# Aff

### Obama Lose Now - Laundry List

#### Obama will lose - 10 reasons

Bommarito 7/4 Sal is a writer at Policymic. "10 Reasons Obama Will Lose in November," 2012, http://www.policymic.com/articles/10704/10-reasons-obama-will-lose-in-november

The writing is on the wall: Barack Obama is going to lose the presidential election in November. Mitt Romney’s efforts between now and then will have a relatively minor impact on the voters unless he makes a grave misstep.

Here are the top ten issues that will cause voters to support the alternative candidate. Every issue presented herein is virtually out of the hands of the president and his supporters.

1) The economy. There is not an issue that is going well for Obama in this area. Unemployment will continue to be extremely high when it is announced on Friday. In addition to official unemployment numbers, the situation is exacerbated by a huge number of unemployed workers who have given up their efforts to find employment.

2) Europe. Absolutely nothing will be settled on the continent before our elections. The instability created by the on again, off again negotiations between Euro zone leaders is depressing America. Corporate executives are concerned, stock market investors are skittish and people around the world are wondering why the U.S. is playing no role in the important changes that are happening in Europe. This speaks to the irrelevance of Obama in the deliberations.

3) The stock markets. Middle class investors are still far off their highpoints of wealth accumulation prior to 2008 as exhibited by lower pension and housing valuations. The continued turmoil in the world will result in no meaningful upsurge in the markets before the elections.

4) Inability to lead. Every important issue facing this country is out of the hands of Obama. His leadership is moot as best presented by his totally ineffectual impact on congressional deliberations.

5) Partisanship. Obama has done very little to make Washington a kinder and gentler place. There are very few times in history that our government has been more partisan. Voters will be reminded of this phenomenon every day on TV and ascribe most of the blame for this on Obama, whether it is true or not.

6) Iran. From my perspective, Obama does not have a clue what he should do to temper the Iranian crisis. To make matters worse, he is getting no support from the two countries that could end Iranian aggression, threats and nuclear development - China and Russia. The latter are aware that the U.S. and Obama are weak and indecisive, and hope to further erode U.S. influence in the region. It is doubtful that Obama can even impact the actions of the Israelis, who may take control of the situation in the near future.

7) The “Fast and Furious” debacle. Some people have said Attorney General Eric Holder has not done anything illegal or conspiratorial. It sure does not seem that way. Congress has already embarrassed the AG and the administration, and the former’s decision to play hardball with Congress looks bad for the Obama administration. If he has not done anything wrong, why not give Congress all the information it has requested?

8) Health care. The majority of Americans are not in favor of the current health care law. Now that Chief Justice Roberts has proclaimed it a new tax on Americans, Republicans will make hay on this issue in campaign advertisements.

9) Young, minority and disenfranchised voter apathy. Obama energized all of these groups in 2008. The magic is gone, or should I say the myth of Obama has been debunked. Many voters feel a sense of helplessness and will not vote; the vast majority of these groups would likely support Obama if they did.

10 The conservatives and the Tea Party smell blood. These groups will be totally engaged in November, as they know that Obama is vulnerable. The power of the right was obvious during the Republican primaries. I predict that Tea Party activity in swing states will have a gigantic impact on the elections.

#### Obama will lose - key demographics are defecting

Katsman 7/11 (Abe Katsman, American attorney, consultant, political commentator and writer living in Israel, “Big trouble for Obama: Lessons of presidential reelection history”, <http://blogs.timesofisrael.com/big-trouble-for-obama-lessons-of-presidential-reelection-history/>, 7/11/12, Bhattacharyya)

Let’s take a short break from the back-and-forth arguments on the merits of whether to reelect President Barack Obama or to send him packing after one term. Instead, here’s a different take on how the election is shaping up based on some compelling history and demographic analysis. (Spoiler alert: This analysis does not bode well for the Democrats.) Conventional wisdom holds that it is tough to beat an incumbent president. In a broad sense, that is true: 25 incumbent presidents have stood for reelection; only 9 have lost. But there is a remarkable underlying pattern in American presidential history: While the United States has elected 16 presidents to second terms, in 15 of those cases, the president was reelected by a wider margin than in his first-term election. (The outlier: Woodrow Wilson was re-elected in 1916 by a razor-thin margin in what was essentially a referendum on whether America should enter World War I. His campaign theme: “He kept us out of war.” Eleven weeks into his second term, at Wilson’s urging, the US declared war against Germany. Fascinating history, but I digress.) There is a lesson in that wider-margin-required-for-reelection statistic. Second term presidential candidacies are ultimately a thumbs-up/thumb-down verdict on a president’s first term in office. Either the first term has been successful enough to win over even some of those who voted against the president the first time around, or the president loses. The question in the minds of voters — especially those who did not vote for the incumbent the first time around — boils down to: “Do I want four more years of this?” And in the case of President Obama, who won 53% of the vote last time out, it’s hard to see what segments of the electorate would be clamoring to answer that question in the affirmative at all, let alone in higher percentages than he received in 2008. His job approval numbers are far below that 53% level already. Obama’s 2008 margin of victory was 7%. Now, let’s assume that 2008 Republican voters remain Republican; if just one in 13 Americans who supported Obama switch their vote, he loses. And if he can’t repeat the enthusiastic turnout numbers from various demographics he won in 2008, he’s in even bigger trouble. Ready for some campaign arithmetic? Let’s look at those demographics. First, Obama ’08 spurred a record turnout of black Americans — and an all-time high of 13% of ballots cast — who voted for his historic election at an appropriately historic rate of 96%. Both those numbers will be nearly impossible to duplicate — after all, re-electing the first black president isn’t exactly as monumental as electing him the first time. Furthermore, Obama’s gay marriage endorsement hurts him in the culturally conservative black community, and astronomical unemployment rates, especially for young black men, aren’t going to help. If black turnout drops from 65% to a more normal 58%, and Obama’s vote drops to 90%, that 7% margin of victory instantly shrinks to 5%. The under-30 vote will be another Obama headache. This demographic turned out in droves for Hope and Change, making up 18% of the total vote, and voting more than 2:1 for Obama — worth more than six points of Obama’s seven-point margin. As they’ve graduated into a terrible job market, the under-30 crowd won’t repeat either that turnout or that endorsement of Obama. If one in three of that group’s Obama voters switches sides, the entire six-point Obama advantage disappears. The Jewish vote likely presents still another hurdle for Obama. Jews make up close to 4% of the overall vote (due to ridiculously high participation rates). Jews voted 78%-22% for Obama, accounting for 3 of Obama’s 53%. But Obama’s difficult relationships with Israel and the US economy have disillusioned many Jewish voters. If even one out of three of those Jewish Obama votes become Romney votes, another two points are erased from Obama’s 2008 victory. Whether the demographic is military veterans, white working-class voters, soccer moms, Catholics, Mormons, or Evangelicals, the pattern is repeated. Who is going to vote for Obama in higher numbers than they did in 2008? Two new polls should be particularly worrisome for Obama. Gallup reported yesterday that across 12 swing states, Romney voters are more likely to be “extremely enthusiastic” about voting by an eight-point margin. And the Hill reported its new survey results yesterday showing one in five self-identified Democrats saying that the country had changed for the worse during the Obama administration. Overall, 56 percent of all likely voters see the changes to the country since Obama took office as negative, versus just 35 percent who view them positively. “Do I want four more years of this?” In the face of a limping economy, exploding deficits, and America’s increasingly precarious position on the world stage, it’s hard to believe that Obama can get even all of his own 2008 voters to answer that question in the affirmative, let alone a chunk of those who voted Republican last time. Only nine incumbents have lost bids for reelection. But if America continues its pattern of only reelecting presidents by a wider margin than that of their first term, Obama is about to become number 10.

#### Obama's losing ---funding problems and other factors

Yoshida 7/12, Adam Yoshida is a political commentator and the author of A Land War in Asia and the forthcoming A Thousand Points of Light. He is also a writer for the American Thinker, 7/12/20[Adam, “Obama Campaign Is in Worse Shape Than It Looks” American Thinker, <http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/07/obama_c> ampaign\_is\_in\_worse\_shape\_th an\_it\_looks.html]ADravid

One strains, studying the entire history of presidential elections, to think of a president who was re-elected under such economic conditions as prevail in the U.S. today. Now, with June's campaign finance data trickling out, we can add the grotesque financial mismanagement of the Obama campaign as another factor counting against the president in addition to those historic headwinds. Last time around, Mr. Obama argued that his successful management of his campaign was proof that he was up to the administrative challenges of the presidency. Now, with months of evidence to back us, his opponents can convincingly argue that, in fact, his campaign shares the defects of his administration: out-of-control spending over the long term followed not by spending reductions, but instead by a frantic search for more money, wherever it might be found. We don't know the final numbers for June yet. But here is what we do know. The Romney campaign and the RNC, smashing records, finished the month with around $160 million in cash on hand after raising $106 million over the last month. The Obama campaign raised $71 million in June after finishing May with $109 million in cash on hand. Figuring out the Obama campaign's present cash level is a matter of simple algebra -- $109 million plus $71 million minus X, X being the amount spent in June. How much did Team Obama spend in June? Given that they haven't leaked the figure yet, it stands to reason that whatever the number is, it must be high enough to leave them trailing Team Romney. Based on ad spending and what we know about the Obama campaign's fixed costs, I think that we can make an educated guess. During some weeks in June, the Obama campaign spent as much as $16 million in television advertising. All told, from what figures are publicly available, it seems reasonable to estimate that Obama's June ad spending totaled in the range of $50 million.However, the Obama campaign's fixed expenses are also extremely high. With 700 employees, the campaign is spending at this point around $3 million a month in staff alone. In fact, at earlier points during this campaign, nearly half of Obama's spending was directed towards administrative expenses -- a reflection of a campaign infrastructure that was shaped during a period when they were anticipating raising more than $1 billion for the race. In other words, $60 million is probably a lowball estimate for Obama's June spending, leaving his campaign at a significant cash disadvantage versus the Romney campaign heading into July.By way of comparison, at the end of June 2004, the Bush-Cheney campaign had $63 million in cash on hand to the Kerry campaign's $28 million. For the incumbent to be trailing the challenger by somewhere north of $40 million in cash at this stage of the campaign is a very worrisome thing.This is especially true when one considers some of the other tea leaves. The inability of the Democratic convention to raise money and the resultant need to reduce the scale of the festivities is a prime example of what one would expect to see from a campaign in serious trouble.It has often been remarked upon that Obama has already attended far more fundraisers than any of his predecessors. You can raise only so much money from holding dinners with George Clooney before all of your Hollywood-New York-San Francisco donors are maxed out. If the Obama campaign has another month like June or one that's just slightly worse, the situation for the campaign moves from concerning to dire.If Romney raises another $100 million -- which, given his fundraising surge after the health care decision, he just might -- and Obama raises in the same range, then the former will have $260 million to spend over the month of July and the latter will have around $190 million. Assuming equal ad spending and accounting for the Obama campaign's much higher fixed expenses, let's say that Romney spends $65 million in July and Obama spends $70 million. At that point, you could have an Obama campaign looking into August -- and an onrushing general election campaign -- with an entirely insurmountable cash disadvantage.Now, you can make a convincing argument that a president of sufficient rhetorical force might overcome challenging economic times and win an election. Politicians have been outspent before and won. But let's face it: a guy who is facing terrible economic numbers and who is getting outspent by tens of millions of dollars is going to lose even if he is the most convincing orator since Cicero -- which, to be blunt, this guy is not.Consider the polls. Obama remains effectively tied with Romney in every major poll out in recent days -- Gallup, Rasmussen, ABC, CNN/Opinion Research, Washington Times -- in spite of the fact that the Obama campaign has massively outspent the Romney campaign so far, more or less flooding the airwaves in battleground states with campaign ads. The Romney campaign, while keeping its own powder dry, has been able to maintain parity through the assistance of outside groups, such as Crossroads GPS. I don't think that anyone expects, going forward, Republican Super-PACs and other outside groups to be outspent by Democratic ones, and as things stand today, it looks like the Obama campaign is going to blow what once seemed to be an unbeatable financial lead. Obama himself may well become the first incumbent in the modern era to be outspent, and by a large margin at that.This does not mean, of course, that the election is over. With his chances of winning on the merits or through logistics blown, Obama has just one serious hope for re-election: he needs to find a way to deliver a knock-out blow against Mitt Romney that will lead a majority of Americans to conclude that he is unacceptable as a prospective president. For that reason alone, I am not particularly looking forward to the coming months, as I expect that the Obama campaign's attacks, already typically ugly and deceitful, will become increasingly hateful and shrill and that they will continue up until the last possible moment.Nor should we rule out that, all other things having failed, Obama might use "the Chicago way" to muscle on through. After all, this is a man who -- together with his team -- won most of his elections not at the polls, but rather by disqualifying his opponents from the ballot and having divorce records mysteriously unsealed. The carefully coordinated attack against Governor Romney over his "Swiss bank accounts" will, I am certain, soon give way to darker insinuations perhaps both by the president and by his supporters. Perhaps, as we saw in 2008 with donations made to the campaign from unverified foreign credit cards, when they run out of legitimate money, the campaign will find new sources. We ought not forget the lessons of 2004, when Democratic operatives, with the collusion of parts of the mainstream media, sought to use forged documents to attack the character of President Bush in order to sway the election. They were stopped then only because the new media was ready, willing, and able to refute and respond to their lies. A cornered opponent is more dangerous than any other.

