without nuclear weapons—is and will always be a constant strategic worry.

## \*\*\*Obama Good - Iran Strikes Bad\*\*\*

### Laundry List 1

#### Iran strikes causes multiple scenarios for nuclear war, CBW use and terrorist attacks.

**Russell -09** (James A. Russell, managing editor of Strategic Insights, the quarterly ejournal published by the Center for Contemporary Conflict at the Naval Postgraduate School, Spring 2009, *Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East*, Security Studies Center)

Iran’s response to what would initially start as a sustained stand-off bombardment (Desert Fox Heavy) could take a number of different forms that might lead to escalation by the United States and Israel, surrounding states, and non-state actors. Once the strikes commenced, it is difficult to imagine Iran remaining in a Saddam-like quiescent mode and hunkering down to wait out the attacks. Iranian leaders have unequivocally stated that any attack on its nuclear sites will result in a wider war81 – a war that could involve regional states on both sides as well as non-state actors like Hamas and Hezbollah. While a wider regional war need not lead to escalation and nuclear use by either Israel or the United States, wartime circumstances and domestic political pressures could combine to shape decision-making in ways that present nuclear use as an option to achieve military and political objectives. For both the United States and Israel, Iranian or proxy use of chemical, biological or radiological weapons represent the most serious potential escalation triggers. For Israel, a sustained conventional bombardment of its urban centers by Hezbollah rockets in Southern Lebanon could also trigger an escalation spiral. Assessing relative probability of these scenarios is very difficult and beyond the scope of this article. Some scenarios for Iranian responses that could lead to escalation by the United States and Israel are: Terrorist-type asymmetric attacks on either the U.S. or Israeli homelands by Iran or its proxies using either conventional or unconventional (chemical, biological, or radiological) weapons. Escalation is more likely in response to the use of unconventional weapons in populated urban centers. The potential for use of nuclear retaliation against terrorist type attacks is problematic, unless of course the sponsoring country takes official responsibility for them, which seems highly unlikely. Asymmetric attacks by Iran or its proxies using unconventional weapons against U.S. military facilities in Iraq and the Gulf States (Kuwait, Bahrain, UAE, Qatar); • Long-range missile strikes by Iran attacking Israel and/or U.S. facilities in Iraq and the Gulf States: • Conventional missile strikes in and around the Israeli reactor at Dimona • Airbursts of chemical or radiological agents in Israeli urban areas; • Missile strikes using non-conventional weapons against US Gulf facilities such as Al Udeid in Qatar, Al Dhafra Air Base in the UAE, and the 5th Fleet Headquarters in Manama, Bahrain. Under all scenarios involving chemical/biological attacks on its forces, the United States has historically retained the right to respond with all means at its disposal even if the attacks come from a non-nuclear weapons state.82 • The involvement of non-state actors as part of ongoing hostilities between Iran, the United States, and Israel in which Hezbollah and/or Hamas became engaged presents an added dimension for conflict escalation. While tactically allied with Iran and each other, these groups have divergent interests and objectives that could affect their involvement (or non-involvement in a wider regional war) – particularly in ways that might prompt escalation by Israel and the United States. Hezbollah is widely believed to have stored thousands of short range Iranian-supplied rockets in southern Lebanon. Attacking Israel in successive fusillades of missiles over time could lead to domestic political demands on the Israeli military to immediately stop these external attacks – a mission that might require a wide area-denial capability provided by nuclear weapons and their associated PSI overpressures, particularly if its conventional ground operations in Gaza prove in the mid- to longterms as indecisive or strategic ambiguous as its 2006 operations in Lebanon. • Another source of uncertainty is the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) – referred to here as “quasi-state” actor. The IRGC manages the regime’s nuclear, chemical and missile programs and is responsible for “extraterritorial” operations outside Iran. The IRGC is considered as instrument of the state and reports directly to Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei. So far, the IRGC has apparently refrained from providing unconventional weapons to its surrogates. The IRGC also, however arms and funds various Shiite paramilitary groups in Iraq and Lebanon that have interests and objectives that may or may not directly reflect those of the Iranian supreme leader. Actions of these groups in a wartime environment are another source of strategic uncertainty that could shape crisis decision-making in unhelpful ways. • The most likely regional state to be drawn into a conflict on Iran’s side in a wider regional war is Syria, which is widely reported to have well developed missile and chemical warfare programs. Direct Syrian military involvement in an Israeli-U.S./Iranian war taking the form of missile strikes or chemical attacks on Israel could serve as another escalation trigger in a nuclear-use scenario, in particular if chemical or bio-chem weapons are used by the Syrians, technically crossing the WMD-chasm and triggering a retaliatory strike using any category of WMD including nuclear weapons. • The last – and perhaps most disturbing – of these near-term scenarios is the possible use by Iran of nuclear weapons in the event of conventional strikes by the United States and Israel. This scenario is built on the assumption of a U.S. and/or Israeli intelligence failure to detect Iranian possession of a nuclear device that had either been covertly built or acquired from another source. It is possible to foresee an Iranian “demonstration” use of a nuclear weapon in such a scenario in an attempt to stop an Israeli/U.S. conventional bombardment. A darker scenario would be a direct nuclear attack by Iran on Israel, also precipitated by conventional strikes, inducing a “use them or lose them” response. In turn, such a nuclear strike would almost certainly prompt an Israeli and U.S. massive response – a potential “Armageddon” scenario.

### Laundry List 2

#### The attack would be the worst thing ever – global terrorism, war with Russia, and war with China would ensue

**ULLLAH JAN 06** Head of Independent Centre of Strategic Studies (Canada, Ottawa).

[Abid, 2/20/06, http://mathaba.net/0\_index.shtml?x=528456]

If Iran has no nuclear weapons, as concludes Mohammed el-Baradei the respected chief of the IAEA, the war on Iran, in itself, will not lead to the speculated World War 3. It will only worsen the situation worldwide. Instead of directly ending up in a World War, the war on Iran will only become a next phase in spreading the World War that is already on without our realizing that we are passing through its initial phases. [1] On the other hand, a false assumption that Iran has no nuclear weapons will, in fact, quickly engulf many more countries and take the World War that is already on to a quick climax.[2] Under-estimating Iran’s nuclear capacity is pushing the extremists in Washington into launching a war that the US administration has been planning since a long time. The IAEA’s inspections and confirmation that Iran has no nuclear weapons and there is no nuclear program in operation are no different than the confirmation by the United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq that Saddam had no weapons of mass destruction. Confirmation of the absence of weapons actually led to the United States' final decision to launch a war of aggression on Iraq. This time around, the United States is in for a big trouble. It is attacking Iran, not for the reason that it has, or it is planning to have nuclear weapons, but only because it has assumed that Iran is years away from producing nuclear weapons. Many analysts believe that an attack on Iran will turn into a World War because the Iranian government has a long-range strategy for "asymmetrical" warfare that will disrupt the flow of oil and challenge American interests around the world. Certainly, if one is facing an implacable enemy that is committed to "regime change" there is no reason to hold back on doing what is necessary to defeat that adversary. However, the main reason for escalation of the conflict will be exactly the assumption on the part of the United States, Israel and Britain that Iran cannot respond with nuclear weapons. At a time when nuclear material—including red mercury and different forms of Uranium—were flowing in the streets of Pakistan, a high ranking Pakistani official, working in the Iranian consulate, told this writer that Iran is obtaining smuggled nuclear material from its field commanders in Afghanistan. It was well before the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan took place. Keeping this fact in mind, it is simply naïve to assume that the United States or Israel will launch an un-provoked war of aggression on Iran, and Iran will remain a sitting duck and not retaliate with what it must have refined and retooled since mid-nineties.[3] Even if we assume that the Iranian government purchased nuclear material without any intention of putting it to use, it is highly unlikely that it will still let this material gather dust while it is being openly and seriously threatened by the United States and Israel. If scientists in Germany and the United States could work to develop nuclear weapons from scratch during the World War II, how long will it take a nation pushed against the wall and with all the ingredients available to put something workable together and retaliate with a bang? So, the practical chances of Iran’s retaliation with a nuclear weapon in the face of a war of aggression imposed on it are far more than the theoretical assumptions that Iranian Intelligence will plan covert operations which will be carried out in the event of an unprovoked attack on their facilities. It is true that a nuclear response from Iran would mean a definite suicide when looked in perspective of the nuclear power of the United States and Iran. But it also doesn’t make any sense that the United States would keep bombing Iran, the way it has planned, into the Stone Age, yet despite being able to respond, Iran will simply turn the other cheek. This chain of inevitable reactions will in fact lead a wider conflagration that the warlords in Washington and Tel Aviv have not even imagined. Emboldened by their adventures in Afghanistan and Iraq, and deluded by the IAEA conclusion that Iraq has no nuclear weapons, the warlords are set to go into a war that will definitely lead to massive bloodshed in the Middle East and the downfall of the United States as we see it. Despite Bush and company’s claims that the world is not the same after 9/11, the world remained more or less the same after 9/11. However, their world will surely turn upside down with their miscalculation of going into a third war of aggression in five years. The Russian and Chinese stakes in this issue cannot be ignored altogether. Attacking Iran would prove too much for Russia and China. Russia has snubbed Washington by announcing it would go ahead and honor a $700 million contract to arm Iran with surface-to-air missiles, slated to guard Iran's nuclear facilities. And after being burned when the US-led Coalition Provisional Authority invalidated Hussein-era oil deals, China has snapped up strategic energy contracts across the world, including in Latin America, Canada and Iran. It can be assumed that both China and Russia will not sit idly by and watch Iran being annihilated by the United States. If Iran is attacked with lethal force, it will retaliate with the utmost force available at its disposal; that much is certain. Remembering my discussion 9 year ago with a well informed source who was working for the Iranian government, I am pretty sure that the utmost force in the hands of Iran definitely includes nuclear weapons. One of the signs for that is the confidence with which the Iranian government responds to US threats. Iranian leaders have acted responsibly and reasonably so far. It is always the mistake of extremists to misjudge the behavior of reasonable men. The Iranians tried to avoid purchasing nuclear material from the Pakistani black market to avoid arousing unnecessary suspicion. They kept their nuclear program limited to energy production. It is the United States and its allies which are provoking it into reaction. As a result, it has been a mistake of reasonable men in Iran to mistake the behavior of extremists in Washington and not getting out of NPT or testing a few nuclear devices to balance its power against its enemies. Many analysts are predicting that attack on Iran will be provoked because a majority of Americans are not in favor of a new war. Although setting up a pre-text for domestic support cannot be ruled out, one can say with certainty from the track record of Bush and company that they will hardly bother to engineer another terrorist attack.[4] In the fits of madness, they have already made themselves believe that they have enough justification to wage a war or aggression on Iran. The Washington Times has already started beating war drums and promoting "policy experts" who believe the US must go alone if needed (Feb 6, 2006).[5] Irrespective of any pretext and going alone or in a coalition of barbarians, the signs tell us that the warlords are not going to relinquish their totalitarian dreams. It is very unfortunate on their part that they are putting their hands in hornet nest where they may get stung with nuclear weapons. Their retaliation, for sure, will lead to total disaster. A disaster, far worse than what the title "World War 3" can convey.

#### US/China war causes extinction.

**Straits Times -2K** (Straits Times, June, 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan] (PDNSS2115)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO -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 possibilityof 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 civilization. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Annaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

#### US-Russia nuclear war causes extinction

The **American Prospect**, 2/26/**01**

The bitter disputes over national missile defense (NMD) have obscured a related but dramatically more urgent issue of national security: the 4,800 nuclear warheads -- weapons with a combined destructive power nearly 100,000 times greater than the atomic bomb that leveled Hiroshima -- currently on "hair-trigger" alert. Hair-trigger alert means this: The missiles carrying those warheads are armed and fueled at all times. Two thousand or so of these warheads are on the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) targeted by Russia at the United States; 1,800 are on the ICBMs targeted by the United States at Russia; and approximately 1,000 are on the submarine-based missiles targeted by the two nations at each other. These missiles would launch on receipt of three computer-delivered messages. Launch crews -- on duty every second of every day -- are under orders to send the messages on receipt of a single computer-delivered command. In no more than two minutes, if all went according to plan, Russia or the United States could launch missiles at predetermined targets: Washington or New York; Moscow or St. Petersburg. The early-warning systems on which the launch crews rely would detect the other side's missiles within tens of seconds, causing the intended -- or accidental -- enemy to mount retaliatory strikes. "Within a half-hour, there could be a nuclear war that would extinguish all of us," explains Bruce Blair. "It would be, basically, a nuclear war by checklist, by rote."

**Unchecked terrorism will result in extinction**

Yonah **Alexander**, professor and director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies in Israel and the United States. “Terrorism myths and realities,” The Washington Times, August 28, **2003**

Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns. Two myths in particular must be debunked immediately if an effective counterterrorism "best practices" strategy can be developed [e.g., strengthening international cooperation]. The first illusion is that terrorism can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated completely, provided the root causes of conflicts - political, social and economic - are addressed. The conventional illusion is that terrorism must be justified by oppressed people seeking to achieve their goals and consequently the argument advanced by "freedom fighters" anywhere, "give me liberty and I will give you death," should be tolerated if not glorified. This traditional rationalization of "sacred" violence often conceals that the real purpose of terrorist groups is to gain political power through the barrel of the gun, in violation of fundamental human rights of the noncombatant segment of societies. For instance, Palestinians religious movements [e.g., Hamas, Islamic Jihad] and secular entities [such as Fatah's Tanzim and Aqsa Martyr Brigades]] wish not only to resolve national grievances [such as Jewish settlements, right of return, Jerusalem] but primarily to destroy the Jewish state. Similarly, Osama bin Laden's international network not only opposes the presence of American military in the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq, but its stated objective is to "unite all Muslims and establish a government that follows the rule of the Caliphs." The second myth is that strong action against terrorist infrastructure [leaders, recruitment, funding, propaganda, training, weapons, operational command and control] will only increase terrorism. The argument here is that law-enforcement efforts and military retaliation inevitably will fuel more brutal acts of violent revenge. Clearly, if this perception continues to prevail, particularly in democratic societies, there is the danger it will paralyze governments and thereby encourage further terrorist attacks. In sum, past experience provides useful lessons for a realistic future strategy. The prudent application of force has been demonstrated to be an effective tool for short- and long-term deterrence of terrorism. For example, Israel's targeted killing of Mohammed Sider, the Hebron commander of the Islamic Jihad, defused a "ticking bomb." The assassination of Ismail Abu Shanab - a top Hamas leader in the Gaza Strip who was directly responsible for several suicide bombings including the latest bus attack in Jerusalem - disrupted potential terrorist operations. Similarly, the U.S. military operation in Iraq eliminated Saddam Hussein's regime as a state sponsor of terror. Thus, it behooves those countries victimized by terrorism to understand a cardinal message communicated by Winston Churchill to the House of Commons on May 13, 1940: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory however long and hard the road may be: For without victory, there is no survival."