### Obama Lose Now - Polls

#### Obama will lose - polls prove - our evidence cites momentum

Washington Times 7/9 "Obama loses ground to Romney in key measures of poll," 2012, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jul/9/obama-loses-ground-to-romney-in-key-measures-of-po/

Mitt Romney continues to hold a whisker-thin 1-percentage-point lead over President Obama in a head-to-head election match-up, but the former Massachusetts governor is eating into the president’s air of inevitability, according to the latest The Washington Times/JZ Analytics poll released Monday night.

The poll found Mr. Romney leading 43 percent to 42 percent — about the same margin as the poll in May, but Mr. Obama slipped on several key measures, including fewer voters who say they expect him to win, and fewer who say they are voting for him because he’s the best candidate.

Voters, who by a small margin say they agree with the Supreme Court’s ruling upholding health care, still seem in a mood to punish Mr. Obama for it — particularly among independents. The poll found 45 percent of self-identified independents said they are less likely to support the president now after the ruling, compared with 20 percent who said the ruling made them more likely to back him.

John Zogby, the pollster who conducted the survey, said Mr. Obama had been ticking upward in other polling last month, but the health care ruling appears to have arrested that momentum.

The nationwide survey of 800 likely voters was conducted Friday through Sunday, and the findings are in line with other major polls showing a tight race.

In the previous TWT-JZ Analytics Poll, taken in mid-May, Mr. Romney led by less than half a percentage point.

Adding Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson into the mix gives Mr. Obama the edge, 43 percent to 41 percent, over Mr. Romney. Mr. Johnson collects about 4 percent of the vote.

Pollsters say the expectations game plays a big role in predicting election winners. On that score Mr. Obama is doing better than Mr. Romney: 45 percent of voters said they expect the president to win re-election versus 33 percent who say Mr. Romney will win. But in both cases, those numbers are down from the May TWT/JZ Analytics Poll, while the number of those who aren’t sure who will win has risen 8 percentage points, to reach nearly a quarter of all voters.

Democrats were more optimistic about Mr. Obama’s chances than Republicans were optimistic about Mr. Romney‘s, the survey found.

Mr. Zogby said the expectations game is good news for Mr. Obama, and shows Mr. Romney still has some work to do in convincing his party faithful that he is up for the challenge. But he said Mr. Obama also should be worried that he is polling so low overall as an incumbent.

“An incumbent president polling 42 percent at this point in time is not good,” he said.

Mr. Obama also has slipped in one measure of enthusiasm. In the May poll, 64 percent of the president’s supporters said they were backing him because he was the “best candidate,” but that slipped to 57 percent in this survey.

The number voting for him because they dislike Mr. Romney or find Mr. Obama the “lesser of two evils” grew 9 points.

Another piece of news for Mr. Romney came Monday, when the two campaigns announced some of their fundraising numbers. Mr. Romney and his Republican allies reported raising $35 million more in June than Mr. Obama and allied Democratic committees.

The Romney campaign said that fundraising is a signal of discontent with Mr. Obama, on which they hope to capitalize.

### Obama Lose Now - Economy

#### Obama will lose - our evidence is future predictive - even if he's winning now the economy will deteriorate and swing voters to Romney

LoGiurato 7/11 Brett is a writer for the Business Insider. "BBVA Compass: The Deteriorating Economy Means Romney Will Wallop Obama With 53.3% Of The Vote," 2012, http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-romney-election-prediction-economy-jobs-manufacturing-2012-7

The bank BBVA Compass is predicting that Mitt Romney will win the 2012 election as economic conditions continue to deteriorate over the next few months. In a research note Wednesday, the bank said that the current economic conditions favor a victory for President Barack Obama.

However, the bank expects manufacturing activity to slow in the months ahead, causing further sluggish job growth that has become the norm of the past few months. That's why they think Romney will emerge with the presidency: From the note:

#### Voters turning away from Obama---economy

Bennett 7/11, A CNN contributor—Former U.S secretary of education and former director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy—author of many books, including "The Book of Man: Readings on the Path to Manhood.", 7/11/12[William J., “Obama's running out of excuses on economy,” CNN, [http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/11/opinion/bennett-obama-economy-excuses/index.html]ADravid](http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/11/opinion/bennett-obama-economy-excuses/index.html%5dADravid)

(CNN) -- The White House is running out of time, and ideas, for turning the economy around before the fall elections. Almost three years into recovery, the U.S. economy added only 80,000 jobs in June, marking its third consecutive month of poor job growth. The Wall Street Journal noted that the United States gained just 225,000 jobs in the past three months combined, making it the weakest quarter of job growth since the labor market began to recover in 2010. The unemployment rate, still 8.2%, has been stuck above 8% for 41 straight months, the longest streak since the Great Depression. A government report found that 85,000 Americans left the workforce in June to enroll in the Social Security Disability Insurance program. That means that more workers joined the federal government's disability program in June than got new jobs. William Bennett How did the White House respond to the anemic report? "There are no quick fixes to the problems we face that were more than a decade in the making," Alan Krueger, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, said in a written statement. In other words, any chances for economic recovery before the fall elections look slim. More importantly, there is a profound lack of urgency from the White House for any large scale, serious reforms. Obama defends tax plan McConnell: Most tepid recovery In fact, Krueger went on to claim the economy really isn't as bad as we think. "The economy has now added private sector jobs for 28 straight months, for a total of 4.4 million payroll jobs during that period," he said. The obvious problem here is that Obama has been president for more than 40 months. The White House conveniently blames Republicans for decades of lost jobs, but forgets to mention the United States lost 4.3 million jobs in President Obama's first 13 months in office. Krueger concluded, "[I]t is important not to read too much into any one monthly report and it is informative to consider each report in the context of other data that are becoming available." This isn't the first time the White House has used this excuse. In fact, the Romney campaign was quick to put together a list of the 30 times the White House has used this same excuse, dating back to November 2009. Is the White House perhaps telling us something more significant: that we shouldn't read too much into the entire term of Barack Obama's presidency? In Ohio on Friday, Obama excused the jobs report by again claiming he inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression. He added that the jobs report is "a step in the right direction" and that "it's still tough out there." The president appears intellectually and ideologically spent, and it's not just Republicans saying that. Robert Reich, former Secretary of Labor in the Clinton administration, wrote recently, "[T]he excuse is wearing thin. It's his economy now, and most voters don't care what he inherited." He added, "[H]e has to show he understands the depth and breadth of this crisis." It's not so clear the president does. On Monday, he again called to repeal the Bush tax cuts on the highest earners, a contentious partisan issue that the public knows will not be solved before the elections. In his weekly address he continued to push for more construction projects and increased financial aid for college students. Even to Keynesian economists on the left these are hardly bold policies a party can rally behind. The economy is shaping up to be the most important factor of the 2012 elections, yet the president seems content to rest his re-election chances on worn-out, recycled policy proposals and ad hominem attacks on Mitt Romney. It's hard to see how this is a winning strategy.

### Obama Lose Now - Fundraising

#### Obama will lose now - fundraising

AP 7/9 Associated Press. "Romney winning money race," 2012, http://www.timesunion.com/news/article/Romney-winning-money-race-3694646.php

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama on Monday said he raised $71 million in June for his re-election campaign, after Republican candidate Mitt Romney reported $106 million during the same period. It was the second consecutive month that Romney collected more cash and underscores the challenge for Obama ahead of November.

The grim news for Obama came as his campaign officials have publicly worried they were on track to lose the money race. Obama's campaign manager, Jim Messina, said in an email to supporters just three days ago: "Their gap is getting wider, and if it continues at this pace, it could cost us the election."

Obama is fighting on two fronts to keep the presidency: On one hand, he faces Romney's own war chest that pays for campaign operations. On the other, he has to push back against the hundreds of millions of dollars flowing to GOP-aligned "super" political action committees, or PACs, which have aired continual attack ads aimed at Obama and his record.

Indeed, wealthy donors have been instrumental in helping Romney beat Obama. When he broke fundraising records last month, Romney's campaign praised small-dollar donors it said made it possible. But it was actually a small and often wealthy number of donors responsible, with each giving an average of about $2,400, according to an Associated Press analysis.

### Obama Lose Now - Pennsylvania Warrant

#### Obama will lose now - Pennsylvania voter I.D. law dooms him

Andrew-Gee 7/10 Eric Andrew-Gee is a writer at the New Republic. "Will Pennsylvania’s Voter ID Law Cost Obama the Election?," 2012, http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/104814/will-pennsylvania%E2%80%99s-voter-id-law-cost-obama-the-election

Come November, the campaign will have to worry about another factor outside of its control in Pennsylvania, one whose toll will far surpass the number of victims of the recent heat wave: the state’s new voter ID law. The new law is likely to keep hundreds of thousands of voters from the polls, many of whom are likely Obama supporters, jeopardizing the President’s confident march to victory in a state he won easily in 2008.

The consequences could be vast. Pennsylvania has 20 electoral college seats, and as Robert Draper reported in the New York Times Magazine last weekend, the pro-Obama Super PAC Priorities USA believes that “Obama has to keep Pennsylvania in the win column” to get reelected.

THE VOTER ID law, which was passed by a Republican statehouse and will be enforced starting in September, requires voters to show valid photo ID every time they vote. The claim is that stringent rules will prevent voter fraud, particularly voter impersonation—basically, a voter pretending to be another voter.

But in a state where the last recorded case of voter impersonation happened ten years ago, what explains Republicans’ ardor for the cause? In late June, Mike Turzai, Pennsylvania’s Republican House Majority Leader, gaffed his way toward revealing the truth. In the course of listing his party’s recent achievements, Turzai said the voter ID law was “going to allow Governor Romney to win the state of Pennsylvania.”

He couldn’t have been clearer: fighting voter fraud is a fig leaf. The real goal is stealing Pennsylvania’s presidential contest from Barack Obama by suppressing the votes of his supporters. And the scary thing is, they might succeed.

Consider this: A recent study showed that 758,000 registered voters don’t have photo ID issued by the Department of Transportation—the most common form of ID that lets you vote under the new law. That’s 9.2 percent of Pennsylvania voters. In 2008, Obama won the state by 624,551 votes. Right now, his lead in the polls in Pennsylvania is 6 percent. In other words, Pennsylvania’s disenfranchised voters could well tip the scales against the President.

That’s because people without valid ID weren’t all that likely to vote for Romney anyway. A 2006 nationwide study by the Brennan Centre found that 25 percent of black voting-age American citizens did not have government-issued photo ID, compared to just 8 percent of whites. Meanwhile, citizens making less than $35,000—a demographic among whom Romney is not expected to do particularly well—were twice as likely to lack government photo ID as people making over $35,000.

### Obama Lose Now - Turnout

#### Low projected turnouts of young, Hispanic, and Black Voters, the major Obama supporters, make Obama’s reelection unlikely

Gallup 7/13, (Gallup Polls, A polling system for political and economi issues, “Young U.S. Voters' Turnout Intentions Lagging”. 7/13/12 AD. 7/14/12. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/155711/Young-Voters-Turnout-Intentions-Lagging.aspx|Ashwin> Varma)

Fifty-eight percent of U.S. registered voters aged 18 to 29 say they will "definitely vote" this fall, well below the current national average of 78% and far below 18- to 29-year-olds' voting intentions in the fall of 2004 and 2008. The 20-percentage-point deficit for young voters versus the national average compares unfavorably with six- and seven-point deficits in the later stages of the 2004 and 2008 elections, respectively. Turnout intentions are currently lower among all registered voters than they were in the month before the last two elections, with 78% saying they will definitely vote, compared with figures of at least 85% in October/November 2004 and 2008. This partly reflects the normal pattern in which fewer voters say they will definitely vote in the late spring and early summer months than in the fall of an election year. However, a comparison of similarly timed data in the 2004 and 2008 elections still suggests turnout levels this year may not match those from the last two elections. In June 2004 (80%) and June 2008 (82%), slightly more registered voters said they would definitely vote than the 78% who do so now.¶ Young voters were one of the key groups in President Obama's winning 2008 coalition. They widely support the president this year as well, but historically their turnout levels usually lag behind those of other groups. Thus, the question surrounding young voters is not so much that they will support as whether they will officially register that support in the voting booth. Racial and ethnic minorities are another subgroup whose higher turnout in 2008 helped Obama win the presidency. This is especially true for blacks, whose support for Obama exceeded 90%. The percentage of blacks who say they will definitely vote is similar to the national average this year (76% versus 78%), as it was in prior years. However, as with most other groups, it is lower now than it was in the fall of 2004 and 2008. It is unclear whether the percentage of black registered voters who say they will definitely vote will increase significantly over the course of the campaign, as occurred for young voters in the past two campaigns. In June 2008, 84% of black registered voters said they would definitely vote, compared with 87% at the end of the campaign, suggesting little change over time. In 2004, however, black voting intentions did increase significantly from June (78%) to October (88%).¶ Hispanic registered voters, who currently support Obama by more than a 2-to-1 margin, are, along with 18- to 29-year-olds, one of the groups with the lowest expected turnout. Currently, 64% of Hispanic voters say they will definitely vote, 14 points below the national average. In the fall of 2008, Hispanic turnout intentions were eight points below the national average. Gallup does not have data on Hispanic turnout intentions prior to October 2008, so it is unclear how the current figures compare to the summer of 2004 or 2008.With Obama maintaining just a slight advantage over Mitt Romney in registered voters' presidential preferences, the election result could be decided by turnout. The challenge for Obama is that many of his strongest support groups, including young adults, blacks, and Hispanics, have historically turned out to vote at lower rates than other subgroups. So maintaining a relatively high level of turnout among these groups is a key to Obama's winning a second term. This preliminary look at the data suggests young voters will not turn out at the same rate as in 2008, even if they show an expected increase in voting intention over the course of the campaign. Black turnout appears as though it will be similar to that for all voters, though participation among Hispanics could be lower. Turnout among all voters in 2012 may also be lower than in the past two presidential elections, both of which had above-average turnout from a historical perspective.

### Thumpers

#### Tons of thumpers - economy, unemployment, Fast and Furious, and international turmoil

Kass 6/24 John is a writer for the Chicago Tribune. "This election, being Obama is bad, but being the non-Obama won't help Romney

," 2012, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/columnists/ct-met-kass-0624-20120625,0,7364096.column

And more trouble is ahead for Obama. The economy remains stagnant, and unemployment numbers are outrageously high — not the 8 percent or so that seems to be the accepted figure, but higher, with so many just giving up and dropping out of the jobs market and out of the statistics. For the first time in the postwar era, American families face the reality that the children might not have better opportunities than their parents.

Meanwhile, the Operation Fast and Furious scandal gets hotter, the Middle East is roiling, Europe trembles, the Greek welfare state is at the verge of political and social collapse. So Obama's media mouthpieces were sent out to beat the bushes that the U.S. is not Greece, and that we should boldly pin our ears back and spend, spend, spend our way back to paradise.

#### Obama's pushing taxes now - that alienates the electorate

Stirewalt 7/12 Chris is a writer at Fox News. "Romney Keeps it Simple: Obama is a Tax and Spend Liberal," 2012, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/07/12/romney-keeps-it-simple-obama-is-tax-and-spend-liberal/

President Obama has a very complicated argument to make as he works to sell his plan for higher taxes on top earners.

Calling for higher taxes on anyone in an election year during a fresh economic slowdown is tough. Obama and his campaign may be having some success in stoking resentment at the rich in general and Republican Mitt Romney specifically, but when Democrats talk about raising taxes, voters get anxious. It reinforces the most unpopular part of the blue team’s brand: tax-and-spend liberalism, a label that could prove toxic to Obama’s re-election hopes.

### Too Early to Call

#### Too early to call - black swans will always alter the outcome - empirically proven

Greensfield 5/1 (Jeff, 5/1/12, “Why 2012 election predictions are rubbish: Fear the Black Swan!”, Yahoo News, <http://news.yahoo.com/why-2012-predictions-are-rubbish--fear-the-black-swan-.html>. Mr. Greensfield is a political correspondent for Yahoo News.)

You want to know who’s going to be the next president of the United States? Happy to oblige. Just tell me who’s going to win Ohio. No Republican has ever won the White House without winning Ohio. And only one Democrat has done it—JFK by a whisker—in the past 50 years. Or tell me what will happen to real personal income growth in the third quarter of 2012. Or tell me what the jobless rate will be in the fall, since (all together now), no incumbent since FDR has been re-elected when the unemployment rate has been higher than 7.2 percent. What’s that? You can’t do that because it’s only April? That doesn’t stop an army of soothsayers — including ones at Yahoo! — from offering up formulas to calculate, with scientific precision, the shape of the November vote. As common-sense guides, they make sense: incumbents and incumbent parties suffer when the economy is bad; a deeply divided party has a hard time winning a general election. As “laws” with the predictive capacity of knowing when ice melts ... not so much. (Back in 2000, the most trusted academic models of the election forecast a comfortable-to-overwhelming Democratic popular vote victory based on the glowing economy; what we got was an effective tie). I received an early lesson in caution after boldly predicting that John Lindsay would win the White House in 1972. Even stronger lessons were provided over the years by the appearance of a hugely influential factor in Presidential elections: the Black Swan. The term comes, not from that Natalie Portman ballet movie, but from a best-selling book in 2007 by Nassim Nicholas Taleb that examines our persistent “ability” to ignore the potentially huge effects of unlikely, random events. Given what happened a year later--when we woke up on a mid-September day to find the financial universe on the brink of collapse--the book seemed prescient. In political terms, “Black Swans” have shown up often enough to make even the boldest soothsayer hold his tongue. Think back to 1960, when Republicans could still compete for the black vote, and when an influential figure like Martin Luther King Sr. endorsed Richard Nixon out of concern about a Catholic in the White House. Then, on October 25, King’s son was arrested on a bogus parole-violation charge and transferred to a rural state prison where, his family feared, his life might be endangered. After John Kennedy called King’s wife, and Robert Kennedy called the governor of Georgia (and after Richard Nixon’s efforts to have the Justice Department intercede were ignored), King was released, and his father announced he was transferring his "suitcase full of votes” to Kennedy. On Election Day, black voters were crucial to Kennedy’s razor-thin margins not just in Illinois (8,000 controversially counted votes), but also in Michigan, New Jersey and Missouri. Or consider 1968, when Hubert Humphrey had closed the once-cavernous gap between himself and Richard Nixon. With days to go before Election Day, the United States and North Vietnam were very close to an agreement on peace negotiations. Thanks to the intervention by Anna Chennault, an unofficial but well-connected Nixon campaign emissary, the South Vietnamese government balked. Had that deal been concluded by the Lyndon B. Johnson administration, there’s good reason to think that Vice President Humphrey would have won the election. Go back to the last days of the 2000 campaign, and the disclosure of a drunk-driving arrest of a young George W. Bush. Karl Rove maintained that the story cost Bush the popular vote by keeping a few million evangelicals away from the polls. And for Democrats, that butterfly ballot in Palm Beach County will always be a Black Swan of pterodactyl-sized proportions. Or look again at the financial collapse of mid-September 2008. I’m skeptical of claims that John McCain could have won that contest under any circumstances, given the financial resources of Barack Obama’s campaign and the country’s unhappiness with President Bush. Without question, though, the fear of economic meltdown meant a shift in the tenor of the campaign, one that that redounded in Obama’s favor. Not every late-breaking event changes the outcome of an election. John Kerry believed that the release of an Osama Bin Laden video just before the 2004 election cost him the White House; I lean more toward a superior get-out-the-vote operation in Ohio by the Bush campaign. And it’s not that fundamental things don’t apply. If you think in terms of probabilities rather than predictive certainty, the fall economic data is a sound guide for placing bets. But until someone can take a quick trip into the future and tell me how Ohio’s going to vote, I’ll say no sooth.

### Link N/U - Spending Now

#### The link's REALLY nonunique - Obama's already increased the debt by over 5 trillion

Jeffrey 7/12 Terence is a writer at CNS News. "The $64,000 Question: How Much Has Debt Increased Per Taxpayer Under Obama?" 2012, http://cnsnews.com/news/article/64000-question-how-much-has-debt-increased-taxpayer-under-obama

(CNSNews.com) - The national debt has now increased by more than $64,000 per federal taxpayer since Barack Obama was inaugurated president.