### On Balance

#### on balance strikes worse – their ev is based on flawed best case analysis, ignores alternatives and exaggerates the threat

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

In "Time to Attack Iran" (January/February 2012), Matthew Kroenig takes a page out of the decade-old playbook used by advocates of the Iraq war. He portrays the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran as both grave and imminent, arguing that the United States has little choice but to attack Iran now before it is too late. Then, after offering the caveat that "attacking Iran is hardly an attractive prospect," he goes on to portray military action as preferable to other available alternatives and concludes that the United States can manage all the associated risks. Preventive war, according to Kroenig, is "the least bad option." But the lesson of Iraq, the last preventive war launched by the United States, is that Washington should not choose war when there are still other options, and it should not base its decision to attack on best-case analyses of how it hopes the conflict will turn out. A realistic assessment of Iran's nuclear progress and how a conflict would likely unfold leads one to a conclusion that is the opposite of Kroenig's: now is not the time to attack Iran.

### Turns Afghanistan

#### Strikes distract US – causes Afghan theater to flare-up

**Riedel,** Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, **2007**

(Bruce, Speech for the University of Maine School of Policy and International Affairs <http://www.brookings.edu/views/speeches/riedel20070723.htm> gjm)

First, we should recognize clearly how awful the military option is and what a catastrophe war would be for America, for Iran and for the region as a whole. To imagine war with Iran use as your template not the Israeli air strike on Osirak in 1981 but the war last year between Israel and Hizballah in Lebanon with hundreds of clashes, dozens of air strikes and extended salvoes of missiles and rockets – close to 4000 in the end—into Israel's cities, especially Haifa. Only **a war with Iran would not be fought in the relatively small space of the Galilee,** it **would be fought across the whole of the Middle East** from Lebanon to the Khyber Pass. Iran would have every incentive to strike American targets across the region with missiles, terrorists and insurgents.    An early casuality would be the Maliki government in Iraq which could not afford to choose between its two most important sponsors. The Shia street in Iraq would go with Iran as would the Shia warlords Iran has supported there for years. Once again the Kurds would be in a hard place torn between America and Iran. Whether the Karzai government in Kabul could survive is also open to question. So the US would find the twin insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan burning more intensely while it struggled to destroy targets deep inside Iran and Iran retaliated with terror on a global scale. And once the fireworks begin to settle down, what then? Do we try to occupy Iran? With what army? This is not an option that serious policy makers should spend much time considering. When we looked at it in the Clinton administration – long before the Iraq war—it was wisely rejected.

#### Strikes crank Afghanistan policy

Paul Kelly 7/2/08 (Editor, The Australian, “All must lean on Iran”)

There is, however, no denying that the US and Iran are on a collision trajectory. Former US diplomat Nicholas Burns, who was number three at the State Department under Bush, told The Australian: ``I think for President Bush and for the next president, Iran is the most serious foreign policy challenge because the consequences of an altercation with Iran are incalculable for our interests and for the fate of the larger Middle East. We have been right to keep the military option on the table but I do not believe there is an inevitability about war with Iran.'' The arguments against hostilities by either the US or Israel are far greater than recognised. First, **any strike will prejudice the pivotal US strategic goals in Iraq and Afghanistan. It would expose 150,000 US forces in Iraq to Iranian retaliation. It would threaten progress in Iraq and vastly complicate US force withdrawal. It would trigger Iranian terrorist activity across the region and provoke Shi'ite militia group Hezbollah into strikes.** It would represent a complete refusal to absorb the lesson from the 2003 invasion of Iraq: that resort to massive military action unleashes forces beyond the control of the US. Second, **the global economic consequences would be grave. Iranian retaliation would see the world oil price skyrocket from its present high level.** Commander-in-chief of Iran's revolutionary guards, Mohammad Ali Jafari, has warned that Iran ``will definitely act to impose controls on the Persian Gulf and Strait of Hormuz''. This will take inflation and recession threats to new peaks in the industrialised world. **The resentment towards Bush would be even greater.** Third, **the Bush administration would implode politically**. There is little grasp in Australia of the dramatic power shifts within the administration with Vice-President Dick Cheney's influence on the wane and the diplomatic option in the ascendancy under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defence Secretary Robert Gates.

#### ( ) Strikes make Afghanistan a mess

**Daily Times,** Monday, January 24, 200**5**

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=story_24-1-2005_pg4_21> [gjm]

WASHINGTON: With the bulk of its ground forces tied down in Iraq, the United States has compelling reasons to avoid military action against neighbouring Iran even while stepping up pressure to halt its nuclear programme, analysts said.  “There are no good military options,” James Carafano, a military expert with the conservative Heritage Foundation, said Friday. The United States could launch pinpoint strikes on targets in Iran from US warships or from the air. But short of an imminent threat from nuclear-armed Iranian missiles, any gain would likely be outweighed by the trouble Iran could cause US forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, he said.  Anthony Cordesman, an expert on Iran at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, said Iran “would see any pre-emptive attack as encirclement.” “It would probably react hard to whatever happened, and that would make it more destabilising than stabilising,” he said in an interview.

### Turns China

#### Iran strikes crushes US-Sino ties, and suck China into global conflict

**RNVA ‘9**

The Romanian National Vanguard News Agency is an independent international new agency – in this instance they are reporting Russian and Chinese reactions to an Israeli strikes – “Russia and China Warn US That Israeli Attack On Iran Means World War” – July 19th – 2009 – http://news.ronatvan.com/2009/07/19/russia-and-china-warn-us-that-israeli-attack-on-iran-means-world-war/

**A chilling report circulating in the Kremlin** today **states that** President **Medvedev and Chinese President Hu** **have issued an “urgent warning” to the United States that says if the Americans allow an Israeli nuclear attack upon Iran, “World War will be our response”.**  Fueling Russian and Chinese fears are intelligence reports stating that Israel has moved over three-quarters of its Naval Forces through the Suez Canal and has assembled over 30 of its US-built fighter jets inc for a planned attack using American made “bunker busting” bombs and nuclear armed cruise missiles. Russian Military Analysts state in these reports that Israel first plans to use its US-built fighter jets to target Iran’s nuclear facilities, and upon a combined Iranian and Lebanonese Hezbollah “response”, that is said will “rain missiles down upon Israel”, Israeli submarines and surface vessels with unleash nuclear armed cruise missiles against Iran’s military, religious and political infrastructure. Israeli news sources are also confirming Russian and Chinese fears over an attack by their country upon Iran, and as we can read as reported the Haaretz News Service: “Israel’s recent deployment of warships across the Red Sea should be seen as serious preparation for an attack on Iran, an Israeli defense official told the Times of London on Thursday. “This is preparation that should be taken seriously. Israel is investing time in preparing itself for the complexity of an attack on Iran. These maneuvers are a message to Iran that Israel will follow up on its threats,” the official was quoted as saying.” President Bush had become so alarmed over Israel’s plan to attack Iran that in an unprecedented move, just prior to leaving office, he refused the Israelis “secret request” for 1,000 of the American bunker busting bombs they wanted, but, Israel had obtained 100 of these dreaded weapons in a 2005 deal with the Pentagon. Upon Obama assuming the US Presidency, Israel’s Prime Minister gave the American leader a stark warning that “Either you take care of Iran-quickly-or I will”, a challenge that Obama, while in Russia last week, slapped down by warning that the United States is “absolutely not” giving Israel a green light to attack Iran, a curious statement, however, when viewed in the light of the American Vice President Biden stating just days before that “Israel is free to do whatever it deems necessary to remove the Iranian nuclear threat”. Fueling Russian and Chinese fears over Israel’s planned attack on Iran, these reports continue, is the Jewish states planned use of Iraqi territory from their Kurdistan region which borders Iran, and which this past week furthered its goal to become an independent Nation with the adopting of a new constitution, and with its Israeli trained army can expect an “immediate” invasion from both its sworn enemies Turkey and Iran. Even worse, Syria’s leader has reportedly warned the US that upon Turkey and Iran declaring war upon Kurdistan and Israel it would “no choice” but to honor its defense agreements with the Iranians calling for their Nations to protect each other in times of peril. Further complicating this mess is Turkey’s membership in NATO, and which under that alliances agreement calls for the United States and Europe to join with the Turkish military in fighting against what in essence would be their own allies of Israel and Kurdistan. Not being known to the American people is that while their Military Forces have been fighting in Iraq, the United States and Iran have longstanding agreements allowing the Iranians to shell Iraqi Kurd territory without fear of reprisal, an agreement that also includes Turkey who have battled against the Iraqi Kurds for decades. Most ominously in these reports though, both **Russia and China state that they will have “no choice” but to place an “immediate embargo” against any oil and gas coming from the Middle East and weapons to the region the United States may try to supply.** **China further states in this warning that upon an Israeli attack upon Iran they will “immediately cease” to purchase any more US debt,** and with the American deficit hitting $1 Trillion for the first time in their history, and with it expecting to exceed $2 Trillion by the end of the fiscal year on September 30th, a particually grave threat being that **China’s** $2 Trillion in re**serves are the only thing keeping the US economy afloat.** Russian Intelligence Analysts further report that the long-serving head of Iran’s Atomic Energy Organization, Gholam Reza Aghazadeh, resigned today over fears for his and his family’s safety upon an attack by Israel upon the Persian Nation. What is not known at this time, these reports summarize, is if Israel’s Iron Dome missile defense system, which the Israelis report has been “successfully tested”, would be able to withstand the estimated 6,000 plus missiles expected to be fired at it by the combined powers of Iran, Syria and Hezbollah. But, to Israeli war leaders believing that upon the conventional destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities, the Persian Nation will “sue for peace” rather than be hit by nuclear weapons, these reports state, unequivocally, **that Iranian leaders are “fully prepared” to engulf the entire World in “brutal fire”** rather than to ever “kneel down” before the “Zionists” they have long stated have no right being in the Middle East in the first place.

### Turns Econ

#### massive oil shock and global economic collapse regardless of Iranian response – countermeasures cant check

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Some analysts, including Afshin Molavi and Michael Singh, believe that the Iranians are unlikely to attempt to close the strait due to the damage it would inflict on their own economy. But Tehran's saber rattling has already intensified in response to the prospect of Western sanctions on its oil industry. In the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike on Iran's nuclear program, Iranian leaders might perceive that holding the strait at risk would encourage international pressure on Washington to end the fighting, possibly deterring U.S. escalation. In reality, it would more likely have the opposite effect, encouraging aggressive U.S. efforts to protect commercial shipping. The U.S. Navy is capable of keeping the strait open, but the mere threat of closure could send oil prices soaring, dealing a heavy blow to the fragile global economy. The measures that Kroenig advocates to mitigate this threat, such as opening up the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve and urging Saudi Arabia to boost oil production, would be unlikely to suffice, especially since most Saudi crude passes through the strait. Ultimately, if the United States and Iran go to war, there is no doubt that Washington will win in the narrow operational sense. Indeed, with the impressive array of U.S. naval and air forces already deployed in the Gulf, the United States could probably knock Iran's military capabilities back 20 years in a matter of weeks. But a U.S.-Iranian conflict would not be the clinical, tightly controlled, limited encounter that Kroenig predicts.

#### ( ) Strikes crush global econ

**Hedges ‘6**

(Chris Hedges is former Middle East bureau chief for The New York Times and author of the bestseller “War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning” -- “Bush’s Nuclear Apocalypse” – October 9th – available via TruthDig -- http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?p=300562&sid=c296082a93092430f9a238f8a00a928b)

**An attack on Iran will ignite the Middle East.** **The loss of Iranian oil, coupled with** Silkworm **missile attacks by Iran on oil tankers in the Persian Gulf, could send oil soaring** to well over $110 a barrel. **The effect on the domestic and world economy will be devastating, very possibly triggering a huge, global depression.** The 2 million Shiites in Saudi Arabia, the Shiite majority in Iraq and the Shiite communities in Bahrain, Pakistan and Turkey will turn in rage on us and our dwindling allies. We will see a combination of increased terrorist attacks, including on American soil, and the widespread sabotage of oil production in the Gulf. Iraq, as bad as it looks now, will become a death pit for American troops as Shiites and Sunnis, for the first time, unite against their foreign occupiers.

#### ( ) Strikes melt-down US economy – China stops debt servicing

**RNVA ‘9**

The Romanian National Vanguard News Agency is an independent international new agency – in this instance they are reporting Russian and Chinese reactions to an Israeli strikes – “Russia and China Warn US That Israeli Attack On Iran Means World War” – July 19th – 2009 – http://news.ronatvan.com/2009/07/19/russia-and-china-warn-us-that-israeli-attack-on-iran-means-world-war/

Most ominously in these reports though, both Russia and China state that they will have “no choice” but to place an “immediate embargo” against any oil and gas coming from the Middle East and weapons to the region the United States may try to supply. **China further states** in this warning **that upon an Israeli attack upon Iran they will “immediately cease” to purchase any more US debt**, **and with the American deficit hitting $1 Trillion for the first time in their history, and with it expecting to exceed $2 Trillion by the end of the fiscal year** on September 30th, a particually grave threat being that **China’s $2 Trillion in reserves are the only thing keeping the US economy afloat**.

#### And, strikes make econ decline inevitable:

**Haass,** President of the Council on Foreign Relations, 200**5**

(Richard N., *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, gjm)

Using preventive strikes to destroy Iran's developing weapons program would also be much easier said than done, given the imperfect nature of the intelligence on Iran's program and the operational challenges of attacking its dispersed and buried nuclear facilities. U.S. strikes might succeed in destroying part of Iran's weapons program and set it back by months or even years. But even if this were to occur, Iran would surely reconstitute its program in a manner that would make future strikes even more difficult. Moreover, Iran has the ability to retaliate by unleashing terrorism (using Hamas and Hezbollah) against Israel and the United States or by promoting instability in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Saudi Arabia. A U.S. strike on Iran would also further anger the Arab and Muslim worlds, where many already resent the double standard of U.S. and international acceptance of Israel's and India's nuclear weapons programs. Much of the Iranian population, currently alienated from the regime, would likely rally around it in the case of a foreign attack, making external efforts to bring about regime change that much more unlikely to succeed. Attacking Iran would also lead to sharp and possibly prolonged increases in the price of oil, which could trigger a global economic crisis./// Nor would the United States avoid these costs if Israel carried out the strike (a scenario suggested by Vice President Dick Cheney in January 2005), since Israel would be widely viewed as doing the United States' bidding.

#### ( ) Strikes kill econ – oil and transportation sector

**Samore,** Vice President, Director of Studies, Maurice R. Greenberg Chair, Council on Foreign Relations, **2007**

(Gary, Iran: Prospect for War, March 23, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/12935/iran.html> [gjm])

Second, against this uncertain value of air strikes, Iran is likely to retaliate in some way, which would threaten U.S.interests and allies in the region and possibly escalate into a broader conflict.  Most experts think that Iran’s retaliation would be measured and indirect, such as encouraging attacks by Shia militias against U.S. forces in Iraq or Hezbollah attacks against Israel, rather than launching missiles at Israel or attacking shipping in the Persian Gulf, which would invite certain escalation.  Nonetheless, even indirect retaliation could get out of hand – another round in southern Lebanon or direct clashes between U.S. and Iranian forces along the border with Iraq and in the Gulf.  In the worst case, oil supplies and transportation could be disrupted, with significant economic repercussions.