At the close of business on Jan. 20, 2009, according to the U.S. Treasury, the total debt of the federal government was $10,626,877,048,913.08. By the close of business on July 10, 2012, that debt had climbed to $15,885,854,755,351.47—an increase of $5,258,977,706,438.39.

### Link Turn - Generic

#### Transportation infrastructure is key to Obama victory - the public loves it

HNTB 12 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 18, http://www.hntb.com/news-room/news-release/americans-value-highways-and-bridges-as-a-national-treasure

KANSAS CITY, Mo. (May 18, 2012) – A new survey from HNTB Corporation finds two-thirds (66 percent) of Americans who intend to vote during this year's presidential election feel that a candidate's standing on American transportation infrastructure will influence their decision; more than one in five (22 percent) say this will be extremely influential on who they vote for.

"Our highways, bridges and other transportation infrastructure are essential assets that support growth and investment in the U.S. economy," said Pete Rahn, HNTB leader national transportation practice. "People expect them to be resilient, reliable and safe."

Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways.

Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The Highway Trust Fund – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds.

More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded.

The uncertainty over a long-term bill also is a challenge for state departments of transportation, which rely heavily on federal funding to support major highway and bridge programs, and creates ambiguity for planners and contractors who need the certainty of a long-term bill to commit to large, complex multiyear projects.

"The absence of a long-term bill is hurting our economic competitiveness," said Rahn. "Recent efforts by the House and Senate to move discussions into a conference committee and hammer out potential details of a bill are a step in the right direction, but what’s really needed is a stable, long-term authorization that can adequately pay for our transportation system."

Overall, 4 in 5 (80 percent) Americans would rather increase funding and improve roads and bridges than continue current funding levels and risk allowing our roads and bridges deteriorate.

#### The public loves transportation infrastructure investment

HNTB 12 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. "Tolling the distance to fund U.S. transportation," May 31, http://www.hntb.com/news-room/news-release/tolling-the-distance-to-fund-us-transportation

KANSAS CITY, Mo. (May 31, 2012) – Infrastructure is on the minds of the American public. According to a survey from HNTB Corporation, nearly 9 in 10 (87 percent) agree transportation funding is a public investment worth making.

"Americans value infrastructure and are willing to invest in projects that make a difference in their communities," said Pete Rahn, HNTB leader national transportation practice. "Transportation improvements create jobs, encourage development and ease congestion."

According to the Federal Highway Administration, in 2007 every $1 billion in federal highway expenditures supported about 30,000 jobs: 10,300 in construction, 4,675 in supporting industries and another 15,094 in induced employment.

This sentiment also is borne out by the results of many local transportation-related election issues, which historically pass more than 73 percent of the time.

Yet few are willing to pay more in gas taxes, the traditional form of revenue for surface transportation projects at the state and federal levels. Perhaps this is because approximately half of Americans (51 percent) are not confident that they taxes they pay to build interstates are making a difference.

A recent report issued from the Miller Center at the University of Virginia and a bipartisan conference, including former U.S. Secretaries of Transportation Norman Mineta and Samuel Skinner, acknowledged this lack of confidence and the need to better articulate the positive stories generated by such investment in communities’ economic competitiveness and quality of life.

Many are driven toward tolls to pay for such projects. In fact, more than 3 in 5 (61 percent) Americans would prefer to get additional infrastructure funds through tolls rather than an increased federal gas tax or a vehicle miles driven user fee. And 37 percent would be willing to pay more tolls in order to improve interstate highways, while just 17 percent would pay additional gas taxes.

"We need to tap into alternative revenue sources," Rahn said. "Tolling is an important part of the mix, but we also should recognize one sized doesn’t fit all. All options should be on the table, and we should do more to educate the public on where public-private partnerships, state infrastructure banks, alternative bond programs and other sources of revenue are making a positive difference."

While there may be a need to tell transportation's story more effectively, the general public does believe in the value of a national transportation program.

#### Infrastructure spending is a political win for Obama - recaptures key voters

Cooper 12 (Donna, Senior Fellow at American Progress, 1/20/12, “Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

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. Just as the creation of our middle class finds it roots, in part, in the building of our infrastructure, so too is the restoration of our infrastructure essential to the restoration of the breadth and vibrancy of America’s middle class.

### Link Turn - Unemployment

#### Obama needs a job creation program to win the election

Ruggiero 7/11 Russell is a writer at the Examiner. "Its Obama’s Race to Lose: Closer than 2008," 2012, http://www.examiner.com/article/its-obama-s-race-to-lose-closer-than-2008

No surprises here, President Obama faces a tougher road to the White House than in 2008. Mitt Romney is doing a good job in raising cash, and the June 8.2% unemployment report added more momentum to his presidential bid. With some good strategic moves by the challenger we could have a real race on our hands. However, more hoping that economy improves (Democrats) or hoping the economy decelerates (Republicans) will be needed to determine an ultimate winner. The key topic is still how to create long-term well-paying jobs. Bain Capital may be a current jab by the Democratic Political Machine, but President Obama needs to show how his team can win with a positive agenda like creating a new Job Creation Program that could gain bipartisan support. It is ideas like these that will determine the outcome on November 6.

#### That's the plan

Bivens and Pollack 10 (Josh Bivens, <http://www.epi.org/people/josh-bivens/>, Ethan Pollack, <http://www.epi.org/people/ethan-pollack/>, “An analysis of Transportation for America’s Jobs Proposals”, <http://www.epi.org/publication/ib271/>, 2/4/10, Bhattacharyya)

A year ago Congress passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), a $787 billion jobs package designed to mitigate the severity and length of the current recession. One of the key components of the Recovery Act was investments in transportation infrastructure. These investments provided high economic benefits per dollar by putting people back to work and boosting consumer demand. A year later it is clear that the Recovery Act was successful—the Congressional Budget Office recently reported that the Recovery Act boosted gross domestic product (GDP) by 2.2 percentage points in both the second and third quarter of last year, and most independent analysts conclude that the economy would have lost between 1 and 1.5 million more jobs without the legislation (Bivens 2009). But with continuing job losses, unemployment projected to rise for at least another six months, and a 10.6 million job gap, it is clear that more needs to be done. This Issue Brief considers the job impacts of infrastructure investments, specifically in terms of the repair and maintenance of highways, bridges, and public transit, the preservation of existing transit jobs and services, and the expansion of access to jobs resulting from enhanced public transportation. This analysis examines a proposal by Transportation for America, which is consistent with the basic job-creation proposals found in EPI’s American Jobs Plan. The Transportation for America jobs package would allocate $34.3 billion more to highways, mass transit, high- speed rail, buses, and bike/pedestrian routes. This analysis looks at how many and what kinds of jobs this type of investment would create, and how that mix of jobs compares to the overall economy. It also looks at where these jobs are created by region, state, and urban/suburban/rural. Overall, the $34.3 billion jobs package will create approximately 480,000 direct and indirect jobs. This does not include “re-spending” jobs, which would make the job impact considerably higher. This investment would disproportionately benefit those hardest hit by the recession, providing a higher proportion of jobs to low-wage workers and workers without a college degree relative to the overall economy. The investment would disproportionately create jobs for African Americans and Hispanics relative to their employment levels in the overall economy.

### Link Turn - HSR

#### HSR's popular with the American public

HNTB 10 (HNTB Corporation is an employee-owned infrastructure firm serving public and private owners and contractors, “America’s high-speed rail aspirations remain strong”, <http://www.hntb.com/news-room/news-release/america%E2%80%99s-high-speed-rail-aspirations-remain-strong>, 2/18/10, Bhattacharyya)

New America THINKS survey results from HNTB Corporation illustrate transit and passenger rail remain top of mind after the Obama administration’s $8 billion high-speed rail grant announcement last month. Nearly nine in ten (88 percent) Americans are currently open to high-speed rail travel for long-distance travel within the United States. While this is a strong majority, that support is down slightly from the 94 percent America THINKS recorded in March 2009. “The time has come for high-speed rail,” said Peter Gertler, HNTB high-speed rail services chair. “Stimulus money is seeding initial projects. It’ll be up to those of us in the industry – working in partnership with transportation agencies and elected officials – to keep up the momentum.” Gertler said such advocacy efforts are crucial at a time general excitement about high-speed rail has slowed. Americans were far more likely to choose high-speed rail over driving or flying for a trip to a city in their region in March 2009 than February 2010 (54 percent versus 38 percent). “The pain we all felt when gasoline was hovering near $4 a gallon has receded,” Gertler said. “Yet we can’t stand by for the next crisis to hit to address the underlying issues of congestion and our dependency on limited fossil fuels.” While general interest may have slowed, there’s still a great deal of support for passenger rail enhancements overall. More than four in five (83 percent) Americans agree public transit and high-speed rail infrastructure should receive a larger share of federal funding than they do now. “While our interstate highways empowered economic growth and development during the last 50 years, we can no longer simply build our way out of congestion and conservation problems,” Gertler said. “Establishing a long-term multi-modal transportation vision that includes rail is crucial.”Liz Rao, HNTB national public transit services chair, agreed. “The U.S. Department of Transportation recently shifted its criteria when evaluating transit proposals for federal funding to consider environmental and economic development benefits as well as congestion relief. Such a focus will allow us to improve our communities’ quality of life as well as make better use of limited resources.”

#### Americans Support the HSR Initiative

ARPU Poll 2010, (Angus Reid Public Opinion Poll, Nation-wide Poll on High Speed Rail, “Half of Americans Support Obama’s High-Speed Rail Plan”. 4/6/10 AD. 7/12/12. http://www.visioncritical.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/2010.04.06\_Trains\_USA.pdf|Ashwin)

Many Americans are supportive of a government-proposed plan to build high-speed rail corridors in certain regions of ¶ the country, a new Angus Reid Public Opinion poll has found. ¶ In the online survey of a representative national ¶ sample of 1,005 American adults, 49 per cent of respondents support President Barack Obama’s recently announced plan to create the high-speed rail corridors. A quarter of Americans (26%) do not back this proposal. ¶ As part of this survey, respondents were shown a ¶ map that displays the 10 proposed regional highspeed rail corridors. They were then asked to ¶ choose their preferred mode of transport if they ¶ had to travel between some of the cities included ¶ in the proposal. ¶ While 35 per cent of respondents say they would ¶ pick the car to travel between these cities, one third of Americans (32%) say they would prefer to ¶ travel in a high-speed train. Only 16 per cent ¶ would fly to their destination, and only three per ¶ cent would take the bus.¶

#### National HSR Popularity still over 80%-people believe Obama should give funding

Shanan 2010, (Zachary Shanan, Environmental Analyst, “83% of Americans Think More Money Should Go to High Speed Rail”. 3/28/10 AD. 7/12/12. http://cleantechnica.com/2010/02/28/88-of-americans-like-high-speed-rail/|Ashwin)

Surprisingly, after Obama’s announcement to give $8 billion to High Speed Rail (HSR) projects across the country, popular support for HSR has dropped, but it is still 88%. Not bad.¶ Of course, more money is needed to make HSR the reality people dream of.¶ A new survey shows that 83% of people think HSR and mass transit should be getting more money.¶ A survey in March of last year by HNTB called “America THINKS” found that 94% of Americans were “open to high-speed rail travel for long-distance travel within the United States” and this year’s version of it (conducted last month and just out) finds that support is down to 88%.¶ Clearly, though, this is still very high.¶ “The time has come for high-speed rail,” says Peter Gertler, HNTB high-speed rail services chair. “Stimulus money is seeding initial projects. It’ll be up to those of us in the industry – working in partnership with transportation agencies and elected officials – to keep up the momentum.”¶ The bottom line is, we have issues concerning pollution and the price of fuel that don’t seem to be going away anytime soon. And even beyond fuel, driving is very “expensive” in time costs in many places — it is not an efficient way to travel around a very populated place. The definition of a populated place is a lot of people in a relatively small area. Giving everyone a large vehicle of their own to move around in is not going to be the best solution.¶ And going from one populated place to another in the same region is better served by fast, mass transit in many instances as well.¶ Of course, we need a lot of funding to go towards high-quality HSR and mass transit if we are going to ever have a more efficient transportation system. But the public seems to be in support of this. 83% (more than 4 out of 5) people support a larger share of federal funding going towards mass transit and HSR infrastructure — they agree that this shift needs to occur. So, hopefully we will see it happen.¶

#### There's massive public demand for HSR

Independent 11 (The Independent, British national morning newspaper published in London by Independent Print Limited, “US official touts high-speed rail at tourism meet”, <http://www.independent.co.uk/travel/news-and-advice/us-official-touts-highspeed-rail-at-tourism-meet-2286663.html>, 5/19/12, Bhattacharyya)

US Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood on Wednesday touted high-speed rail as key to meeting future US transport needs that will also give America greater tourist appeal. "This is what Americans want - high-speed rail built by Americans for Americans," he told a gathering of travel and tourism industry leaders. The administration of President Barack Obama has budgeted $10 billion for investments in high-speed rail systems to connect major urban centers with a goal of serving 80 percent of the population in 25 years. These include corridors along the east coast linking Boston to Washington, Detroit and Chicago in the midwestern region and Los Angeles to Las Vegas. LaHood said the Transportation Department also is pushing interconnectivity of different transportation systems, so a traveler arriving at a US airport would be able to seamlessly move to rail, metro and bus to their destination. He brushed aside political resistance from some conservatives, despite the refusal of governors in three states to accept the federal funds for high speed rail projects. "There is a pent-up demand in America for high-speed rail," said LaHood, who is a Republican. "There is a lot of disappointment in those states for the fact that they didn't get the money." "High-speed rail is coming to America and it will be good for all of you in the hospitality industry," he said. But some participants to the Global Travel and Tourism Summit, which includes top tourism officials and travel chief executives, suggested that the administration has been slow to recognize the looming opportunities in international travel. "There is a general lack of understanding," one participant told LaHood in a question and answer session, complaining about the administration's focus on side issues like travelers' rights. "And I think your role is to get Congress to focus on the things that will really have a lasting impact instead of trying to enter in the margins with something that competition is going to correct anyway," he said. They have cautioned that the United States needs to prepare now to capture a growing flood of tourists from newly emergent powers like China, India and Brazil.

### Link Turn - Amtrak

#### Amtrak’s popularity hitting new highs

AMTRAK 2012, (AMTRAK, Public Release, “AMTRAK ON PACE TO SET NEW RIDERSHIP RECORD”. 4/11/12 AD. 7/12/12. http://www.amtrak.com/servlet/BlobServer?blobcol=urldata&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobkey=id&blobwhere=1249239875207&blobheader=application%2Fpdf&blobhead|Ashwin)

Amtrak is on pace to set another new annual ridership record as ¶ passenger counts across its national network for the first six months of fiscal year 2012 (October ¶ 2011 – March 2012) are up 3.7 percent over the same period last year when the current record ¶ was established. ¶ A closer look at the numbers show all Amtrak business lines experienced growth in the ¶ first half of FY 2012 as compared to the same period the prior year, including the Northeast ¶ Corridor (up 5.2 percent), long-distance trains (up 3.0 percent) and state-supported and other ¶ short-distance routes (up 2.7 percent.) This ridership growth continues a long-term trend that ¶ has led to eight records in the last nine years, including 30.2 million passengers in FY 2011. ¶ “Amtrak achieving ridership records is important, but it is more critical that the right ¶ infrastructure be in place to continue this trend in the years to come and to provide safe, efficient ¶ and reliable rail transportation for all current and future passengers,” said President and CEO Joe ¶ Boardman. “To do this in the Northeast, we must advance our proposed Gateway Program, as it ¶ is essential for the future growth and economic development of the entire region.” ¶ Essential for the future growth and economic development of the entire region.” ¶ Boardman explained the Northeast Corridor (NEC) in particular has seen strong ridership ¶ growth in recent years and demand for passenger rail service on this line is expected to ¶ significantly increase as population grows, highway and airport congestion worsen, and gas ¶ prices rise throughout the region. He added that Amtrak is preparing to meet these challenges by ¶ beginning work on a comprehensive, long-term plan to improve the NEC and expand high-speed ¶ rail service, including through its Gateway Program to build increased tunnel, track and station ¶ capacity into the heart of New York City for intercity and commuter trains. ¶ The regional highlights below (and the attached ridership chart) show both the breadth ¶ and depth of increased Amtrak ridership across the country:

### AT: CTBT - No ! to Prolif

#### No risk of prolif, it wouldn’t cause a chain reaction, and it would be slow at worst - your evidence is alarmism

Gavin 10 (Francis, Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law @ the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs @ the University of Texas at Austin, “Sam As It Ever Was; Nuclear Alarmism, Proliferation, and the Cold War,” Lexis)

Fears of a tipping point were especially acute in the aftermath of China's 1964 detonation of an atomic bomb: it was predicted that India, Indonesia, and Japan might follow, with consequences worldwide, as "Israel, Sweden, Germany, and other potential nuclear countries far from China and India would be affected by proliferation in Asia." 40 A U.S. government document identified "at least eleven nations (India, Japan, Israel, Sweden, West Germany, Italy, Canada, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia)" with the capacity to go nuclear, a number that would soon "grow substantially" to include "South Africa, the United Arab Republic, Spain, Brazil and Mexico." 41 A top-secret, blue-ribbon committee established to craft the U.S. response contended that "the [1964] Chinese nuclear explosion has increased the urgency and complexity of this problem by creating strong pressures to develop independent nuclear forces, which, in turn, could strongly influence the plans of other potential nuclear powers." 42 These predictions were largely wrong. In 1985 the National Intelligence Council noted that for "almost thirty years the Intelligence Community has been writing about which nations might next get the bomb." All of these estimates based their largely pessimistic and ultimately incorrect estimates on factors such as the increased "access to fissile materials," improved technical capabilities in countries, the likelihood of "chain reactions," or a "scramble" to proliferation when "even one additional state demonstrates a nuclear capability." The 1985 report goes on, "The most striking characteristic of the present-day nuclear proliferation scene is that, despite the alarms rung by past Estimates, no additional overt proliferation of nuclear weapons has actually occurred since China tested its bomb in 1964." Although "some proliferation of nuclear explosive capabilities and other major proliferation-related developments have taken place in the past two decades," they did not have "the damaging, systemwide impacts that the Intelligence community generally anticipated they would." 43 In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that "the pace of proliferation has been much slower than anticipated by most." The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability "never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program." If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, "the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today." 44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently "exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation." 45 Nor is there compelling evidence that a nuclear proliferation chain reaction will ever occur. Rather, the pool of potential proliferators has been shrinking. Proliferation pressures were far greater during the Cold War. In the 1960s, at least twenty-one countries either had or were considering nuclear weapons research programs. Today only nine countries are known to have nuclear weapons. Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Libya, South Africa, Sweden, and Ukraine have dismantled their weapons programs. Even rogue states that are/were a great concern to U.S. policymakers--Iran, Iraq, Libya, and North Korea--began their nuclear weapons programs before the Cold War had ended. 46 As far as is known, no nation has started a new nuclear weapons program since the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. 47 Ironically, by focusing on the threat of rogue states, policymakers may have underestimated the potentially far more destabilizing effect of proliferation in "respectable" states such as Germany, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan.

#### No chain reactions – the domino effect never occurs

Alagappa ‘8 (Muthiah – distinguished senior fellow at the East-West Center, The Long Shadow, p. 521-522)

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventive action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India's and Pakistan's nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran's quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country's security concerns about the United States and Tehran's regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S. Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in its political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not **spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability**. The point is that each country's decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. **Though appealing, the domino theory is not predictive**; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of **alarmist predictions**. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia. In fact the so-called dominos became drivers of a vibrant Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that subregion (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in **accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation**. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

### AT: Warming - Not Real/Anthropogenic

#### Warming isn't happening, it's not anthropogenic, and it won't cause extinction

Happer 3/27 (William, Professor of Physics @ Princeton, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the George C. Marshall Institute, Cyrus Fogg Brackett Professor of Physics @ Princeton University, Former Director of Energy Research @ the Department of Energy, " Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again," 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj, EMM)

What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979. The lack of any statistically significant warming for over a decade has made it more difficult for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and its supporters to demonize the atmospheric gas CO2 which is released when fossil fuels are burned. The burning of fossil fuels has been one reason for an increase of CO2 levels in the atmosphere to around 395 ppm (or parts per million), up from preindustrial levels of about 280 ppm. CO2 is not a pollutant. Life on earth flourished for hundreds of millions of years at much higher CO2 levels than we see today. Increasing CO2 levels will be a net benefit because cultivated plants grow better and are more resistant to drought at higher CO2 levels, and because warming and other supposedly harmful effects of CO2 have been greatly exaggerated. Nations with affordable energy from fossil fuels are more prosperous and healthy than those without. The direct warming due to doubling CO2 levels in the atmosphere can be calculated to cause a warming of about one degree Celsius. The IPCC computer models predict a much larger warming, three degrees Celsius or even more, because they assume changes in water vapor or clouds that supposedly amplify the direct warming from CO2. Many lines of observational evidence suggest that this "positive feedback" also has been greatly exaggerated. There has indeed been some warming, perhaps about 0.8 degrees Celsius, since the end of the so-called Little Ice Age in the early 1800s. Some of that warming has probably come from increased amounts of CO2, but the timing of the warming—much of it before CO2 levels had increased appreciably—suggests that a substantial fraction of the warming is from natural causes that have nothing to do with [hu]mankind.