#### ( ) Strikes kill econ – no restraint

**Fallows,** National Correspondent for the Atlantic, 200**4**

(James, The Atlantic December, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200412/fallows> [gjm])

But for the purposes most likely to interest the next American President—that is, as a tool to slow or stop Iran's progress toward nuclear weaponry—the available military options are likely to fail in the long term. A full-scale "regime change" operation has both obvious and hidden risks. The obvious ones are that the United States lacks enough [hu]manpower and equipment to take on Iran while still tied down in Iraq, and that domestic and international objections would be enormous. The most important hidden problem, exposed in the war-game discussions, was that a full assault would require such drawn-out preparations that the Iranian government would know months in advance what was coming. Its leaders would have every incentive to strike pre-emptively in their own defense. Unlike Saddam Hussein's Iraq, a threatened Iran would have many ways to harm America and its interests. Apart from cross-border disruptions in Iraq, it might form an outright alliance with al-Qaeda to support major new attacks within the United States. It could work with other oil producers to punish America economically. It could, as Hammes warned, apply the logic of "asymmetric," or "fourth-generation," warfare, in which a superficially weak adversary avoids a direct challenge to U.S. military power and instead strikes the most vulnerable points in American civilian society, as al-Qaeda did on 9/11. If it thought that the U.S. goal was to install a wholly new regime rather than to change the current regime's behavior, it would have no incentive for restraint.**\*edited for gendered language\***

### Turns Heg

#### ( ) Iran strikes absolutely crank hegemony

Stephen **Lendman** is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization and frequently writes for Global Research Reports –Global Research, March 7, **2007** – cross-posted at: http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/talk/blogs/911review.

**Attacking Iran will just make things far worse. It would be a fanatical "hail Mary" act of insanity that by one definition is repeating the same mistakes, expecting different results. It has no more chance of success than our misadventures in Iraq and Afghanistan. And if nuclear weapons are used, including so-called low-yield ones, it will be an appalling crime against humanity and catastrophic event potentially affecting millions in the region by radiation poisoning alone. If it happens, it will irreversibly weaken US influence and credibility everywhere accelerating our decline even faster toward second-class status and loss of world leadership already hanging by a thread. It could also be a potentially lethal blow to the benefits of "Western civilization" always arriving through the barrel of a gun and thuggish heel of a colonizer's boot with the US having the biggest barrels and largest shoe sizes.**

### Turns Iraq

#### ( ) Strikes in Iran jack Iraq stability and successful withdrawal

Paul Kelly 7/2/08 (Editor, The Australian, “All must lean on Iran”)

There is, however, no denying that the US and Iran are on a collision trajectory. Former US diplomat Nicholas Burns, who was number three at the State Department under Bush, told The Australian: ``I think for President Bush and for the next president, Iran is the most serious foreign policy challenge because the consequences of an altercation with Iran are incalculable for our interests and for the fate of the larger Middle East. We have been right to keep the military option on the table but I do not believe there is an inevitability about war with Iran.'' The arguments against hostilities by either the US or Israel are far greater than recognised. First, **any strike will prejudice the pivotal US strategic goals in Iraq and Afghanistan. It would expose 150,000 US forces in Iraq to Iranian retaliation. It would threaten progress in Iraq and vastly complicate US force withdrawal. It would trigger Iranian terrorist activity across the region and provoke Shi'ite militia group Hezbollah into strikes.** It would represent a complete refusal to absorb the lesson from the 2003 invasion of Iraq: that resort to massive military action unleashes forces beyond the control of the US. Second, **the global economic consequences would be grave. Iranian retaliation would see the world oil price skyrocket from its present high level.** Commander-in-chief of Iran's revolutionary guards, Mohammad Ali Jafari, has warned that Iran ``will definitely act to impose controls on the Persian Gulf and Strait of Hormuz''. This will take inflation and recession threats to new peaks in the industrialised world. **The resentment towards Bush would be even greater.** Third, **the Bush administration would implode politically**. There is little grasp in Australia of the dramatic power shifts within the administration with Vice-President Dick Cheney's influence on the wane and the diplomatic option in the ascendancy under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defence Secretary Robert Gates

#### ( ) Strikes distract US – causes Iraq theater to flare-up

**Riedel,** Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, **2007**

(Bruce, Speech for the University of Maine School of Policy and International Affairs <http://www.brookings.edu/views/speeches/riedel20070723.htm> gjm)

First, we should recognize clearly how awful the military option is and what a catastrophe war would be for America, for Iran and for the region as a whole. To imagine war with Iran use as your template not the Israeli air strike on Osirak in 1981 but the war last year between Israel and Hizballah in Lebanon with hundreds of clashes, dozens of air strikes and extended salvoes of missiles and rockets – close to 4000 in the end—into Israel's cities, especially Haifa. Only **a war with Iran would not be fought in the relatively small space of the Galilee,** it **would be fought across the whole of the Middle East** from Lebanon to the Khyber Pass. Iran would have every incentive to strike American targets across the region with missiles, terrorists and insurgents.    **An early casuality would be the Maliki government in Iraq which could not afford to choose between its two most important sponsors.** The Shia street in Iraq would go with Iran as would the Shia warlords Iran has supported there for years. Once again the Kurds would be in a hard place torn between America and Iran. Whether the Karzai government in Kabul could survive is also open to question. So the US would find the twin insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan burning more intensely while it struggled to destroy targets deep inside Iran and Iran retaliated with terror on a global scale. And once the fireworks begin to settle down, what then? Do we try to occupy Iran? With what army? This is not an option that serious policy makers should spend much time considering. When we looked at it in the Clinton administration – long before the Iraq war—it was wisely rejected.

#### ( ) Even limited attacks on Iran spur instability in Iraq

**Daily Times,** Monday, January 24, **2005**

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=story_24-1-2005_pg4_21> [gjm]

Even a limited US attack on Iran, which shares a 1,450-kilometer open border with Iraq, would invite Tehran to use its influence among Iraq’s Shiites to sabotage the separate peace US forces have enjoyed in southern Iraq. The same is true in Afghanistan, which has a 900-kilometer border with Iran.   “When you’re trying to stabilise Iraq and you’ve got this long border between Iran and Iraq, and you’re trying to keep the Iranians from interfering in Iraq so you can get the Iraq government up and running, you shouldn’t be picking a war with the Iranians,” said Carafano.

#### ( ) Strikes make Iraq instability inevitable

**I**nternational **C**risis **G**roup Middle East Report February 23, 200**6**

<http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=3976&l=1> gjm

Should it be attacked, Iran possesses a wide range of potentially lethal responses, most obviously in Iraq, where, through its abundance of allies, it could further destabilise the situation and target U.S. forces, **particularly by mobilising some members of the Shiite constituency.** Terrorist attacks orchestrated by Iran could wreak havoc throughout the Middle East, and extend to the West itslf. In discussions with European officials, Iran has said it could be “helfpful” on a wide variety of Middle Eastern issues if an understanding on the nuclear issue were reached, but the inference is clear that the opposite could also be true. There are other consequential risks. A military strike could send the price of oil skyrocketing, particularly if, as threatened, Iran attempted to close the Strait of Hormuz, the world’s principal passageway for oil exports. It also likely would provoke a considerable domestic backlash, with even opponents closing ranks behind the regime, at least in the short-run.

#### ( ) Strikes make Iraq a mess

**Daily Times,** Monday, January 24, 200**5**

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=story_24-1-2005_pg4_21> [gjm]

WASHINGTON: With the bulk of its ground forces tied down in Iraq, the United States has compelling reasons to avoid military action against neighbouring Iran even while stepping up pressure to halt its nuclear programme, analysts said.  “There are no good military options,” James Carafano, a military expert with the conservative Heritage Foundation, said Friday.The United States could launch pinpoint strikes on targets in Iran from US warships or from the air. But short of an imminent threat from nuclear-armed Iranian missiles, any gain would likely be outweighed by the trouble Iran could cause US forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, he said.  Anthony Cordesman, an expert on Iran at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, said Iran “would see any pre-emptive attack as encirclement.” “It would probably react hard to whatever happened, and that would make it more destabilising than stabilising,” he said in an interview.

### Middle East War/Regional Escalation

#### Multiple factors cause regional escalation

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

SPILLOVER Keeping other states in the region out of the fight would also prove more difficult than Kroenig suggests. Iran would presume Israeli complicity in a U.S. raid and would seek to drag Israel into the conflict in order to undermine potential support for the U.S. war effort among key Arab regimes. And although it is true, as Kroenig notes, that Israel remained on the sidelines during the 1990-91 Gulf War, the threat posed by Iran's missiles and proxies today is considerably greater than that posed by Iraq two decades ago. If Iranian-allied Hezbollah responded to the fighting by firing rockets at Israeli cities, Israel could launch an all-out war against Lebanon. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad might also try to use the moment to divert attention from the uprising in his country, launching his own assault on the Jewish state. Either scenario, or their combination, could lead to a wider war in the Levant. Even in the Gulf, where U.S. partners are sometimes portrayed as passive, Iranian retaliation might draw Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates into the conflict. The Saudis have taken a much more confrontational posture toward Iran in the past year, and Riyadh is unlikely to tolerate Iranian attacks against critical energy infrastructure. For its part, the UAE, the most hawkish state in the Gulf, might respond to missiles raining down on U.S. forces at its Al Dhafra Air Base by attempting to seize Abu Musa, Greater Tunb, and Lesser Tunb, three disputed Gulf islands currently occupied by Iran.

#### Destabilizes region, causes terrorism and collapses US influence – even if most arab leaders support it

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

 A strike could also set off wider destabilizing effects. Although Kroenig is right that some Arab leaders would privately applaud a U.S. strike, many on the Arab street would reject it. Both Islamist extremists and embattled elites could use this opportunity to transform the Arab Spring's populist antiregime narrative into a decidedly anti-American one. This would rebound to Iran's advantage just at the moment when political developments in the region, chief among them the resurgence of nationalism in the Arab world and the upheaval in Syria, are significantly undermining Iran's influence. A U.S. strike could easily shift regional sympathies back in Tehran's favor by allowing Iran to play the victim and, through its retaliation, resuscitate its status as the champion of the region's anti-Western resistance.

#### Iran strikes would escalate into a broader Middle East conflagration

Michel **Chossudovsky**, Center for Research on Globalization, 1/16/**07** “Editorial Note – Iran: Pieces in Place for Escalation” <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=4483> [Mills]

The following text by Colonel Sam Gardiner (USAF, Retired) confirms our worst fears. The US is in an advanced state of readiness to wage war on Iran. To reverse the tide requires a massive campaign of networking and outreach to inform people across the land, nationally and internationally, in neighborhoods, workplaces, parishes, schools, universities, municipalities, on the dangers of a US sponsored war, which contemplates the use of nuclear weapons. The message should be loud and clear:  It is not Iran which is a threat to global security but the United States of America and Israel.  Even without the use of nukes, the proposed aerial bombardments could result in escalation, ultimately leading us into a broader war in the Middle East.   Debate and discussion must also take place within the Military and Intelligence community, particularly with regard to the use of tactical nuclear weapons, within the corridors of the US Congress, in municipalities and at all levels of government. Ultimately, the legitimacy of the political and military actors in high office must be challenged. The corporate media also bears a heavy responsibility for the cover-up of US sponsored war crimes. It must also be forcefully challenged for its biased coverage of the Middle East war.  What is needed is to break the conspiracy of silence, expose the media lies and distortions, confront the criminal nature of the US Administration and of those governments which support it, its war agenda as well as its so-called "Homeland Security agenda" which has already defined the contours of a police State. The World is at the crossroads of the most serious crisis in modern history. The US has embarked on a military adventure, "a long war", which threatens the future of humanity.  It is essential to bring the US war project to the forefront of political debate, particularly in North America and Western Europe. Political and military leaders who are opposed to the war must take a firm stance, from within their respective institutions. Citizens must take a stance individually and collectively against war.

### Turns Oil Shocks

#### ( ) Strikes cause oil prices to spike

Paul **Kelly 7/2**/08(Editor, The Australian, “All must lean on Iran”)

There is, however, no denying that the US and Iran are on a collision trajectory. Former US diplomat Nicholas Burns, who was number three at the State Department under Bush, told The Australian: ``I think for President Bush and for the next president, Iran is the most serious foreign policy challenge because the consequences of an altercation with Iran are incalculable for our interests and for the fate of the larger Middle East. We have been right to keep the military option on the table but I do not believe there is an inevitability about war with Iran.'' The arguments against hostilities by either the US or Israel are far greater than recognised. First, **any strike will prejudice the pivotal US strategic goals in Iraq and Afghanistan. It would expose 150,000 US forces in Iraq to Iranian retaliation. It would threaten progress in Iraq and vastly complicate US force withdrawal. It would trigger Iranian terrorist activity across the region and provoke Shi'ite militia group Hezbollah into strikes.** It would represent a complete refusal to absorb the lesson from the 2003 invasion of Iraq: that resort to massive military action unleashes forces beyond the control of the US. Second, **the global economic consequences would be grave. Iranian retaliation would see the world oil price skyrocket from its present high level.** Commander-in-chief of Iran's revolutionary guards, Mohammad Ali Jafari, has warned that Iran ``will definitely act to impose controls on the Persian Gulf and Strait of Hormuz''. This will take inflation and recession threats to new peaks in the industrialised world. **The resentment towards Bush would be even greater.** Third, **the Bush administration would implode politically**. There is little grasp in Australia of the dramatic power shifts within the administration with Vice-President Dick Cheney's influence on the wane and the diplomatic option in the ascendancy under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defence Secretary Robert Gates.

### Turns Peace Process

#### Strikes kills peace process

**Samore,** Vice President, Director of Studies, Maurice R. Greenberg Chair, Council on Foreign Relations, **2007**

(Gary, Iran: Prospect for War, March 23, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/12935/iran.html> [gjm])

Finally, an attack on Iran would provoke a strong political reaction, both in the region and internationally.  In the Arab street, Washington’s efforts to pull together a Sunni axis to counter Iranian influence in the region and restart the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians could be fatally wounded.  More broadly, U.S. efforts - along with the Europeans - to build a P-5 consensus in the Security Council against Iran’s nuclear program would be shattered, unless Irantook some action that would be seen as justifying a military response.  Most likely, the U.S. or Israel would be acting alone, with no public support from any other country.

### Turns Prolif

#### Iran attack makes global prolif inevitable

**Logan,** foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, **2007**

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

In addition, Iran lives in a notoriously rough neighborhood. India and Pakistan possess nuclear weapons, as does Russia, just to the region’s north. Turkey rests under the NATO umbrella, and Israel owns nuclear weapons of its own. In the end, attacking Iran only would underscore further the dilemma faced by states that find themselves on Washington’s hit list. Without nuclear weapons, there is no assurance that the U.S. will not attack--other than supine acquiescence to Washington’s various demands. As Nobel laureate Thomas Schelling explains, the perverse fact is that America’s counterproliferation policy is a prime driver of proliferation.