#### Any warming their evidence cites isn't anthropogenic and the overall warming trend has reversed

Leake 10 (Jonathan, Times Online, Citing John Christy of the UA Huntsville, a former author for the IPCC, “World may not be warming, say scientists,” 2-14, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7026317.ece?print=yes&randnum=1269060067737>, EMM)

The United Nations climate panel faces a new challenge with scientists casting doubt on its claim that global temperatures are rising inexorably because of human pollution. In its last assessment the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) said the evidence that the world was warming was “unequivocal”. It warned that greenhouse gases had already heated the world by 0.7C and that there could be 5C-6C more warming by 2100, with devastating impacts on humanity and wildlife. However, new research, including work by British scientists, is casting doubt on such claims. Some even suggest the world may not be warming much at all. “The temperature records cannot be relied on as indicators of global change,” said John Christy, professor of atmospheric science at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, a former lead author on the IPCC. The doubts of Christy and a number of other researchers focus on the thousands of weather stations around the world, which have been used to collect temperature data over the past 150 years. These stations, they believe, have been seriously compromised by factors such as urbanisation, changes in land use and, in many cases, being moved from site to site. Christy has published research papers looking at these effects in three different regions: east Africa, and the American states of California and Alabama. “The story is the same for each one,” he said. “The popular data sets show a lot of warming but the apparent temperature rise was actually caused by local factors affecting the weather stations, such as land development.” The IPCC faces similar criticisms from Ross McKitrick, professor of economics at the University of Guelph, Canada, who was invited by the panel to review its last report. The experience turned him into a strong critic and he has since published a research paper questioning its methods. “We concluded, with overwhelming statistical significance, that the IPCC’s climate data are contaminated with surface effects from industrialisation and data quality problems. These add up to a large warming bias,” he said. Such warnings are supported by a study of US weather stations co-written by Anthony Watts, an American meteorologist and climate change sceptic. His study, which has not been peer reviewed, is illustrated with photographs of weather stations in locations where their readings are distorted by heat-generating equipment. Some are next to air- conditioning units or are on waste treatment plants. One of the most infamous shows a weather station next to a waste incinerator. Watts has also found examples overseas, such as the weather station at Rome airport, which catches the hot exhaust fumes emitted by taxiing jets. In Britain, a weather station at Manchester airport was built when the surrounding land was mainly fields but is now surrounded by heat-generating buildings. Terry Mills, professor of applied statistics and econometrics at Loughborough University, looked at the same data as the IPCC. He found that the warming trend it reported over the past 30 years or so was just as likely to be due to random fluctuations as to the impacts of greenhouse gases. Mills’s findings are to be published in Climatic Change, an environmental journal. “The earth has gone through warming spells like these at least twice before in the last 1,000 years,” he said.

### AT: Warming - No Extinction

#### Warming won't cause extinction

NIPCC, panel of nongovernmental scientists and scholars created by Dr. S. Fred Singer, Emeritus Professor of Environmental Science @ University of Virginia, 11 (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, Created by Siegfriend Singer, Emeritus Professor of Environmental Science @ University of Virginia, Surviving the unprecedented climate change of the IPCC. 8 March 2011. <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>

In a paper published in *Systematics and Biodiversity*, Willis *et al*. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas *et al*., 2004; Solomon *et al*., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford *et al*., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### Even the worst-case scenario wouldn’t cause extinction

Lomborg 8 – Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange \*\*[degrees] added in

These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren't for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a "catastrophe" and the beginning of the "extinction" of the human race. This **is simply silly**.

His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners' scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6 [degrees].0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400.

Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland's ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive).

Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world's coastal infrastructure and much of the world's farmland – "undoubtedly" causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years' time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting.

Tickell's claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc.

The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that **benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs** (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. **This is simply not the end of humanity**. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

It’s not an existential threat—humans can adapt.

Lomborg 10—Bjorn Lomborg, Adjunct Professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Centre, former director of the Environmental Assessment Institute in Copenhagen, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Copenhagen, 11-17-2010 (“Cost-effective ways to address climate change,” *Washington Post*, November 17th, Available Online at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/16/AR2010111604973.html, Accessed 01-08-2011)

The process is called adaptation, and it's something we humans are very good at. That isn't surprising, since we've been doing it for millennia. As climate economist Richard Tol notes, our ability to adapt to widely varying climates explains how people live happily at both the equator and the poles. In the debate over global warming, in which some have argued that civilization as we know it is at stake, this is an important point. Humankind is not completely at the mercy of nature. To the contrary, when it comes to dealing with the impact of climate change, we've compiled a pretty impressive track record. While this doesn't mean we can afford to ignore climate change, it provides a powerful reason not to panic about it either.

### AT: Warming - Obama Can't Solve

#### Obama won't be able to pass warming policies - Congress will be gridlocked

Abdullah 12, Former regional correspondent for McClatchy Newspapers---Writer and producer for CNNpolitics.com, 6/8/12[Halimah, “Could Congress go from bad to worse after election?” CNN, <http://www.cnn.co> m/2012/06/08/polit ics/congress-worse-election/index.html]ADravid

Washington (CNN) **-- Think this current climate of political polarization is bad? Things could get even uglier in 2013. With a third of the Senate and every seat in the House up for election this year, each side is already bragging about how likely it is they will win back or take over the next Congress. But if the past three years are any indicator, no matter if the Republicans or Democrats control the House or Senate -- or both -- gridlock, brinkmanship and stalemate could continue to plague the next president and frustrate the American electorate.** The ongoing back and forth Friday between the White House and Republican leadership over exactly who is at fault for the weak economy offers a glimpse into what's in store. "One of the things that people get so frustrated about is that instead of actually talking about what would help, we get wrapped up in these political games. That's what we need to put an end to," President Barack Obama said on Friday, a day when politicos on both sides of the aisle played the blame game over the country's fiscal troubles. **Voters have been clear in expressing their displeasure with Congress, whose approval ratings -- currently only 15% of Americans polled think Congress is doing a good job -- have been in the basement for much of the past few years. And it doesn't stop there.** Just look at, for instance, Congress' work habits. Obama: Economy 'is not doing fine' Romney: Obama not up to the task The Republican-controlled House's frequent election-year recesses do little to clear the mountain of legislative work off their plates and have rankled such Democratic colleagues as House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-California. "Instead of recessing yet again, the House should remain at work and pass critical legislation that will create jobs for the middle class that will actually be signed into law. Republicans must not run out the clock on the economy," Pelosi wrote in a letter to House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, this week, adding that the upcoming recess is the ninth weeklong break this year. Whether President Obama or Republican Mitt Romney occupies the Oval Office next year, both men are facing an indigestion-inducing plate full of domestic problems. Either one could, for instance, have to preside over a dramatic overhaul of the health care reform law if the Supreme Court strikes down the individual coverage mandate as unconstitutional this month. The original law passed in 2010 without a single Republican vote in the House or the Senate. **The backlog of bills that have passed in one chamber but are in limbo in another include the** hotly debated transportation bill**. Many House Republicans want any deal on the transportation construction measure to include approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline.** In the Senate, both parties are at loggerheads on the best way to address mushrooming student loan rates. **If the balance of power in the Senate shifts to the Republicans, as some political analysts expect, or Democrats and Republican end up with a near equal number of seats, partisan gridlock could become even worse.** Both the Cook Political Report and the Rothenberg Political Report suggest that at least two to four Senate seats are in play, including open seats in the battleground states of Virginia and Wisconsin. Seats in Massachusetts, Nevada, New Mexico and Maine are also competitive. "You can expect these bitter times to continue," said Thomas Mann, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-author of the book "It's Even Worse Than It Looks: How the American Constitutional System Collided With the New Politics of Extremism." It's little wonder why. **A new Pew Research Center study found that the nation is more politically polarized than it has been in the past 25 years and "the values gap between Republicans and Democrats is now greater than gender, age, race or class divides." So, there's little chance of compromise on solutions for shoring up the ailing economy and stanching job losses as the country braces for the impact of more than $1 trillion in mandatory budget cuts set to kick in next year.** Should Obama win re-election, he'll be a second-term president facing a narrow window to accomplish policy goals before he enters the lame duck phase of his office**.** **"If president Obama is re-elected he will have to work with a Republican Senate to define his legacy,**" said Nathan Gonzales, deputy editor of The Rothenberg Political Report. **Obama's "big opportunity will be 2013." That's the same year sequestration, massive mandatory across the board budget cuts, are triggered as part of a congressional deal that allowed Obama to raise the debt ceiling.** The large defense budget, which many Republican lawmakers defend as necessary to maintain, will face substantial cuts. Ironically, Obama may have to take a harder, more partisan line in order to get his agenda passed, Mann said. "It's his second term. The country is facing serious problems," Mann said. "**If the Republicans are playing an opposition game I can't imagine he can peacefully engage in constructive negotiations** with (Republicans). He would find the same problem he faces today." Things aren't likely to go much easier for Romney. If Romney should win the general election and his party maintains control of the House and ekes out a Senate majority, the newly minted president may still face some political headaches. Candidates down ballot may get a boost from a Romney win, but it is unlikely his party will net the 60 seats needed for a filibuster-proof Senate majority. He'll also face intense pressure from his party to keep his campaign promises and steer clear of compromise. "If Romney is elected he'll have a brief honeymoon period," said Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics. "**In this polarized era I see no reason for optimism there**.

#### Obama’s reelection is useless because Senate is poised to return to Republican hands

Bedard 2011, (Paul Bedard, Political Author U.S. News, “Senate GOP Poised to Win 4-Seat Majority”. 6/23/11 AD. 7/14/12. http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2011/06/23/senate-gop-poised-to-win-4-seat-majority|Ashwin)

Senate Republicans are looking strong going into the 2012 election, poised to pick up enough states to create a four-seat majority and possibly a filibuster-proof lead if the eventual GOP presidential nominee routs President Obama, according to party leaders and a new election analysis.¶ "Barring an unexpected reelection landslide by President Obama, Republicans are at least slightly favored to take the Senate. It's just a basic matter of numbers," says Larry Sabato, the University of Virginia political analyst, in a new report.¶ He predicts that Republicans are likely to win Republican Senate seats in North Dakota, Missouri, Montana, and Nebraska. He also sees chances for the GOP to take seats in Virginia, New Mexico and Wisconsin. A sweep would give the Republicans 54 Senate seats and make Sen. Mitch McConnell the majority leader.¶ And in jarring news for the Democrats, he said that the GOP can "compete" and possibly take Democratic-held seats in Florida, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, West Virginia, and Hawaii. Additional victories in six of those would give the GOP a filibuster-proof 60-seat super majority that would effectively ice President Obama's agenda, if he's reelected, or greatly boost a GOP president. Some of his predictions jive with McConnell's, who sees Republican pickups in Democratic-held seats in North Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, Missouri and Virginia and open seats in New Mexico and Wisconsin.¶ For the GOP to do better, Obama would have to be routed and Sabato has a measurement of how that could happen. "Over the past three decades, nearly three of every five truly competitive Senate races, decided by 53% to 47% or less, went the way of the presidential election winner in each state. That proportion may be as high or higher in 2012." In other words, he said, presidential coattails will matter in 2012.

#### Even if Obama is reelected, he will face more gridlock in Congress---Republicans will oppose his plans

Clift 11, Eleanor Clift is a contributing editor for Newsweek---She is a political reporter, television figure and author—Her column is published weekly in Newsweek and MSNBC websites. She is a panelist on The MacLaughlin Group. The is a political contributor to Fox News and a Board Member at the International Women’s Media Foundation, 12/23/11[Eleanor, “Will a Reelected President Obama Face More Gridlock in 2013?” The Daily Beast, http://www.thed ailybeast.com/articles/2 11/12/26/will-a-reelected-president-obama-face-more-gridlock-in-2013.html]ADravid

So is there any reason to believe that Obama would fare better in a second term? More of the same is not appealing. Yet for Obama to govern with any degree of success, he would need either a big electoral upset—with Democrats regaining the House and maintaining a nominal hold on the Senate—or a chastened Republican Party, newly open to cooperation and willing to set aside the all-or-nothing brinkmanship that has defined its strategy. **The prospect of four more years of gridlock while Obama looks on from the sidelines will hardly energize voters already disappointed by the president’s performance. For now, Obama is benefiting by standing apart from an institution whose approval rating is 11 percent, but mastering the legislative process is a big part of the job of being president, and while Obama squeezed major legislation through Congress in his first two years, this last year has been a disaster all around.** “**Unless Democrats win a big victory in Congress, it’s hard to see how a second term would be any better,”** says Jack Pitney, an American-government professor at Claremont McKenna College. “**Second terms never are**.” Pitney was a congressional staffer on the Republican side in 1985, and finds the aftermath of President Reagan’s reelection instructive. “Even though Reagan had won a huge mandate (carrying 49 states), it didn’t translate into much legislative success, with the important exception of tax reform.” Reagan faced a Democratic House and a Republican Senate, a mirror image of the party divisions that frustrate Obama today. Obama is more likely to win in a squeaker than with a Reagan-sized mandate. **“You might say if the election of 2008 didn’t persuade Republicans to go along with the majority, why would a narrow Obama victory in 2012 have a better effect?”** asks William Galston, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution**. If the president couldn’t quell fractious lawmakers when he had a 70 percent approval rating and a big electoral mandate, why would he be any more effective in dealing with Congress after a hard-fought reelection campaign in which the GOP has a better than even chance to capture control of the Senate, and keep its hold on the House?** Yet in politics, as in life, things rarely turn out as predicted. Unless a major backlash against the GOP restores Democratic primacy in the House and maintains the Democratic Senate, a unified Republican Congress might not be such a bad thing from Obama’s perspective, says Galston. “They would be co-owners of the government, and if they want to get the White House [in 2016] they’ve got to persuade the people they can say yes as well as no.” Given a truly divided government, Galston argues there could be greater cooperation between the Democratic White House and the Republican Congress. That would echo the Clinton presidency when the GOP Congress, led by Speaker Newt Gingrich, served up welfare reform and a balanced budget for Clinton to sign. There is not much incentive now for Obama to be more hands-on with Congress, but in a second term he might want to reconsider his approach. Pietro Nivola, a scholar at Brookings’ Governance Studies Program, compares Obama’s leadership with Woodrow Wilson, another “professor president” with a background as an intellectual who made the transition from academia to politics. Wilson, like Obama, took office after his party had won two back-to-back elections, only to be repudiated in the midterm, with Democrats losing dozens of House seats and, two years later, the majority. The difference between the two men, says Nivola, is that Wilson didn’t fall victim to his own high expectations the way Obama has. Wilson was much more parsimonious, campaigning on a very short list: banking reform, knocking down protectionism, and a tougher approach to antitrust. Obama promised the moon, and while he gets accused of being vague (“hope and change”), his campaign document, “A Blueprint for Change,” is a very long list of things he promised to do, with some, like changing the culture in Washington, proving intractable. Wilson laid down clear markers before every piece of legislation, and he spent time on Capitol Hill in an office set aside for him. “He was in their faces,” says Galston. An avowed Anglophile, Wilson didn’t bother wooing the other party. The Democrats had won with big margins and Wilson operated more like a prime minister, preferring to work with his own party. Obama also won with big margins, but the Brookings study concludes he was overly deferential to Congress, behaving more like “a stakeholder mediating at arm’s length than the chief engineer of the policies he sought.” There is not much incentive now for Obama to be more hands-on with Congress, but in a second term he might want to reconsider his approach. Obama **spent much of his first two years in a futile bid for bipartisanship, asserting himself only at the eleventh hour to rescue legislation, as he did with the health-care bill, while mostly leaving the negotiations to emissaries he would dispatch to Capitol Hill “as though some pearl of legislation might form around them,”** says Galston. **There won’t be a “Blueprint for Change” heralding a second Obama term. Modesty will be in order as he promises to secure gains and finish the job he started. Whether he will approach Congress differently will depend on the circumstances, and his own reflection on what went right, and what went wrong.** A lame-duck session after the election could produce notable results and a bipartisan deal just like the last one, with the expiring Bush tax cuts again at center stage. Looking into his crystal ball, Nivola says Obama would not want to go down in history as the president who continued to run up the debt, so a second-term priority would be the grand bargain that eluded him earlier this year. Securing the implementation of health-care reform and reining in Medicare spending would be another priority. Immigration reform would be high up there as well, especially if Hispanics turn out for him. “He would feel some obligation to deliver for them,” says Nivola. Wilson’s second term, beset by illness and foreign-policy setbacks, offers no guidelines. But the former president was onto something, Nivola concludes, “that citizens need to know that partisan politics are not an abnormality but a fact of life in a vibrant democratic polity.” If what we’re seeing is the new normal, fine, as long as the excesses of partisanship give way at some point to the needs of the citizenry, a premise that House Republicans are currently testing. We’ve seen these battles occur with equal intensity within the parties, as the Republican split over the payroll tax made clear. Pitney recalls Gingrich denouncing “the perfectionist caucus” in the GOP in 1998. The House GOP’s surrender in the payroll-tax fight may not signal a sea change in congressional relations with the White House, but House Republicans might not be so eager for confrontation over the coming year, says Pitney: “They looked in the mirror and saw Grinch.”

#### Obama can't solve warming - GOP power, lobby groups, and inertia will block any action

Walsh 11 (Bryan, Environment Writer @ Time, " Who's Bankrolling the Climate-Change Deniers?" 10/4, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2096055,00.html)

Not anymore. With the exception of Jon Huntsman — who barely registers in polls — you can't find a Republican presidential candidate who unequivocally believes in climate science, let alone one who wants to do anything about it. Instead of McCain — who has walked back his own climate-policy realism since the 2008 elections — we have Texas Governor Rick Perry, who told voters in New Hampshire over the weekend that "I don't believe manmade global warming is settled in science enough." And many Republicans agree with him: the percentage of self-identified Republicans or conservatives answering yes to the question of whether the effects of global warming were already being felt fell to 30% or less in 2010, down from 50% in 2007-08. Meanwhile, liberals and Democrats remained around 70% or more. (See pictures of the effects of global warming.) That's deeply troubling. It's one thing when people disagree on the effectiveness of different approaches to fix a problem; it's worse when they refuse even to believe that a problem exists — despite an overwhelming scientific consensus that says it does. One of America's major political parties has, in effect, adopted denial as policy. How did we get here? As the sociologists Riley Dunlap of Oklahoma State University and Aaron McCright of Michigan State University suggest, climate denialism exists in part because there has been a long-term, well-financed effort on the part of cosnservative groups and corporations to distort global-warming science. That's the conclusion of a chapter the two researchers recently wrote for The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society. "Contrarian scientists, fossil-fuel corporations, conservative think tanks and various front groups have assaulted mainstream climate science and scientists for over two decades," Dunlap and McCright write. "The blows have been struck by a well-funded, highly complex and relatively coordinated denial machine." For those who've followed the seesaw of the climate debate in the U.S., there's not much new in Dunlap and McCright's chapter, but they do lay out just how long and how intensively some conservatives have been fighting mainstream climate science. Fossil-fuel companies like Exxon and Peabody Energy — which obviously have a business interest in slowing any attempt to reduce carbon emissions — have combined with traditionally conservative corporate groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and conservative foundations like the Koch brothers' Americans for Prosperity, to raise doubts about the basic validity of what is, essentially, a settled scientific truth. That message gets amplified by conservative think tanks — like the Cato Institute and the American Enterprise Institute — and then picked up by conservative media outlets on the Internet and cable TV. (See TIME's special report about Copenhagen's climate-change conference.) All of the naysayers seem to be following the playbook written by the tobacco industry in its long, ongoing war against medical findings about the dangers of smoking. For both Big Oil and Big Smoke, that playbook is lethally simple: don't straight-up refute the science, just raise skepticism and insist that the findings are "unsettled" and that "more research" is necessary. Repeat that again and again regardless of the latest research, and you help block the formation of the solid majority needed to create any real political change. That's made all the easier because whether you're quitting smoking or oil, the job is painful — and voters don't like pain. "It's reasonable to conclude that climate-change-denial campaigns in the U.S. have played a crucial role in blocking domestic legislation and contributing to the U.S. becoming an impediment to international policymaking," write Dunlap and McCright. It's certainly true that the U.S., even after President Obama's election, remains an international outlier when it comes to belief in climate science, as former President Bill Clinton noted recently. Climate denial makes Americans "look like a joke," Clinton said from the stage of his foundation's annual meeting last month. "If you're an American, the best thing you can do is make it politically unacceptable for people to engage in denial." That was also the main message behind former Vice President Al Gore's recent Climate Reality project, which was broadcast around the world on Sept. 14. Of course, the fact that the message is coming from two political figures who are — to say the least — highly associated with the Democratic Party is part of the problem. Over time, belief in climate science has **become less about the science than about establishing a cultural identity** — you're a denier or a believer depending on whether you're a Republican or a Democrat, just like you're a Yankees or a Red Sox fan depending on whether you're from New York City or Boston. Of course, polarization is harmless in sports — and indeed, it can be essential to the fun. It's insanity as a basis for complex public policy. So would it make a difference if the conservative denial machine were to collapse tomorrow? Sadly, I'm not sure. Even in places like Western Europe, where belief in climate science tends to be much stronger, it's hard to build support for the actual steps to reduce carbon emissions. Human beings have a hard time dealing not just with pain, but also with long-term problems, especially ones that don't necessarily show immediate effects. Whether it's planning for retirement or losing weight, we find it too easy to disregard very clear science — and disregard our long-term health — in order to satiate our immediate desires. There's no excuse for the sort of half-fictions and outright lies that too often make up the climate-change-denial machine, but it's human psychology — as much as politics — that's preventing us from dealing with one of the greatest threats the species faces. The most powerful denial machine of all may be the one inside our heads.

### AT: Healthcare - No Repeal

#### **ZERO chance of Romney repealing healthcare - it's politically impossible (this card also answers their reconciliation warrant)**

Lizza 6/28 Ryan Lizza is the Washington Correspondent for The New Yorker magazine. "WHY ROMNEY WON’T REPEAL OBAMACARE," 2012, http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2012/06/why-romney-wont-repeal-obamacare.html#ixzz1zCIy8dbv

Mitt Romney, speaking just before noon today, declared that on his first day in office, “I will act to repeal Obamacare.” I think he chose his words carefully. As President, he may indeed “act” to repeal it on Day One, but I don’t believe he will actually be able to overturn the law.

If Romney were to win in November, the first matter he’d have to deal with would be the fallout from the so-called fiscal cliff of December 31st, the day when some five hundred billion dollars worth of tax increases and spending reductions take effect, which could put the economy into another recession (if it’s not already in recession by then). This moment would perhaps be Romney’s greatest chance at repeal. Because the fiscal-cliff negotiations will be an enormous fight over the size and scope of the federal government, every government policy will theoretically be open to debate—including, Romney might insist, repeal of the A.C.A.

But it’s a fantasy. The negotiations would be dead before they started if Republicans demanded repeal as a price for a Grand Bargain on taxes, spending, and entitlements. The fiscal-cliff negotiations will undoubtedly include a great deal of horse-trading that will infuriate and cheer partisans on both sides. But there is literally nothing Republicans could offer Democrats in return for repealing the Party’s greatest achievement since the Johnson Administration.