### Turns Russian Conflict/Instability

#### Iran strikes suck Russia into global conflict

**RNVA ‘9**

The Romanian National Vanguard News Agency is an independent international new agency – in this instance they are reporting Russian and Chinese reactions to an Israeli strikes – “Russia and China Warn US That Israeli Attack On Iran Means World War” – July 19th – 2009 – http://news.ronatvan.com/2009/07/19/russia-and-china-warn-us-that-israeli-attack-on-iran-means-world-war/

**A chilling report circulating in the Kremlin** today **states that** President **Medvedev and** Chinese President Hu **have issued an “urgent warning” to the United States that says if the Americans allow an Israeli nuclear attack upon Iran, “World War will be our response”.**  Fueling Russian and Chinese fears are intelligence reports stating that Israel has moved over three-quarters of its Naval Forces through the Suez Canal and has assembled over 30 of its US-built fighter jets inc for a planned attack using American made “bunker busting” bombs and nuclear armed cruise missiles. Russian Military Analysts state in these reports that Israel first plans to use its US-built fighter jets to target Iran’s nuclear facilities, and upon a combined Iranian and Lebanonese Hezbollah “response”, that is said will “rain missiles down upon Israel”, Israeli submarines and surface vessels with unleash nuclear armed cruise missiles against Iran’s military, religious and political infrastructure. Israeli news sources are also confirming Russian and Chinese fears over an attack by their country upon Iran, and as we can read as reported the Haaretz News Service: “Israel’s recent deployment of warships across the Red Sea should be seen as serious preparation for an attack on Iran, an Israeli defense official told the Times of London on Thursday. “This is preparation that should be taken seriously. Israel is investing time in preparing itself for the complexity of an attack on Iran. These maneuvers are a message to Iran that Israel will follow up on its threats,” the official was quoted as saying.” President Bush had become so alarmed over Israel’s plan to attack Iran that in an unprecedented move, just prior to leaving office, he refused the Israelis “secret request” for 1,000 of the American bunker busting bombs they wanted, but, Israel had obtained 100 of these dreaded weapons in a 2005 deal with the Pentagon. Upon Obama assuming the US Presidency, Israel’s Prime Minister gave the American leader a stark warning that “Either you take care of Iran-quickly-or I will”, a challenge that Obama, while in Russia last week, slapped down by warning that the United States is “absolutely not” giving Israel a green light to attack Iran, a curious statement, however, when viewed in the light of the American Vice President Biden stating just days before that “Israel is free to do whatever it deems necessary to remove the Iranian nuclear threat”. Fueling Russian and Chinese fears over Israel’s planned attack on Iran, these reports continue, is the Jewish states planned use of Iraqi territory from their Kurdistan region which borders Iran, and which this past week furthered its goal to become an independent Nation with the adopting of a new constitution, and with its Israeli trained army can expect an “immediate” invasion from both its sworn enemies Turkey and Iran. Even worse, Syria’s leader has reportedly warned the US that upon Turkey and Iran declaring war upon Kurdistan and Israel it would “no choice” but to honor its defense agreements with the Iranians calling for their Nations to protect each other in times of peril. Further complicating this mess is Turkey’s membership in NATO, and which under that alliances agreement calls for the United States and Europe to join with the Turkish military in fighting against what in essence would be their own allies of Israel and Kurdistan. Not being known to the American people is that while their Military Forces have been fighting in Iraq, the United States and Iran have longstanding agreements allowing the Iranians to shell Iraqi Kurd territory without fear of reprisal, an agreement that also includes Turkey who have battled against the Iraqi Kurds for decades. Most ominously in these reports though, both **Russia and China state that they will have “no choice” but to place an “immediate embargo” against any oil and gas coming from the Middle East and weapons to the region the United States may try to supply.** China further states in this warning that upon an Israeli attack upon Iran they will “immediately cease” to purchase any more US debt, and with the American deficit hitting $1 Trillion for the first time in their history, and with it expecting to exceed $2 Trillion by the end of the fiscal year on September 30th, a particually grave threat being that China’s $2 Trillion in reserves are the only thing keeping the US economy afloat. Russian Intelligence Analysts further report that the long-serving head of Iran’s Atomic Energy Organization, Gholam Reza Aghazadeh, resigned today over fears for his and his family’s safety upon an attack by Israel upon the Persian Nation. What is not known at this time, these reports summarize, is if Israel’s Iron Dome missile defense system, which the Israelis report has been “successfully tested”, would be able to withstand the estimated 6,000 plus missiles expected to be fired at it by the combined powers of Iran, Syria and Hezbollah. But, to Israeli war leaders believing that upon the conventional destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities, the Persian Nation will “sue for peace” rather than be hit by nuclear weapons, these reports state, unequivocally, **that Iranian leaders are “fully prepared” to engulf the entire World in “brutal fire”** rather than to ever “kneel down” before the “Zionists” they have long stated have no right being in the Middle East in the first place.

#### ( ) Russia will take sides and get involved

Pepe **Escobar** is the author of Globalistan: How the Globalized World is Dissolving into Liquid War (Nimble Books, 2007) and Red Zone Blues: a snapshot of Baghdad during the surge. He is the roving correspondent for Asia Times and an analyst for the Real News – Asia Times – 10-26-0**7** – http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/IJ26Ak06.html

A high-level diplomatic source in Tehran tells Asia Times Online that essentially **Putin and the Supreme Leader have agreed on a plan to nullify the** George W Bush administration's **relentless drive towards launching a preemptive attack,** perhaps a tactical nuclear strike, **against Iran.** **An American attack on Iran will be viewed by Moscow as an attack on Russia.**  But then, as if this were not enough of a political bombshell, came the abrupt resignation of Ali Larijani as top Iranian nuclear negotiator. Early this week in Rome, Larijani told the IRNA news agency that "Iran's nuclear policies are stable and will not change with the replacement of the secretary of the Supreme National Security Council [SNSC]." Larijani will keep attending SNSC meetings, now as a representative of the Supreme Leader. He even took time to remind the West that in the Islamic Republic all key decisions regarding the civilian nuclear program are made by the Supreme Leader. Larijani actually went to Rome to meet with the European Union's Javier Solana alongside Iran's new negotiator, Saeed Jalili, a former member of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), just like President Mahmud Ahmadinejad. In itself, the Putin-Khamenei meeting was extraordinary, because the Supreme Leader rarely receives foreign statesmen for closed talks, even one as crucial as Putin. **The Russian president**, according to the diplomatic source, **told the Supreme Leader he may hold the ultimate solution regarding the endlessly controversial Iranian nuclear dossier**. According to IRNA, the Supreme Leader, after stressing that the Iranian civilian nuclear program will continue unabated, said. "We will ponder your words and proposal." Larijani himself had told the Iranian media that Putin had a "special plan" and the Supreme Leader observed that the plan was "ponderable". The problem is that Ahmadinejad publicly denied the Russians had volunteered a new plan. Iranian hawks close to Ahmadinejad are spinning that Putin's proposal involves Iran temporarily suspending uranium enrichment in exchange for no more United Nations sanctions. That's essentially what International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohammad ElBaradei has been working on all along. The key issue is what - in practical terms - will Iran get in return. Obviously it's not the EU's Solana who will have the answer. **But as far as Russia is concerned, strategically nothing will appease it except a political/diplomatic solution for the Iranian nuclear dossier**.

### Turns Russian Relations

#### ( ) Strikes ruin US-Russian ties

Pepe **Escobar** is the author of Globalistan: How the Globalized World is Dissolving into Liquid War (Nimble Books, 2007) and Red Zone Blues: a snapshot of Baghdad during the surge. He is the roving correspondent for Asia Times and an analyst for the Real News – Asia Times – 10-26-0**7** – http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/IJ26Ak06.html

A high-level diplomatic source in Tehran tells Asia Times Online that essentially **Putin and the Supreme Leader have agreed on a plan to nullify the** George W Bush administration's **relentless drive towards launching a preemptive attack,** perhaps a tactical nuclear strike, **against Iran.** **An American attack on Iran will be viewed by Moscow as an attack on Russia.**  But then, as if this were not enough of a political bombshell, came the abrupt resignation of Ali Larijani as top Iranian nuclear negotiator. Early this week in Rome, Larijani told the IRNA news agency that "Iran's nuclear policies are stable and will not change with the replacement of the secretary of the Supreme National Security Council [SNSC]." Larijani will keep attending SNSC meetings, now as a representative of the Supreme Leader. He even took time to remind the West that in the Islamic Republic all key decisions regarding the civilian nuclear program are made by the Supreme Leader. Larijani actually went to Rome to meet with the European Union's Javier Solana alongside Iran's new negotiator, Saeed Jalili, a former member of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), just like President Mahmud Ahmadinejad. In itself, the Putin-Khamenei meeting was extraordinary, because the Supreme Leader rarely receives foreign statesmen for closed talks, even one as crucial as Putin. **The Russian president**, according to the diplomatic source, **told the Supreme Leader he may hold the ultimate solution regarding the endlessly controversial Iranian nuclear dossier**. According to IRNA, the Supreme Leader, after stressing that the Iranian civilian nuclear program will continue unabated, said. "We will ponder your words and proposal." Larijani himself had told the Iranian media that Putin had a "special plan" and the Supreme Leader observed that the plan was "ponderable". The problem is that Ahmadinejad publicly denied the Russians had volunteered a new plan. Iranian hawks close to Ahmadinejad are spinning that Putin's proposal involves Iran temporarily suspending uranium enrichment in exchange for no more United Nations sanctions. That's essentially what International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohammad ElBaradei has been working on all along. The key issue is what - in practical terms - will Iran get in return. Obviously it's not the EU's Solana who will have the answer. **But as far as Russia is concerned, strategically nothing will appease it except a political/diplomatic solution for the Iranian nuclear dossier**.

#### ( ) Strikes ruin US-Russian ties – crosses one of their two redlines

**Simes ‘7**

DIMITRI SIMES, PRESIDENT, THE NIXON CENTER – Federal News Service –December 14, 2007 – lexis

But let me just say that **one of** them who is normally described as one of five **top Russian leaders said that for them there were two red lines with the United States. One was a unilateral U.S. and/or U.S.- Israeli attack on Iran**. And another would be the independence of Kosovo recognized by the United States and the West. **He said if this happened, we would have to decide that some things fundamentally have changed in the Russian relationship with Washington** and Brussels. **He said we are not willing, but we are ready.**

#### Turns Soft Power

#### Iran strikes crank US Soft power

**Logan,** foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, **2007**

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

The next unintended consequence would be the effect Iranian civilian casualties would have on American diplomatic standing and the hatred of the U.S. that it would generate in Islamic countries. While concern for civilian casualties should not be a debate-stopper in terms of policy decisions, any decision to attack Iran should be evaluated in terms of how it would affect the war on terror. Even the vastly more limited attack against Lebanon by Israel in the summer of 2006, which produced, in the low estimate, casualties in the high hundreds, resulted in an extremely detrimental political blowback against Israel. Civilian casualties in Iran would be aired again and again in Arab and Muslim media, and the political consequences almost certainly would be worse for America than the consequences Israel suffered in the Lebanon war. The fact is, starting a war with a third Islamic country in the span of several years surely would be used as evidence that Osama bin Laden’s predictions about U.S. intentions were correct.

### Turns Terrorism

#### Iran strikes crank successful war on terrorism

**Logan,** foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, **2007**

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

The next unintended consequence would be the effect Iranian civilian casualties would have on American diplomatic standing and the hatred of the U.S. that it would generate in Islamic countries. While concern for civilian casualties should not be a debate-stopper in terms of policy decisions, any decision to attack Iran should be evaluated in terms of how it would affect the war on terror. Even the vastly more limited attack against Lebanon by Israel in the summer of 2006, which produced, in the low estimate, casualties in the high hundreds, resulted in an extremely detrimental political blowback against Israel. Civilian casualties in Iran would be aired again and again in Arab and Muslim media, and the political consequences almost certainly would be worse for America than the consequences Israel suffered in the Lebanon war. The fact is, starting a war with a third Islamic country in the span of several years surely would be used as evidence that Osama bin Laden’s predictions about U.S. intentions were correct.

#### And, strikes make terrorism inevitable:

**Haass,** President of the Council on Foreign Relations, 200**5**

(Richard N., *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, gjm)

Using preventive strikes to destroy Iran's developing weapons program would also be much easier said than done, given the imperfect nature of the intelligence on Iran's program and the operational challenges of attacking its dispersed and buried nuclear facilities. U.S. strikes might succeed in destroying part of Iran's weapons program and set it back by months or even years. But even if this were to occur, Iran would surely reconstitute its program in a manner that would make future strikes even more difficult. Moreover, Iran has the ability to retaliate by unleashing terrorism (using Hamas and Hezbollah) against Israel and the United States or by promoting instability in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Saudi Arabia. A U.S. strike on Iran would also further anger the Arab and Muslim worlds, where many already resent the double standard of U.S. and international acceptance of Israel's and India's nuclear weapons programs. Much of the Iranian population, currently alienated from the regime, would likely rally around it in the case of a foreign attack, making external efforts to bring about regime change that much more unlikely to succeed. Attacking Iran would also lead to sharp and possibly prolonged increases in the price of oil, which could trigger a global economic crisis. Nor would the United States avoid these costs if Israel carried out the strike (a scenario suggested by Vice President Dick Cheney in January 2005), since Israel would be widely viewed as doing the United States' bidding.

#### Strikes make terror attacks on US soil inevitable

**Hedges ‘6**

(Chris Hedges is former Middle East bureau chief for The New York Times and author of the bestseller “War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning” -- “Bush’s Nuclear Apocalypse” – October 9th – available via TruthDig -- http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?p=300562&sid=c296082a93092430f9a238f8a00a928b)

**An attack on Iran will ignite the Middle East.** The loss of Iranian oil, coupled with Silkworm missile attacks by Iran on oil tankers in the Persian Gulf, could send oil soaring to well over $110 a barrel. The effect on the domestic and world economy will be devastating, very possibly triggering a huge, global depression. The 2 million Shiites in Saudi Arabia, the Shiite majority in Iraq and the Shiite communities in Bahrain, Pakistan and Turkey will turn in rage on us and our dwindling allies. We will see a combination of increased terrorist attacks, including on American soil, and the widespread sabotage of oil production in the Gulf. Iraq, as bad as it looks now, will become a death pit for American troops as Shiites and Sunnis, for the first time, unite against their foreign occupiers.

### Strikes = Escalation

#### Iran will massively escalate – won’t believe strike is limited

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

RIDING THE ESCALATOR Kroenig's discussion of timing is not the only misleading part of his article; so is his contention that the United States could mitigate the "potentially devastating consequences" of a strike on Iran by carefully managing the escalation that would ensue. His picture of a clean, calibrated conflict is a mirage. Any war with Iran would be a messy and extraordinarily violent affair, with significant casualties and consequences. According to Kroenig, Iran would not respond to a strike with its "worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe" unless its leaders felt that the regime's "very existence was threatened." To mitigate this risk, he claims, the United States could "make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government." But Iranian leaders have staked their domestic legitimacy on resisting international pressure to halt the nuclear program, and so they would inevitably view an attack on that program as an attack on the regime itself. Decades of hostility and perceived U.S. efforts to undermine the regime would reinforce this perception. And when combined with the emphasis on anti-Americanism in the ideology of the supreme leader and his hard-line advisers, as well as their general ignorance about what drives U.S. decision-making, this perception means that there is little prospect that Iranian leaders would believe that a U.S. strike had limited aims. Assuming the worst about Washington's intentions, Tehran is likely to overreact to even a surgical strike against its nuclear facilities.

#### Escalation likely – reassurances and redlines fail – deterrence incentives, miscalc, use or lose pressures and unauthorized responses

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Kroenig nevertheless believes that the United States could limit the prospects for escalation by warning Iran that crossing certain "redlines" would trigger a devastating U.S. counterresponse. Ironically, Kroenig believes that a nuclear-armed Iran would be deeply irrational and prone to miscalculation yet somehow maintains that under the same leaders, Iran would make clear-eyed decisions in the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike. But the two countries share no direct and reliable channels for communication, and the inevitable confusion brought on by a crisis would make signaling difficult and miscalculation likely. To make matters worse, in the heat of battle, Iran would face powerful incentives to escalate. In the event of a conflict, both sides would come under significant pressure to stop the fighting due to the impact on international oil markets. Since this would limit the time the Iranians would have to reestablish deterrence, they might choose to launch a quick, all-out response, without care for redlines. Iranian fears that the United States could successfully disrupt its command-and-control infrastructure or preemptively destroy its ballistic missile arsenal could also tempt Iran to launch as many missiles as possible early in the war. And the decentralized nature of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, especially its navy, raises the prospect of unauthorized responses that could rapidly expand the fighting in the crowded waters of the Persian Gulf.

#### US wont be able to resist escalation even if Iran limits retaliation – incentives for large scale preemption, political pressures, miscalc

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Controlling escalation would be no easier on the U.S. side. In the face of reprisals by Iranian proxies, "token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships," or "the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels," Kroenig says that Washington should turn the other cheek and constrain its own response to Iranian counterattacks. But this is much easier said than done. Just as Iran's likely expectation of a short war might encourage it to respond disproportionately early in the crisis, so the United States would also have incentives to move swiftly to destroy Iran's conventional forces and the infrastructure of the Revolutionary Guard Corps. And if the United States failed to do so, proxy attacks against U.S. civilian personnel in Lebanon or Iraq, the transfer of lethal rocket and portable air defense systems to Taliban fighters in Afghanistan, or missile strikes against U.S. facilities in the Gulf could cause significant U.S. casualties, creating irresistible political pressure in Washington to respond. Add to this the normal fog of war and the lack of reliable communications between the United States and Iran, and Washington would have a hard time determining whether Tehran's initial response to a strike was a one-off event or the prelude to a wider campaign. If it were the latter, a passive U.S. approach might motivate Iran to launch even more dangerous attacks -- and this is a risk Washington may choose not to take. The sum total of these dynamics would make staying within Kroenig's proscribed limits exceedingly difficult.

#### Even purely defensive Iranian response causes full scale escalation by US

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Even if Iran did not escalate, purely defensive moves that would threaten U.S. personnel or international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz -- the maritime chokepoint through which nearly 20 per- cent of the world's traded oil passes -- would also create powerful incentives for Washington to preemptively target Iran's military. Of particular concern would be Iran's "anti-access/area-denial" capabilities, which are designed to prevent advanced navies from operating in the shallow waters of the Persian Gulf. These systems integrate coastal air defenses, shore-based long-range artillery and antiship cruise missiles, Kilo-class and midget submarines, remote-controlled boats and unmanned kamikaze aerial vehicles, and more than 1,000 small attack craft equipped with machine guns, multiple-launch rockets, antiship missiles, torpedoes, and rapid-mine-laying capabilities. The entire 120-mile-long strait sits along the Iranian coastline, within short reach of these systems. In the midst of a conflict, the threat to U.S. forces and the global economy posed by Iran's activating its air defenses, dispersing its missiles or naval forces, or moving its mines out of storage would be too great for the United States to ignore; the logic of preemption would compel Washington to escalate.

#### Iran will aggressively and thoroughly retaliate

White ‘7(Wayne, Former Dep Director State Dept, Middle East Policy, 3/22, Lexis)

I'm much more worried about the consequences of a U.S. or Israeli attack against Iran's nuclear infrastructure. That's the one that deeply worries me. I've seen some of the contingency planning, and we're not just probably talking about so-called surgical strikes against an array of targets inside Iran. We're talking about clearing a path to those targets by taking out much of the Iranian air force. We're talking about sinking the Kilo submarines, knocking out the anti-ship missiles that could attack commerce or the American fleet in the Persian Gulf. We're talking about probably trying to take out much of the speedboat capabilities--although that would be the hardest--and even ballistic missile capabilities. You're not talking about a surgical strike. You're talking about a war against Iran, and the Iranians are not going to take that sitting down. They will do everything in their power to retaliate. That could rebound heavily into Iraq, but it also could hammer the region to some degree. Some of the planning that I've seen relates to something like 1,500 aerial sorties and Cruise missile launches stretching over a matter of days. If you think that the Iranians during those days are not going to fire off what they haven't lost yet at commercial targets in the Gulf and aren't going to try to launch missiles that haven't been taken out, think again. The Iranians are going to be fighting back very, very hard.

### Causes Israel Attack

#### Attacking Iran leads to lash out against Israel which pulls in US and leads to regional instability

**Logan,** foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, **2007**

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

Another worry is the potential for Iran to lash out against Israel. Mohammad-Ebrahim Dehqani, commander of the IRCG’s 300,000 troops, stated in May 2006 that "wherever America does something evil, the first place that we will target will be Israel." In August, a mid-ranking Iranian cleric warned that Israel would be in danger if it "makes an iota of aggression against Iran." It is no secret that the Iranian leadership and public see Israel and the U.S. as close allies, and would look upon an attack by one of them as an act of war by both.

The recent violence in Lebanon and northern Israel has underscored another potential Iranian tactic: the use of proxies such as Hezbollah to attack Israel. Even in the limited conflict between Hezbollah and Israel, the Arab force was able to achieve surprising tactical successes even against tough Israeli targets. Israeli tanks were struck by anti-tank missiles, completely destroying more than a dozen. More notably, Hezbollah’s ability to use a radar-guided missile to disable an Israeli warship on patrol in the Mediterranean Sea indicated a new level of sophistication in its attacks. Hezbollah killed 119 Israeli soldiers throughout the conflict, including many members of the elite Golani brigade. Despite the deaths of 1,140 Lebanese civilians, Hezbollah was able to avoid defeat against the elite Israeli military.

Presumably, if Iran were under attack, Hezbollah would be deployed more fully against Israel, inflicting much more damage than did its recent tactics. If Iran were to assault Israel directly, the U.S. could find itself in a similar situation to the predicament during the first Gulf War, attempting to keep Israel out of a conflict for fear that its involvement could cause the war to escalate and spread throughout the region.

### Even Successful Strikes Cause Iran Prolif

#### Iran would quickly reconstitute the program

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

THE COST OF BUYING TIME Even if a U.S. strike went as well as Kroenig predicts, there is little guarantee that it would produce lasting results. Senior U.S. defense officials have repeatedly stated that an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would stall Tehran's progress for only a few years. Kroenig argues that such a delay could become permanent. "Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked -- most recently Iraq and Syria," he writes, "have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs." In the case of Iraq, however, Saddam Hussein restarted his clandestine nuclear weapons program after the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osirak nuclear reactor, and it required the Gulf War and another decade of sanctions and intrusive inspections to eliminate it. Iran's program is also more advanced and dispersed than were Iraq's and Syria's, meaning it would be easier to reconstitute. A U.S. strike would damage key Iranian facilities, but it would do nothing to reverse the nuclear knowledge Iran has accumulated or its ability to eventually build new centrifuges.

#### Iran prolif not inevitable – strikes guarantee it by removing internal political constraints

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

 A U.S. attack would also likely rally domestic Iranian support around nuclear hard-liners, increasing the odds that Iran would emerge from a strike even more committed to building a bomb. Kroenig downplays the "rally round the flag" risks by noting that hard-liners are already firmly in power and suggesting that an attack might produce increased internal criticism of the regime. But the nuclear program remains an enormous source of national pride for the majority of Iranians. To the extent that there is internal dissent over the program, it is a discussion about whether the country should acquire nuclear weapons or simply pursue civilian nuclear technology. By demonstrating the vulnerability of a non-nuclear-armed Iran, a U.S. attack would provide ammunition to hard-liners who argue for acquiring a nuclear deterrent. Kroenig suggests that the United States should essentially ignore "Iran's domestic political tussles" when pursuing "its vital national security interest in preventing Tehran from developing nuclear weapons." But influencing Iranian opinion about the strategic desirability of nuclear weapons might ultimately offer the only enduring way of keeping the Islamic Republic on a peaceful nuclear path.

#### Strikes make Iran prolif even easier – destroys inspection regime

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

 Finally, if Iran did attempt to restart its nuclear program after an attack, it would be much more difficult for the United States to stop it. An assault would lead Iran to distance itself from the IAEA and perhaps to pull out of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty altogether. Without inspectors on the ground, the international community would struggle to track or slow Tehran's efforts to rebuild its program.

### Strikes Fail

#### Limited air strikes fail – create a nationalist backlash – strengthen hard liners – disrupt oil lines and lead to Iranian sponsored attacks on troops in the region

**Dueck,** Ass’t Prof Public and Int’l Affairs at GMU **& Takeyh,** Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, **2007**

(Ray, Political Science Quarterly, v122 n2, Summer,

<http://www.psqonline.org/cgi-bin/99_article.cgi?byear=2007&bmonth=summer&a=01free&format=view> gjm)

Simply hoping for Iranian democratization, on the other hand, is not really a coherent strategy. We can certainly root for the eventual victory of dissident democratic reformers within Iran, but there are no indications of their immi- nent success, to say the least. In practical terms, direct military rollback is not a serious option either. An American invasion and occupation of Iran aimed at dismantling Tehran’s nuclear capabilities is simply not going to happen. Even more-limited U.S. air strikes against Iran and its weapons sites would probably fail to destroy Iran’s nuclear program, and the political fallout would be im- mense: a nationalist backlash among the Iranian public, international con- demnation of the United States, the strengthening of Iran’s hard-liners, the potential disruption of Persian Gulf oil supplies to the industrialized world, and Iranian-sponsored attacks against American troops and interests throughout the region.23

#### Pre-emptive destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities will fail due to a lack of intelligence – even if they succeed they can only delay the program and increase anti-American resentment which supports the current regime

**Fallows,** National Correspondent for the Atlantic, **2004**

(James, The Atlantic December, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200412/fallows> [gjm])

What about a pre-emptive strike of our own, like the Osirak raid? The problem is that Iran's nuclear program is now much more advanced than Iraq's was at the time of the raid. Already the U.S. government has no way of knowing exactly how many sites Iran has, or how many it would be able to destroy, or how much time it would buy in doing so. Worse, it would have no way of predicting the long-term strategic impact of such a strike. A strike might delay by three years Iran's attainment of its goal—but at the cost of further embittering the regime and its people. Iran's intentions when it did get the bomb would be all the more hostile.

#### No adequate intelligence

**Logan,** foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, **2007**

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

Worse intelligence than in Iraq? The U.S. government appears to know very little about Iran’s nuclear program. It is quite difficult to gather worthwhile intelligence on a country with which America has not had commercial or diplomatic relations for almost three decades, and a successful attack against a nuclear program as dispersed and effectively hidden as Iran’s apparently is would require very good intelligence. In 2002, the U.S. learned of startling advances in Iran’s nuclear program after revelations regarding the Natanz enrichment facility and the Arak heavy water reactor were made very publicly by the Mujahedeen- e-Khalq’s (MEK’s) political arm, the National Council of Resistance in Iran (NCRI). Given that these facilities obviously would rank highly on any list of potential targets, we must understand that the Iranian leadership knows that we know about them. It is likely that the leadership in Tehran has taken into account that those locations would be first on a list of American aim points, and have adjusted their programs accordingly, either by diversifying the locations even further than they were, or by relocating nuclear activity.

#### Air strikes cannot take out Iranian underground facilities – too deep for our best bunker buster

**Logan,** foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, **2007**

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

There are other uncertainties about Iran’s program as well. Iran has alleged, for example, that the facilities at Natanz are buried 18 meters underground, whereas retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner contends that they are 15 meters underground. Either way, this would raise questions about how air strikes could destroy the facility. The most effective conventional bunker-busting bomb in the U.S. arsenal, the GBU-28, can penetrate approximately six meters of rock and hardened concrete. That depth would be insufficient to destroy some Iranian targets.

#### Military strikes don’t solve – Iran can stockpile equipment and materials – would withdraw from the NPT after attack – means no inspections / chance for second strikes

**Samore,** Vice President, Director of Studies, Maurice R. Greenberg Chair, Council on Foreign Relations, **2007**

(Gary, Iran: Prospect for War, March 23, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/12935/iran.html> [gjm])

First, the utility of military strikes, in terms of how much damage it would inflict on Iran’s nuclear capabilities and on how long it would take for Iran to rebuild in the aftermath of an attack, is uncertain.  How much time would military attacks buy?  Ten years?  Five years?  Two years?  It’s very hard to estimate, especially because Iran has halted IAEA access to facilities for the production of nuclear-related components since January 2006.  Even if you assume that Iran’s known nuclear facilities could be destroyed by air strikes and that Iran does not have significant secret facilities for the production of fissile material (both of which I believe is true), Iran has probably taken the precaution of  stockpiling material and equipment so it could recover from military attack as quickly as possible.  Moreover, Iran would probably withdraw from the NPT after an attack, which would allow it to rebuild without international inspection and therefore be more able to hide the facilities from a second wave of attacks in the future.  In short, very few people believe that air strikes can stop Iran’s program; at best, it can delayIran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons capacity for some uncertain period of time.

#### Iranian nuclear tech is protected from surgical strikes

**Daily Times,** Monday, January 24, **2005**

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=story_24-1-2005_pg4_21> [gjm]

Iran is believed to protect its most sensitive facilities by dispersing, burying and hardening them, learning from the 1981 Israeli air strike on Iraq’s Osirak nuclear reactor.  So the payoff from surgical strikes on suspected nuclear facilities would be uncertain and temporary, Carafano said.

### SQ Alternatives Solve Prolif

#### Wait and see best – sanctions and negotiations can solve and we can effectively strike later if they don’t

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

THE OPTIONS ON THE TABLE In making the case for preventive war as the least bad option, Kroenig dismisses any prospect of finding a diplomatic solution to the U.S.-Iranian standoff. He concludes that the Obama administration's dual-track policy of engagement and pressure has failed to arrest Iran's march toward a bomb, leaving Washington with no other choice but to bomb Iran. But this ignores the severe economic strain, isolation, and technical challenges that Iran is experiencing. After years of dismissing the economic effects of sanctions, senior Iranian officials now publicly complain about the intense pain the sanctions are producing. And facing the prospect of U.S. sanctions against Iran's central bank and European actions to halt Iranian oil imports, Tehran signaled in early January some willingness to return to the negotiating table. Washington must test this willingness and, in so doing, provide Iran with a clear strategic choice: address the concerns of the international community regarding its nuclear program and see its isolation lifted or stay on its current path and face substantially higher costs. In framing this choice, Washington must be able to assert that like-minded states are prepared to implement oil-related sanctions, and the Obama administration should continue to emphasize that all options, including military action, remain on the table. Some will undoubtedly claim that highlighting the potential risks associated with war will lead the Iranians to conclude that the United States lacks the resolve to use force. But in authorizing the surge in Afghanistan, carrying out the raid that killed Osama bin Laden, and leading the NATO air campaign to oust Libya's Muammar al-Qaddafi, President Barack Obama has repeatedly shown that he is willing to accept risk and use force -- both as part of a coalition and unilaterally -- to defend U.S. interests. And as Martin Dempsey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, told CNN late last December, the United States has a viable contingency plan for Iran if force is ultimately required. But given the high costs and inherent uncertainties of a strike, the United States should not rush to use force until all other options have been exhausted and the Iranian threat is not just growing but imminent. Until then, force is, and should remain, a last resort, not a first choice.

#### Iran won’t build nuclear weapons and time frame is long even if they do

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

BAD TIMING Kroenig argues that there is an urgent need to attack Iran's nuclear infrastructure soon, since Tehran could "produce its first nuclear weapon within six months of deciding to do so." Yet that last phrase is crucial. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has documented Iranian efforts to achieve the capacity to develop nuclear weapons at some point, but there is no hard evidence that Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has yet made the final decision to develop them. In arguing for a six-month horizon, Kroenig also misleadingly conflates hypothetical timelines to produce weapons-grade uranium with the time actually required to construct a bomb. According to 2010 Senate testimony by James Cartwright, then vice chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and recent statements by the former heads of Israel's national intelligence and defense intelligence agencies, even if Iran could produce enough weapons-grade uranium for a bomb in six months, it would take it at least a year to produce a testable nuclear device and considerably longer to make a deliverable weapon. And David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security (and the source of Kroenig's six-month estimate), recently told Agence France-Presse that there is a "low probability" that the Iranians would actually develop a bomb over the next year even if they had the capability to do so. Because there is no evidence that Iran has built additional covert enrichment plants since the Natanz and Qom sites were outed in 2002 and 2009, respectively, any near-term move by Tehran to produce weapons-grade uranium would have to rely on its declared facilities. The IAEA would thus detect such activity with sufficient time for the international community to mount a forceful response. As a result, the Iranians are unlikely to commit to building nuclear weapons until they can do so much more quickly or out of sight, which could be years off.

#### Waiting is best – if iran decides to build a bomb we will detect it and still have time to strike

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Kroenig is also inconsistent about the timetable for an attack. In some places, he suggests that strikes should begin now, whereas in others, he argues that the United States should attack only if Iran takes certain actions -- such as expelling IAEA inspectors, beginning the enrichment of weapons-grade uranium, or installing large numbers of advanced centrifuges, any one of which would signal that it had decided to build a bomb. Kroenig is likely right that these developments -- and perhaps others, such as the discovery of new covert enrichment sites -- would create a decision point for the use of force. But the Iranians have not taken these steps yet, and as Kroenig acknowledges, "Washington has a very good chance" of detecting them if they do.

### Containment Solves/Best

#### containment solves and won’t cause overstretch –current posture sufficient

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

CONTAIN YOURSELF Kroenig argues that "a nuclear-armed Iran would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war" but still concludes that it is ultimately less risky to attack the Islamic Republic now than to attempt to contain it later. He warns that containment would entail a costly forward deployment of large numbers of U.S. forces on Iran's periphery for decades. But the United States already has a large presence encircling Iran. Forty thousand U.S. troops are stationed in the Gulf, accompanied by strike aircraft, two aircraft carrier strike groups, two Aegis ballistic missile defense ships, and multiple Patriot antimissile systems. On Iran's eastern flank, Washington has another 90,000 troops deployed in Afghanistan and thousands more supporting the Afghan war in nearby Central Asian states. Kroenig claims that it would take much more to contain a nuclear-armed Iran. But U.S. forces in the Gulf already outnumber those in South Korea that are there to deter a nuclear-armed North. It is thus perfectly conceivable that the existing U.S. presence in the region, perhaps supplemented by a limited forward deployment of nuclear weapons and additional ballistic missile defenses, would be sufficient to deter a nuclear-armed Iran from aggression and blackmail.

#### Containment inevitable – strikes only undermine its effectiveness, cause international backlash and overstretch

**Kahl, 12**

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

To be sure, such a deterrence-and-containment strategy would be an extraordinarily complex and risky enterprise, and there is no doubt that prevention is preferable. Given the possible consequences of a nuclear-armed Iran, the price of failure would be very high. But Kroenig's approach would not solve the problem. By presenting the options as either a near-term strike or long-term containment, Kroenig falls into the same trap that advocates of the Iraq war fell into a decade ago: ignoring postwar scenarios. In reality, the strike that Kroenig recommends would likely be a prelude to containment, not a substitute for it. Since a military raid would not permanently eliminate Iran's nuclear infrastructure, the United States would still need to construct an expensive, risky postwar containment regime to prevent Iran from reconstituting the program, much as it did in regard to Iraq after the Gulf War. The end result would be strikingly similar to the one that Kroenig criticizes, requiring Washington to maintain sufficient air, naval, and ground forces in the Persian Gulf to attack again at a moment's notice. A strike carried out in the way Kroenig advocates -- a unilateral preventive attack -- would also make postwar containment more difficult and costly. Many countries would view such an operation as a breach of international law, shattering the consensus required to maintain an effective poststrike containment regime. The likelihood that the United States could "reduce the political fallout of military action by building global support for it in advance," as Kroenig suggests, would be extremely low absent clear evidence that Iran is dashing for a bomb. Without such evidence, Washington would be left to bear the costs of an attack and the resulting containment regime alone. Finally, the surgical nature of Kroenig's proposed strike, aimed solely at Iran's nuclear program, would make postwar containment much harder. It would leave Tehran wounded and aggrieved but still capable of responding. Kroenig's recommended approach, then, would likely be just enough to ensure a costly, long-term conflict without actually compelling Iran to change its behavior.

### A2: Israel Trick

#### Israel won’t attack – relations with the US

**Cook**, senior fellow, Mid East studies – CFR, 6/9/**’9**

(Steven A, “Why Israel Won’t Attack Iran,” Foreign Affairs)

Given Israel's perception of an acute Iranian threat and its demonstrated ability to act alone, there must be some other factor holding the Israelis back. Most likely, that factor is politics, and more specifically, the importance that close relations with Washington has on the domestic political calculations of Israeli leaders. Unlike 1981, when the United States had barely a toe-hold in the Middle East, Washington occupies two countries in or adjacent to the region, maintains military facilities throughout the Persian Gulf, and relies on Arab governments for logistical support. In the event of an Israeli attack, Washington would surely be accused of colluding with Jerusalem, severely damaging the United States' position in the region while provoking a ferocious Iranian response in Iraq, Afghanistan, Gaza, and southern Lebanon. The resulting breach between Israel and the United States would be unprecedented, creating a crisis far more serious than President Dwight Eisenhower's demand that Israel stand down after its invasion of Sinai in 1956 and Gerald Ford's "reassessment" of 1975 (which suspended all military and economic agreements between the two countries for three months when Israel proved uncooperative in negotiating a second Sinai agreement). This is a scenario with which many Israelis, including Netanyahu, are unlikely to be comfortable.

The Israelis have always claimed that they did not want a formal defense treaty with the United States for fear that such a pact would limit their freedom of maneuver. David Ben Gurion sought close relations with Washington, but not at the expense of Israel's "independence or its existence." Yet, the historical record does not track consistently with Ben Gurion's bravado. The 1956 and 1975 episodes are instructive because the Israelis backed down, establishing an informal pattern for future relations in which Israeli prime ministers tend to tread cautiously when it comes to the United States.

#### Empirics are conclusive

**Cook**, senior fellow, Mid East studies – CFR, 6/9/**’9**

(Steven A, “Why Israel Won’t Attack Iran,” Foreign Affairs)

Yet, despite my best efforts to walk a few financial analysts off the ledge, a mystery remains: Why haven't the Israelis attacked Iran's nuclear facilities? After all, Israel is a country borne of the blood-soaked history of Jews in Europe, and Iran's leaders seem to be promising a new Holocaust. One would think there is already justification enough to dispatch every plane in Israel's arsenal to attack Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Also, between 2001 and 2009, the Israelis enjoyed the support of what was indisputably the most pro-Israel American administration in history. President George W. Bush and his advisors helped enable the Lebanon war in 2006 in the hopes that the vaunted Israel Defense Forces would deal Hizballah a fatal blow, so why not take out the Iranian mother ship, which poses a far greater threat to Israel and U.S. interests in the region than Hizballah's guerrilla army?

The standard wonk answers to these questions are that Israel does not have the capacity to fly its F-15s to Iran and back, that there is uncertainty about the actual targets, that there is too much risk of an inadvertent clash with possibly Turkish or even American air crews, and that the Israelis are in fact giving diplomacy a chance -- despite all evidence that Jerusalem is profoundly skeptical that anything Washington can offer Tehran will bring its nuclear ambitions to heel.

The *New York Times* caused quite a stir in Januarywhen it reported that Israel's defense and political leaders repeatedly sought permission from the Bush administration "to go," but were denied U.S. approval. Still, why didn't Israel attack anyway? Would Bush have ordered U.S forces to shoot down Israeli F-15s as they streaked across the Baghdad sky on their way to Iran? Unlikely. Confronted with a fait accompli, the Bush White House -- even if it were so inclined -- would not have been in a position to condemn an Israeli attack. Given his axis of evil and "with us or against us" rhetoric, it would have been decidedly awkward for Bush to come down on the Israelis for striking a blow against Iran. Moreover, the Israelis set a precedent for not informing the U.S. of dramatic military operations when on June 7,1981, the Sunday morning routines of Reagan administration officials were disrupted with reports ofthe smoldering ruins of what was Iraq's Osirak nuclear facility.

## \*\*\*Aff\*\*\*

### GOP Obstructionism Turn

#### Plan removes key weapon from obama’s campaign arsenal

**Berstein Research, 12** (Sanford C. Bernstein is widely recognized as Wall Street’s premier sell-side research firm. Our research is sought out by leading investment managers around the world, and we are annually ranked at the very top of acknowledged arbiters. In independent surveys of major institutional clients, Bernstein's research is ranked #1 for overall quality, industry knowledge, most trusted, best detailed financial analysis, major company studies, most useful valuation frameworks, best original research, and most willing to challenge management. In Institutional Investor’s 2010 annual client survey, the leading survey by which analysts in our industry are evaluated, 100% of our U.S. Analysts were recognized as among the best in their respective fields -- more than any other firm on Wall Street, 2/3, <http://www.fraternalalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Washington-Research-2012-Preview-Transportation-Funding.pdf>)

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.

#### Plan key to avoid perception of GOP obstruction on jobs issues – prevents Obama win

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO, Soul of America, 1/25, <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

2. In the next 2-3 weeks American public’s appetite for GOP personal attacks will wane. Even though many voters are disappointed that more jobs have not been created on Obama’s watch, they have not seen Gingrich, Santorum or Romney detail realistic job creation plans. To become the GOP presidential nominee, one of them must differentiate from the pack and Transportation funding is a proven means to illustrate realistic job creation. So Congress may negotiate a Transportation bill that includes Highway, Transit and some HSR funding. In that scenario, Romney is most likely to endorse the new Transportation bill to differentiate himself from Gingrich and Santorum. Despite flip-flopping, Romney remembers that significant Highway, transit and HSR investment and job creation (Boston Big Dig, Boston Transit and more Amtrak NEC) made a positive difference to jobs under his watch. If Romney is the leading GOP candidate by then, it would give air cover for more Congressional GOP to split from the Tea Party on Transportation funding. Of course, Romney and Congressional GOPs in battleground states may continuing to pander to the Tea Party until the election. But if they do, President Obama wins this valuable leadership point leading up to the election because he’s been asking for more “job creating” Transportation funding since day one, while the Tea Party GOP has contemplated its navel.

#### Plan removes key election issue for obama

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO, Soul of America, 1/27, <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

Nevertheless, the Tea Party GOP has painted themselves in such a corner against rebuilding infrastructure/job creation, they are enhancing reelection prospects for Obama and the Demos. How ironic that a platform Repubs and Demos have traditionally found common ground prior to November 2010, will be a platform to separate one over the other.

#### Obamas best chance is to run against GOP obstructionism – only risk of turn because its too late to sell a narrative of successful economic policy

**Krugman, 12**

Paul, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, NYT, 6/4, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/04/opinion/krugman-this-republican-economy.html?src=me&ref=general>

At this point, however, Mr. Obama and his political team don’t seem to have much choice. They can point with pride to some big economic achievements, above all the successful rescue of the auto industry, which is responsible for a large part of whatever job growth we are managing to get. But they’re not going to be able to sell a narrative of overall economic success. Their best bet, surely, is to do a Harry Truman, to run against the “do-nothing” Republican Congress that has, in reality, blocked proposals — for tax cuts as well as more spending — that would have made 2012 a much better year than it’s turning out to be.

### No Link – not key issue

#### Its politically irrelevant – not perceived as key issue, no significant jobs perception and Obama can’t spin it

**Freemark, 12**

Yonah Freemark is an independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, from which he graduated in May 2008 with a BA in architecture. He writes about transportation and land use issues for The Transport Politic and The Infrastructurist, 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

In the context of the presidential race, Mr. Obama’s decision not to continue his previously strong advocacy of more and more transportation funding suggests that the campaign sees the issue as politically irrelevant. If the Administration made an effort last year to convince Americans of the importance of improving infrastructure, there seems to have been fewer positive results in terms of popular perceptions than hoped for. Perhaps the rebuffs from Republican governors on high-speed rail took their toll; perhaps the few recovery projects that entered construction were not visible enough (or at least their federal funding was not obvious enough); perhaps the truth of the matter is that people truly care more about issues like unemployment and health care than they do for public transit and roads.

#### Voters don’t care – not high priority

**Pew, 11** (Pew Research Center, 1/20, http://www.people-press.org/2011/01/20/about-the-surveys/)

Improving the nation’s roads, bridges, and transportation does not rank as a particularly high priority for Democrats, Republicans or independents. Still, Democrats are more likely to see this as important (41% top priority vs. 30% of independents, 26% of Republicans. This is the case for dealing with obesity as well.

### Not Key Issue – HSR

#### Voters don’t care about or perceive HSR

**Dorsey, 12** (Thomas, CEO Soul of America, <http://soulofamerica.com/interact/soulofamerica-travel-blog/interstate-hsr-network/>)

Unfortunately, the notion of an Interstate HSR System isn't on the radar screen of most voters and their politicians. At best, Amtrak/HSR projects in the Northeast, California, Midwest, Pacific Northwest and Mid-Atlantic states are viewed as standalone projects. Indifference towards Interstate HSR is understandable. To survive many de-funding threats over the years, Amtrak had to appease many congresspersons with service in low-merit corridors in order to receive sustenance funding. As a result, too many low-merit Amtrak corridors can not be well patronized, even if we invested in them. This state of affairs has created brand confusion for consumers. Does Amtrak stand for improving service like Acela in the Northeast Corridor? Does it stand for "slower than driving", seldom on-time, infrequent trains like Amtrak Piedmont? Or something in between?

#### ( ) Public not aware of HSR

**Schultz ‘11**

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

When Americans were asked about awareness of high-speed rail projects, only a little more than a third (35%) of those living in one of the proposed high-speed rail corridors said they are aware of a high-speed rail project that is either proposed or under development in their state, with more than four in ten (45%) unsure. "The relatively low awareness of high-speed rail across the country is not surprising given the disparate, regional nature of today's hottest HSR debates" said Linda Schulz, Vice President of Public Affairs and Policy at Harris Interactive. "However, as discussions become more prominent in more areas, and as projects get underway, we will be well positioned to monitor changing awareness and attitudes". Not surprisingly, awareness is highest in states where HSR is developing the fastest (68% are aware in California corridor, 60% in Florida). Awareness in other states with proposed high-speed rail projects include the Chicago Hub at 31% and New York at 28%.

### Obama Not Get Credit

#### Obama doesn’t get credit – his sales pitch is especially bad

**Skelley, 12**

Geoffrey Skelley, Political Analyst, U.Va. Center for Politics, 5/23, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/unemployment-update-who-gets-the-credit/>

So far, the Obama campaign has run ads promoting the president’s handling of the economy, such as spots that tout the auto industry bailout and mention increased job growth. But are voters buying the pitch and giving Obama credit? That’s up for debate, especially with Republican governors in key swing states, such as Virginia and Ohio, competing with the president for the public’s applause. In Virginia, in what can mainly be described as a campaign to improve his chances of being Romney’s running mate, Gov. Bob McDonnell’s (R) Opportunity Virginia PAC has run an ad highlighting Virginia’s economic improvement during McDonnell’s tenure. The spot notes that Virginia has its lowest unemployment rate in three years and the lowest in the Southeast. As our chart shows, Virginia’s 5.6% figure is at least 1% better than any other Southern state. Federal spending, particularly defense expenditures, is a big reason why, of course — a point often left unmade in a state whose politicians regularly launch broadsides against “wasteful spending by Washington.” Meanwhile, Ohio and much of the Rust Belt have seen stirrings of economic improvement. But the president has not necessarily received a significant bump from this news. A recent Quinnipiac poll found that Ohioans who think the Buckeye State’s economy has improved give Gov. John Kasich (R) credit for the change by a 68% to 22% margin over President Obama. Voters who think the economy is worse also blame the sitting governor more than the president, 49% to 27%. Considering Ohio’s unemployment rate has gone from 8.8% in April 2011 to 7.4% last month, both incumbents can brag about the change. But it is far more important for Obama, who is on the ballot this November while Kasich isn’t up for reelection until 2014. Strategically, the Obama campaign wants to convince voters that the economy is in fact improving. Tactically, this has meant running ads in key swing states that generally promote Obama’s economic stewardship. Yet the campaign might be losing an opportunity if it doesn’t take greater ownership of positive state-specific numbers. Obama’s generic television ads might do more than simply target all the swing states as a bloc. Instead, he could focus on each state separately. If a state’s unemployment rate has improved over the past year, then the president’s campaign could run general election ads that trumpet the success. Ohio and especially Virginia are ideal for such advertising. In politics, a president gets the blame for anything bad that happens on his watch. Conversely, he gets the credit for anything good that unfolds during his term — that is, if he doesn’t let others take the credit from him. To this point, President Obama has failed to take advantage of the improved jobs numbers in some competitive states with unemployment lower than the national average. In this close election, Obama has little margin for error.

### Too Early

#### Too early – uniqueness and link should be treated with grain of salt

**Sabato, 5/31/12** (Larry, Director, UVA Center For Politics, <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/presidential-polling-in-june-flip-a-coin-instead/>)

With all of the polls, models and history at their disposal, political analysts should be able to figure out who is going to win a November presidential election by June, right? Well, not quite. While we would modestly suggest to Socrates and our readers that we know more than nothing about the election, declaring the winner with certainty at this point is a fool’s errand, particularly when the current data argue only that the contest will be a close one. In the RealClearPolitics average of national horse race polls as of Wednesday, President Obama was narrowly ahead of Mitt Romney by 2.0 percentage points. Meanwhile, in last week’s Crystal Ball, Alan Abramowitz showed how his respected presidential election model forecasts a very tight race at this point, with Obama as a slight favorite. But surely, this year is an outlier, many would assert. Because of the unique circumstances surrounding this election, including the great economic dislocation caused by the 2008 crash and the restless mood of Americans even after three straight wave elections, it’s understandable that this contest would remain hazy late into the spring. That’s true. But uncertainty in June is not unique, at least not in modern history. If anyone doubts that a reassessment — maybe several of them — will come as 2012 wears on, consider this: Over the past eight elections, Gallup — the most recognizable of polling organizations — has only identified the eventual popular vote winner twice in its early June horse race polling: In June 1980, President Jimmy Carter led Ronald Reagan 39% to 32%, with independent John Anderson at 21%. In November, Reagan defeated Carter, 51% to 41%, with Anderson getting less than 7%. Remember that this race appeared close until the very end, with some polling even indicating that Carter might actually win just a few days before the election. But Reagan proved his mettle in a late debate, and Carter’s attempt to negotiate freedom for the American hostages in Iran failed. Those late developments helped turn a close election into a blowout. Note, also, Anderson’s strong early performance in polls: Third party candidates sometimes appear formidable in early surveys and then fade away as the election gets closer, victims of the voters’ desire not to “waste” their ballots. The polling was fairly stable in 1984. In June, Reagan already led Walter Mondale by 53% to 44%. The incumbent won 59% in the fall. Such early polling, and Reagan’s strength, prompted Mondale to throw a Hail Mary by selecting Geraldine Ferraro as his running mate. Like most Hail Marys, the pass was incomplete. By 1988, the June polling was far more misleading: Michael Dukakis was ahead of George H.W. Bush by a landslide, 52% to 38%. Bush ended up winning more than 53% in November. The June 1992 polling projected the nation’s first independent president, Ross Perot. At 39%, Perot easily topped Bush (31%) and Bill Clinton at 25%. Less than five months later, the order was reversed: Clinton won with 43%, Bush (37%) was ousted and Perot finished last with 19%, failing to win a single electoral vote. However, Perot maintained his support to a greater degree than most independent candidates do down the stretch. Gallup’s June 1996 survey got Clinton’s reelection percentage right on the nose (49%), but Bob Dole, at 33%, was well below his eventual 41% and Perot had 17% in June but finished with about 8% in November. Like 1984, Clinton’s reelection bid lacked drama. The squeaker of 2000 was close even in June, but Gallup had George W. Bush up over Al Gore, 46% to 41%. Come November, Gore won the popular vote by half a percentage point, though of course he lost the Electoral College vote. Gallup had John Kerry well on his way to avenging Gore’s loss in June 2004. Kerry led Bush outside the margin of error at 49% to 43%. Instead, Bush grabbed his second term with 51% in November. It’s rarely recalled, but John McCain actually led Barack Obama by a whisker in Gallup’s daily tracking at the beginning of June 2008, 46% to 45%. It wasn’t close in the fall, with Obama winning 53%. And the uncertainty goes back further. Jimmy Carter looked as though he would roll Gerald Ford in 1976; instead, the election ended up incredibly tight. So did the 1960 and 1968 contests. As we never tire of repeating, Harry Truman shocked the world in 1948 by defeating “President-elect” Thomas E. Dewey. This is not meant to cast aspersions on Gallup; rather, it’s to say that presidential races are not static, and that polling conducted five months before the election is only a snapshot in time, as opposed to a reliable prediction as to how the race will eventually shake out. As of Wednesday, Obama and Romney were tied, 46%-46%, in the Gallup poll. Obviously, this is a matchup that could go either way. Almost everything can change, and frequently does, during the course of the summer and fall in a presidential race. The economy can get decidedly better or worse. International crises can pop up — or peace can break out. Unexpected scandals can engulf one or both major party candidates. One or more independents or third-party candidates may prove influential in the presidential tally. Politics, as we’ve insisted for years, is a good thing. And a fun thing, too, for people who do not treat American elections as a life or death affair. There will be many spectacles between now and Nov. 6, and plenty of unexpected developments in this semi-scripted human drama. But while we know the road to the finish line will be fascinating, let’s also grant that it will be somewhat unpredictable. For those of you who can’t wait, just join the partisans on both sides who absolutely, positively know their side will win — in a landslide! One side will be right, more or less, and after the election, the winners will lord their perceptiveness over friends, family and the opposition. And if your partisanship isn’t intense enough for this route, there’s always that coin in your pocket. With the prospect of a tight presidential race, a good flip may tell you as much as June polls.

#### Too early – nothing matters now and voters aren’t paying attention

**Silver, 5/15/12** (Nate,chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical models <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/>)

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

#### Can’t predict the election – unforeseen alt causes trump

**Cunningham 11** (Pat, Columnist – RRS, “Here’s Why Outcome of Next Presidential Election is Impossible to Predict at this Point”, Rockford Register Star, 12-13, http://blogs.e-rockford.com/applesauce/2011/12/13/heres-why-outcome-of-next-presidential-election-is-impossible-to-predict-at-this-point/)

Forty-seven weeks from today, tens of millions of Americans will flock to polling places all across the country to cast ballots in the presidential election of 2012 — and right now it’s anybody’s guess as to what kind of collective judgment they will make. I mean anybody’s guess. That’s not just a profound grasp of the obvious. Rather, it’s a confident prediction that many, many weeks will pass before any confident prediction of the election outcome can be made. The principal reason for this is that, in my 50 years of following these matters, I’ve never seen such volatility in the national political mood. I say this as a pundit whose own smug predictions, in some cases, have been made to look silly in recent months. To wit, as recently as a few months ago, I was saying that Newt Gingrich had absolutely no chance — none, zip, zilch, nada — of winning the Republican presidential nomination. But look at him now. As some other pundit put it just the other day, Gingrich has gone from an afterthought to a juggernaut in the proverbial blink of an eye. But the topsy-turvy race for the GOP nomination isn’t the only reason why it’s foolish to say how the election of 11 months hence is likely to play out. Another is that President Obama, for all his troubles, has maintained a fairly steady position in the polls and has yet to fall far behind any of his potential Republican rivals in hypothetical match-ups. Just yesterday, the difference between Obama’s overall approval and disapproval ratings in the Gallup Daily Tracking poll was within the survey’s margin of error. Nor has Obama’s approval rating ever been as low as Ronald Reagan’s was at one point in his first term. All of this suggests that the president may or may not be in terrible shape by the time Americans begin making up their minds before voting next year. Then, too, Obama’s standing among voters inevitably will be influenced by public perceptions of the person the Republicans choose to run against him. It’s one thing to say that the incumbent looks less than strong in a hypothetical race with a generic opponent. But his GOP challenger won’t be a generic person. It will be an actual person with actual strengths and weaknesses. In the final analysis, the following are among the most important factors that will make the election outcome impossible to predict with any confidence until the final days of the campaign: –Money: Well more than a billion dollars is likely to be spent in efforts to influence the electorate. The sum will dwarf anything we’ve ever seen before. Many of these expenditures will be relatively ineffective, but some of them could well tip the balance in a few key states. –Personalities: Beyond the issues of governance on which civic-minded voters are supposed to base their ballot choices, there’s the all-important matter of likability. I’ve often told the story of how Ronald Reagan still would have defeated Democrat Walter Mondale in 1984, even if they had switched all their positions on the issues. Reagan’s likability trumped almost all other considerations. Unpredictable events: Elections can pivot, at times, on occurrences that no one saw coming — natural disasters, foreign crises, foolish gaffes, sudden scandals, etc. Given all these factors and more, I’m not even ready to subscribe to the conventional political wisdom that the presidential race of 2012 is likely to be a close one, with the winner prevailing only by a small margin. For all we know at this point, it might turn out to be a landslide.

#### It’s complex, non-linear, and history proves prediction’s impossible

**Teitelbaum 11** (Robert, Reporter – Daily Deal, “Prediction and Its Discontents”, Daily Deal, 9-7, Lexis)

I guess you could have predicted this. With the world a mess -- call it disequilibrium, nonlinear perturbations, turbulence, possibly a phase change, perhaps a revolution, certainly a damn load of woe -- prediction as a respectable way to expend mental energy has suddenly become about as popular as Osama bin Laden futures. Now the truth is I've had serious doubts about the ability of anyone (including myself) to predict -- economists, analysts, especially pundits, most spectacularly anyone on television -- for some time now, certainly as long as I've realized the irrefutable fact that most stock pickers really stink, and that even the best have a lot of trouble sustaining a market-beating run. I would boast about this (well, I am) except that skepticism about prediction doesn't require genius, just a modest appreciation for history and a distrust of authority figures, like local weathermen and politicians. Living through the last decade has been one tutorial after another on the failure of prediction, in particularly, but not exclusively, the failure of markets to see around the corner: the dot-com bust, Sept. 11, the mortgage bubble, the financial crisis, the euro-zone mess, right on down to Hurricane Irene. In fact every decade teaches that lesson, though we are, as a species, very poor students in that regard. That's a long preamble to the fact that the papers and blogosphere seem to be awash in denunciations of prediction today. The cover of this week's Bloomberg Businessweek is http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/the-god-clause-and-the-reinsurance-industry-09012011.html|artfully apocalyptic in the run-up to the Sept. 11 anniversary, with a cover line for a story on reinsurance that declares, "Risk: A Decade of Disaster Has Made Predicting Impossible." Not a lot of nuance in that statement. In the Financial Times, the always-estimable John Kay, who was very early and sophisticated on such topics, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b1972594-d874-11e0-8f0a-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1XHOfPSna|hammers economists one more time Wednesday about why they're often wrong. Kay has come back from his holiday clearly re-energized to dismantle economic pretensions, as we've noted http://www.thedeal.com/thedealeconomy/the-continuing-critique-of-economics.php|here and http://pipeline.thedeal.com/tdd/ViewBlog.dl?id=39112|here. But in this column, he dwells on reflexivity generated by human systems when folks believe a prediction may be right, thus either leading to an efficient market or to predictions short-circuited by feedback loops. "The economic world, far more than the physical world, is influenced by our beliefs about it," writes Kay, who is nothing if not nuanced. "It is a mistake to ignore the efficient market; it is also a mistake to take it too seriously." Andrew Sullivan, who does not usually paddle about in such waters (although skepticism about prediction does seem to be part of a certain kind of classical conservatism: If you can't see the future clearly, then be careful of advocating for change), http://andrewsullivan.thedailybeast.com/2011/09/countering-expert-failure.html|gathers up a handful of posts from Robin Hanson's Overcoming Bias http://www.overcomingbias.com/2011/09/predict-yourself.html|on personal prediction models and Erica Grieder at The Economist http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2011/09/perils-prediction|on journalistic prediction. Sullivan asks, "How can we make prediction more valuable?" He then http://thefifthwave.wordpress.com/2011/09/06/analyzing-events/|links to a long and interesting summation of the issues from a blog called The Fifth Wave, which wrestles mostly with the difficulties of applying linear, Newtonian billiard-ball cause-and-effect concepts to nonlinear human events, that is to history. The Fifth Wave in turn links to two other attacks on prediction, Duncan Watts' book "http://www.amazon.com/Everything-Obvious-Once-Know-Answer/dp/0385531680/ref=sr\_1\_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1315241074&sr=1-1|Everything is Obvious," and a book on punditry and its failings by Philip Tetlock, "http://www.amazon.com/Expert-Political-Judgment-Good-Know/dp/0691128715/ref=sr\_1\_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1315241122&sr=1-1|Expert Political Judgment," that suggests that "great experts in world politics have been wrong often enough to put in doubt the whole concept of expertise." No knock on Tetlock, but that was pretty obvious. Still, the Fifth Wave does set up the problem nicely. "In brief, we love to stretch common sense and Newtonian (or billiard-ball) causation beyond the breaking point. When we fail, we take it for granted it was because of insufficient information. This too is a failure of understanding. It's not that we lack enough information, it's that no amount of information can ever be enough. Human events unfold within complex systems governed by weird, nonlinear dynamics. Prediction by means of billiard-ball mechanics is impossible, in principle. Because each complex system develops in unique ways, events are also rarely susceptible to probabilistic analysis. Rightly considered, a question like "Who will win the 2012 presidential elections?" refers to a single token. There have been no previous 2012 presidential elections to average out with this one.

#### Mean’s no risk of the DA

**Shermer 12** (Michael, Founding Publisher and Editor – Skeptic Magazine, “Wrong Again: Why Experts' Predictions Fail, Especially About the Future”, Huffington Post, 1-5, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-shermer/wrong-again-why-experts-p\_b\_1181657.html)

So as 2012 unfolds, most notably with predictions about political elections, beware of the experts on CBS, NBC, ABC, Fox, CNN, and even here at Huffington Post. For the most part these experts are no better than dart-throwing chimps. By contrast, follow the electronic markets that employ the wisdom of the crowd, such as www.intrade.com, whose track record predicting election outcomes far surpasses that of any of the aforementioned sources. Remember this prediction in the months to come: InTrade has Mitt Romney taking the Republican nomination at 79.7% but losing to Barack Obama in the general election by 51.5%.

### Only Econ Fundamentals Matter - A2: Econ Perception Link

#### Perception of economic benefit won’t influence voters unless actual economic recovery occurs

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12429>)

If you focus on the economy, though, the situation looks more complicated. Obama’s NBC/WSJ job rating on handling the economy is 45 percent approval and 57 percent disapproval. Those numbers are less favorable than his overall approval rating. When respondents were asked whether they thought Obama’s policies had helped or hurt economic conditions, or had made no difference at all, 36 percent said they had helped, 30 percent said they made no difference, and 33 percent said they had hurt. Obviously, you can push the “made no difference” group in either direction. But the 63 percent who said that Obama’s policies either made no difference or hurt economic conditions do not bode well for the president. When asked whether they thought the economy would get better, get worse, or stay about the same over the next 12 months, 38 percent said that it would get better, 42 percent said it would stay the same, and 19 percent predicted that things would get worse. With 61 percent believing that the economic picture will either get worse or stay the same, the public clearly remains very nervous about the economy—again, not good news for the president. Respondents were given a choice of 13 positive attributes and asked whether each better describes Obama or Romney; the good news for the president is that the respondents associated 10 attributes more with him than with his challenger. They are, in descending order of advantage: “being easygoing and likable”; “caring about average people”; “being compassionate enough to understand average people”; “dealing with issues of concern to women”; “looking out for the middle class”; “being knowledgeable and experienced enough to be president”; “being consistent and standing up for his beliefs”; “sharing your positions on the issues”; and “being honest and straightforward.” Obama also had a narrow advantage, within the margin of error, on “setting the proper moral tone for the country.” Taken together, the results suggest that Obama’s reelection should be a slam dunk, right? Not necessarily. Although Romney had the advantage on only two attributes, they were “having good ideas for how to improve the economy” (by 6 points) and “changing the business as usual in Washington” (by 7 points). Those sound a lot like central tenets of Obama’s campaign four years ago. So Obama had the advantage on most of the attributes, but Romney led on two of the most important ones. The results aren’t convincing enough to give the advantage to either Romney or Obama. All of these findings reinforce the view that the economy will be a very important factor in the election, regardless of whether it improves or just bumps along. Obama badly needs the country’s economic performance over the next six months to validate his policies and decisions. If the overall economy improves, job creation increases, and consumer confidence goes up, those markers will serve as validation. If the economy is bouncing along, with growth at a subdued level and unemployment still at or above 8 percent—not the 9 percent of a year ago, but hardly in the 7.2-to-7.4 percent range that boosted President Reagan’s 1984 reelection fortunes after the 1982 recession—the public will be in no mood to validate Obama’s policies and decisions. Gallup’s most recent polling suggests that Obama has received a bit of a boost from the decline in gasoline prices; his approval rating bumped up to 50 percent in three consecutive days of Gallup’s three-day moving averages. The bump shows just how volatile public attitudes are, particularly when important economic issues are involved. That volatility isn’t likely to change between now and Election Day. The economy will determine this election.

#### Actual economic conditions on the ground will shape public perceptions

**Cook, 12**

(Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12429>)

The pace of the exceedingly fragile economic recovery over the 204 days between now and the Nov. 6 election is a lot more important than anything that either President Obama or Mitt Romney says over the course of the campaign. How fast the economy grows—measured by change in gross domestic product, in the unemployment rate, and in real personal disposable income, as well as in oil and gasoline prices—will be far more influential than rhetoric in determining whether voters renew Obama’s contract for another four years. If the economy grows, the jobless rate declines, real incomes increase, and gasoline prices drop, Obama’s economic policy would be validated. It would also heal some of the scar tissue of his first two years, when his approval numbers plummeted among independent voters and Democrats were ejected from their House majority. Conversely, if economic growth remains sluggish, the jobless rate stays about the same, voters’ personal finances don’t improve, and gas prices stay high, Obama’s situation would look considerably dimmer. The struggles would reinforce lingering doubts from 2009 and 2010, when voters saw the president and the Democratic Congress as being more focused on health care reform than on a dramatically worsening economy. His reelection hopes would diminish.

#### Economic outcomes on the ground shape voters economic perception of obama

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 3/26, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12306>)

A far more important factor in determining whether voters decide to renew Obama’s contract for another four years is whether they see his stewardship of the economy as a success. Has he done as well as anyone could realistically have done? Or did he have other priorities—like health care—that seemed to merit more attention than dealing with a worsening economic downturn and dramatically escalating unemployment? With each passing week we will get a new crop of statistics that will provide clues as to how the economy is faring. Will the narrative be a continuation of the improvement seen since last fall? Or, will this spurt have been more temporary, bumping against headwinds—in the form of high energy prices, a global economic downturn, and recession in Europe—preventing that pattern from continuing through the November election? How will the economy perform over the seven months between now and the election? Upcoming economic reports are likely to answer the question about whether Obama’s presidency will be judged as a success. The Conference Board on Tuesday will release its latest survey of consumer confidence. On Friday, the Thomson/Reuters/University of Michigan Index of Consumer Sentiment will be released. These are the two most closely watched measures of how Americans see the economy now, and what their expectations are for the coming months. A week from Friday, the March unemployment figures will be reported. Analysts will look to see whether the improvement in the jobless picture seen over the winter will continue or whether it has leveled off. Some speculate that rapidly rising gasoline prices may ease sooner, rather than skyrocketing through the spring and summer, as many have forecasted. Which forecasts turn out to be right will be hugely important both politically and for the economy. Up until now, much of the spike in gas prices has been offset by unusually low heating bills paid during the fourth-warmest winter on record, and the warmest since 1990. The Wall Street research firm ISI Group, as of Oct. 3, had charted 16 out of 20 weeks as having more negative economic news and developments than positive ones. Since October 10, it has marked 25 weeks in a row of more positive than negative news and developments. But it has noted that the positive mix last week was not particularly convincing—a possible sign that the recent upbeat pattern may be breaking up. Right now, a fair number of voters sit on the fence when it comes to assessing Obama’s performance on the economy. They are disappointed that he didn’t do better, but they are unwilling to pass final judgment. How the economy fares in the coming months will determine which side of that fence these voters decide to come down on.

### Thumper – Health Care

#### Health care ruling key – swings election

**Green, 12** (Laura, Washington Bureau, Palm Beach Post, 6/6, lexis)

health law ruling effect to be huge High court's decision this month may sway election Americans will learn in the next few weeks whether they live in a nation in which every citizen is guaranteed health care, and one in which virtually everyone must acquire it or pay a penalty. The U.S. Supreme Court is expected to hand down a landmark ruling by June 30 in the Affordable Care Act case, which was challenged by Florida and 25 other states. The ruling not only will determine the fate of President Obama's signature legislative achievement but conceivably could influence the presidential vote in November. "It could fundamentally change the election," said Robert Jarvis, a law professor at Nova Southeastern University in Davie. "Here we've got President Obama saying, 'This is the major domestic achievement of my administration,' and a few months before the election, the Supreme Court could say (it) is unconstitutional."

### Thumper – Iran Strikes

#### Israeli strikes on Iran coming --- destroys Obama

**Bloice 12** (Carl, Member – National Coordinating Committee and Columnist – Black Commentator, Foreign Policy in Focus, 1-18, http://www.fpif.org/blog/october\_surprise\_by\_israel\_could\_sink\_obamas\_re-election\_chances)

"October Surprise" by Israel Could Sink Obama's Re-election Chances

During the interview at Washington’s Teatro Goldoni restaurant, Brzezinski admitted to having voted for Republicans a couple of times (one being George H.W. Bush). “A good election is one that would shape out in an intelligent victory by Obama,” he said, adding that, however, “There is no sign of that from the other side.” “Which means Obama will win,” asked Luce. Well, not at all, says Brzezinski. “My fear is that two or three weeks before the election something will happen – an October surprise. If Iran were struck by Israelis during October, the negative effects would not be felt until late November and December. The first effect would be, ‘Ah, how wonderful. Let’s get behind the Israelis.’ Then all bets would be off.”

Now, Brzezinski is no peacenik, and most of his policies are not something any progressive could support. The bloody mess in Afghanistan is largely his fault. But when you read his writings or hear him speak you come away confident that he is, for the most part, sane and sensible. His comment about Iran should have made the front pages of the big newspapers – and gone viral on the blogs.

Nobody I know who pays attention to such things imagines that the Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu would launch a strike against Iran without at least the tacit okay from Washington. If Brzezinski thinks it might, that’s scary news.

However, on January 14, the Wall Street Journal reported “U.S. defense leaders are increasingly concerned that Israel is preparing to take military action against Iran, over U.S. objections, and have stepped up contingency planning to safeguard U.S. facilities in the region in case of a conflict.” According to the paper, the alarm grew to the point last week that President Obama got Netanyahu on the telephone and the chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was dispatched this week to Tel Aviv.

“U.S. officials briefed on the military's planning said concern has mounted over the past two years that Israel may strike Iran. But rising tensions with Iran and recent changes at Iranian nuclear sites have ratcheted up the level of U.S. alarm,” said the Journal.

The article’s authors, Adam Entous, Juliane Barnes and Jay Solomon, went on to suggest obliquely –and I think unlikely –that the reason the U.S. is uncertain about Israeli intention is a spy problem. “Some American intelligence officials complain that Israel represents a blind spot in U.S. intelligence, which devotes little resources to Israel,” they wrote. “Some officials have long argued that, given the potential for Israel to drag the U.S. into potentially explosive situations, the U.S. should devote more resources to divining Israel's true intentions.”

Now that’s really scary.

Over at Counterpunch, Alexander Cockburn takes up the questions, “Will Israel attack? Is Obama, coerced by domestic politics in an election year, being dragged into war by the Israel lobby? Will he lunch the bombers? Is the strategy to force Iran into a corner, methodically demolishing its economy by embargoes and sanctions so that in the end a desperate Iran strikes back?”

“As with sanctions and covert military onslaughts on Iraq in the run up to 2003, the first point to underline is that the US is waging war on Iran,” writes Cockburn. “But well aware of the US public’s aversion to yet another war in the Middle East, the onslaught is an undeclared one.”

#### Iran Strikes swamp – whether US gets involved or not

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 5/3, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12454>)

Iran, the Wild Card One distinct possibility in this election year has always been that a major international incident, very possibly in the Middle East, could push a close presidential election decisively in one direction or the other. An air strike by Israel, the United States, or both, against Iran to prevent it from developing a nuclear-weapons capability has been the most widely speculated flash point in the region. Over the past year, Republican presidential candidates have frequently talked about Iran on the campaign trail. More than a few members of the pro-Israel community in the United States see President Obama as an unreliable ally. They view him as much less supportive of Israel than President George W. Bush was. The GOP presidential contenders, with the exception of Rep. Ron Paul, attacked Obama relentlessly on the subject. Just a few months ago, it seemed entirely plausible that Obama could get boxed into supporting such an attack on Iran whether he wanted to or not. An international incident, particularly an attack in the Middle East, could have a huge, but unpredictable, effect on the race between Obama and presumptive GOP nominee Mitt Romney. The very real possibility of a clash with Iran, the general political instability in the region, and turmoil in Yemen and the Sudan, have been major factors in the increase in worldwide oil prices. Thus, the international political situation has contributed to the rise of domestic gasoline prices over the past year, with obvious economic and political implications.

#### Either Israel or US strikes would swing election

**Cook, 12** (Charlie, Cook Political Report, National Journal, 4/12, <http://cookpolitical.com/node/12364>)

Presidential elections have a lot of moving parts. They rarely turn on any single factor or issue. Take, for example, the tensions over Tehran’s nuclear aspirations and the possibility of an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities by either Israel or the United States. In five minutes, the tone and direction of this election could completely change. But of the “known unknowables,” as former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld might say, the big one is what happens with the economy between now and Nov. 6.

## \*\*\*Random/Unrelated\*\*\*

### A2: Transportation funding now

#### Obama hasn’t gotten major new transportation funding initiatives

**Freemark, 12**

Yonah Freemark is an independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, from which he graduated in May 2008 with a BA in architecture. He writes about transportation and land use issues for The Transport Politic and The Infrastructurist, 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become practically impossible to pursue. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate. For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside.

#### Temporary funding extentions lack popular support

**Press Enterprise, 12** (2/9, lexis)

If lawmakers cannot come to an agreement, a temporary extension of the current bill could be approved to keep money flowing to projects. But such stop-gap measures, seen as emblematic of Congress' inability to get anything done, have become increasingly unpopular.

#### No new funding coming now

**Freemark, 12**

Yonah Freemark is an independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, from which he graduated in May 2008 with a BA in architecture. He writes about transportation and land use issues for The Transport Politic and The Infrastructurist, 1/25, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

The prospect of agreement between the two parties on this issue, however, seems far-fetched. That is, if we are to assume that the goal is to complete a new and improved spending bill, rather than simply further extensions of the existing legislation. The House could consider this month a bill that would fund new highways and transit for several more years by expanding domestic production of heavily carbon-emitting fossil fuels, a terrible plan that would produce few new revenues and encourage more ecological destruction. Members of the Senate, meanwhile, have for months been claiming they were “looking” for the missing $12 or 13 billion to complete its new transportation package but have so far come up with bupkis. The near-term thus likely consists of either continued extensions of the current law or a bipartisan bargain that fails to do much more than replicate the existing law, perhaps with a few bureaucratic reforms.
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Maybe the voters are already there, ahead of the money men. From the Associated Press exit polls in Nevada: ECONOMY TOPS FOR MOST: Nevadans face one of the toughest economies in the country, and a majority of participants in today's caucuses said the economy was the issue that made the most difference in their vote. But the issue was cited as tops by fewer people than in Florida, South Carolina or New Hampshire. Romney carried 6 in 10 economy voters, his best showing among this group so far. A sizable one-third called the federal budget deficit the decisive issue in their vote, and these voters were less supportive of Romney.