Assuming that Romney comes through this period of his transition and Presidency with a deal that settles the tax and spending issues brought about by the fiscal cliff (and the related debt-ceiling vote that will likely happen weeks later), he could then return to his domestic agenda, which, he declared today, includes repeal of the A.C.A. as the first priority. But he would immediately face a set of political circumstances similar to the ones that made health care such a difficult issue for Obama in 2009.

Absent the Senate Democratic Caucus being found to be running a crack house or chid-prostitution ring, there is no prospect whatsoever of the Republicans winning a sixty-vote, filibuster-proof majority in the Senate this year. The most likely outcome is the Democrats narrowly retaining control, though Republican control is certainly within the realm of possibility.

Assuming that Romney comes to Washington without a sixty-vote majority in the Senate, the task of repeal will be nearly insurmountable. First of all, the Congressional Budget Office, which “scores” all legislation—and which so frustrated Obama in 2009 that he refused to mention its name in White House meetings, demanding instead that aides call it “banana”—would now be the A.C.A.’s best friend. The last time the C.B.O. weighed in on the matter, it reported that repeal of the A.C.A. would cost the government almost three hundred billion dollars. Republicans dispute that, but they’d still be under pressure to explain where they would come up with that money.

The bigger problem, of course, would be in the Senate. Remember the weeks that the Senate Finance Committee spent arguing over health care? The committee would need to return for a repeat performance. If Democrats still controlled the committee, Republicans would have to somehow force it to debate repeal and find at least one Democratic vote to send repeal legislation to the full Senate. This is unlikely to happen.

But if it does, in order to become law, Romney’s repeal of the A.C.A. would face a battery of three separate tests requiring sixty Senate votes: one to bring the legislation to the floor, one to start the debate, and one to end the debate. The filibuster, the G.O.P.’s favorite parliamentary device of the Obama era, would now be the Party’s great enemy.

Many Republicans, especially in the blog and talk-radio swamps, would cry, “Use reconciliation!” Readers familiar with the congressional debates of 2009-2010 will remember that this procedure allows certain budgetary measures to pass through the Senate with a simple majority. (After Ted Kennedy died and was replaced by the Republican Scott Brown, Obama and congressional Democrats used the reconciliation process to make some final, crucial changes to the health-care law.) But reconciliation wouldn’t work here—the process can only be used for policies that have budgetary effects and a C.B.O. score. Much of the A.C.A., such as the insurance exchanges and subsidies, would fall under these categories. But a lot of it, including the hated individual mandate, does not. Repealing the exchanges and subsides without repealing the mandate and the other regulations and cost controls in the law would create a health-care Frankenstein that a President Romney would be rather nuts to support.

If the Supreme Court had gutted the law today by throwing out the mandate and the regulations and several of the other “non-scoreable” items, a President Romney with a G.O.P. Congress might have had a relatively easy time finishing the job of killing Obama’s law, even without sixty votes in the Senate. But today the Court did two things that make repeal of the A.C.A. nearly impossible now: it has given its not-inconsequential stamp of legitimacy to the law, and it has made the parliamentary path of repeal through Congress highly unlikely and probably impossible, at least in the near future.

Far-sighted conservatives always thought that their great hope for toppling Obama’s most important legislative achievement was through the courts. They were correct.

#### Repeal is just political grandstanding - GOP won't actually take action

Roosevelt Institute 7/12 (“Why Republicans Won’t Repeal the Affordable Care Act”, <http://www.care2.com/causes/why-republicans-wont-repeal-the-affordable-care-act.html>, 7/12/2012) Kerwin

With the Supreme Court ruling upholding the core of the Affordable Care Act, Republicans at every level have renewed their promise to repeal it. It is Mitt Romney’s “Day One” task. Because Chief Justice John Roberts upheld the individual mandate under the taxing power in the Constitution, conservatives such as [economist Keith Hennessy](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304211804577500573035021342.html) and [Virginia Attorney General Ken Cucinelli](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/304392/victory-defeat-kenneth-t-cuccinelli-ii) argue, the penalties for non-compliance are now a “tax,” and the mandate can be repealed under the federal budget reconciliation process, which can’t be filibustered in the Senate. That is, just 50 senators, along with a Republican vice president to break the tie, can repeal the mandate.¶ This is true – though the Court’s decision has nothing to do with it. Anything that has a significant impact on federal revenues or spending, such as fees, interest on student loans, or mining licenses, can be changed using the budget reconcilation process. The mandate, and some other provisions of the Affordable Care Act, can certainly be stripped out by a Republican majority. Other provisions that don’t affect the budget, such as some of the requirements placed on insurance companies to cover preexisting conditions and keep young adults on their parents’ plans, probably can’t be, because their effect on federal finances is minimal.¶ So if Romney wins the presidency and Republicans capture the Senate (as seems likely, if Romney wins), at the very least, we can expect them to repeal the individual mandate, right? It’s the least popular element of the law, and not too difficult to sever from the rest. As Paul Starr of Princeton and The American Prospect has argued for years, a mandate with minimal enforcement mechanisms might be [worse than no mandate at all.](http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/99072/the-health-care-mandate-really-was-mistake)¶ Whether they do that or not will be an interesting case study in the role of money in politics. Health [insurance companies](http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/indus.php?Ind=F09) and [HMOs,](http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/indus.php?ind=H03) after all, are mainstays of the Republican money machine. Aetna, the health insurer that spends the [most](http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/indusclient.php?id=H03&year=2010) on lobbying, recently bolstered its Republican bona fides by being the first public corporation to disclose recent contributions to Republican dark-money committees, the American Action Network and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s political arm. Aetna’s former CEO, Ronald Williams, even went so far as to [renounce](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/18/us-aetna-reform-idUSBRE85H0X620120618) the company’s long-standing support for the mandate, predicting it would fall at the Supreme Court.¶ But for health insurers like Aetna, stripping out the mandate alone would be the worst possible outcome. It would mean that they would still have to take all applicants, and couldn’t reject or charge more to people with preexisting conditions. And they wouldn’t have the profits from younger, healthier customers. Ideally, companies like Aetna would like to have the mandate without any of the other reforms, but that’s a political non-starter, since individuals would be mandated to buy something that the insurers would refuse to sell them. Failing that, the insurers could live with the Affordable Care Act, or the pre-ACA status quo. But what they can’t live with is the insurance reforms alone, without a mandate. (As a spokesperson for America’s Health Insurance Plans told Reuters, “There has always been broad agreement that the insurance market reforms… cannot work without universal coverage.”)¶ And you can be pretty sure that they won’t have to. By deepening their alliance with the Republican Party, Aetna and other insurers have made sure they would be at the table, whether the Court overturned the mandate (in which case the insurers’ goal would be to undo the rest of the law) or upheld it.¶ Some Republicans, including Romney, promise to repeal the whole law and “replace” it with something better, often suggesting that the replacement would include the popular provisions on preexisting conditions. That, too, is a non-starter with the party’s cash constituents. And other Republican proposals, such as to allow insurance companies to sell across state lines – that is, evade state regulations – aren’t ready for prime time. Republicans never offered an alternative during the health care debate and they don’t have one now.¶ Thus you have McConnell’s careful lowering of expectations on Monday: “It’s a lot harder to undo something than it is to stop it.” The Republicans will talk about repealing “Obamacare” for as long as it succeeds in firing up their base. But it’s all cheap talk; they won’t do a thing.¶ And so, the Affordable Care Act is secure. Unfortunately, that has less to do with public opinion or the Constitution than the simple power of money in politics.

#### Romney will not be able to repeal “Obamacare”---they can only defend against certain provisions

Volsky 12, Deputy Editor of ThinkProgress.org---Co-author of Howard Dean’s Prescription for Real Healthcare Reform---appeared MSNBC, CNN, Fox Business, Fox News, and CNBC television—graduated from Marist College in New York, 6/28/12[Igor, “4 Reasons Why Republicans Won’t Be Able To Repeal Obamacare,” Think Progress, http://thinkprogress.org/health/2012/06/28/508503/4-reasons-why-republicans-wont-be-able-to-repeal-obamacare/]ADravid

Unless the GOP wins a super majority in the Senate, it can do little more than weaken Obamacare's regulations and defund some of its provisions. June 29, 2012 | Responding to Thursday’s Supreme Court decision upholding the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, Congressional Republicans have scheduled a vote in the House to repeal the law and Mitt Romney pledged to undo the measure if he’s elected president in November. But unless the GOP wins a super majority in the Senate — a scenario no one thinks is plausible — it can do little more than weaken Obamacare’s regulations and defund some of its provisions. Here is why: 1) Romney has no authority to issue waivers. Romney has promised to expand a provision of the Affordable Care Act that allows states to opt out of certain sections of the law to permit states to ignore it entirely. But the executive branch and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) likely don’t have the authority to grant such broad waivers. According to the law, HHS (together with the IRS) have waiver authority, but only if the states meet very specific requirements. Neither have blanket waiver authority, which would have to come from Congress. Sen. Ron Wyden (D-OR) — the author of the waiver provision — has challenged Romney’s claims, saying, “Anybody who tries to move outside the standards of the bill — which is the coverage and costs and the like — well I’ll certainly fight that. But I think lots of other people will too.” 2) Congress can’t repeal the full law through reconciliation. Without the necessary 60 votes in the Senate for full repeal, Republicans are pledging to use a budget reconciliation bill to undo the ACA. But this process would only apply to the budget-related elements of the law and would thus leave many portions — including the mandate — intact. As health care expert Robert Laszewski put it, “Romney could end up creating a chaotic environment driven by enormous uncertainty over just which parts of the new health care law would be implemented–for consumers, health care providers, and insurers.” 3) Republicans have nothing to replace it with. David Frum explains that since the expansion of coverage provisions go into effect in 2014, Romney would have just one year to both repeal and replace the law. Republicans haven’t even coalesced around a single plan — and many in the party believe that the federal government should leave health care alone and want to leave the entire reform process to the states. Thus, “if replacement does not happen in the first 100 days, it won’t happen at all—that is, it won’t happen as a single measure, but rather will take the form of dozens of small incremental changes adopted episodically over the next 20 years.” 4) Americans support Obamacare’s provisions. While Americans may not like “Obamacare” — and the political process of passing it — they do support its major provisions and are likely to resist any effort by Republicans to take away their benefits. A recent Reuters/Ipsos poll found that while 56 percent of Americans oppose the law as a whole, 61 percent of respondents favored allowing young adults to stay on their parents’ insurance plans until age 26, 72 percent wish to maintain the requirement that companies with more than 50 workers provide health insurance for their employees, and 82 percent of respondents favored banning insurance companies from denying coverage to people with pre-existing conditions. As more benefits roll out in 2014, it will be increasingly difficult for Republicans to argue for their repeal.

#### GOP doesn't have the votes to repeal

Sandhya, Somashekar; July 10, 2012 (Reporter for the Washington Post, Article: “Romney Would Face Tough Road Trying to Repeal Obamacare”)< <http://www.standard.net/stories/2012/07/10/romney-would-face-tough-road-trying-repeal-obamacare>

Mitt Romney has vowed that on his first day as president, he would act to repeal President Barack Obama’s health-care law, thus fulfilling a long-standing promise. But the reality for a President Romney would be more complicated. Unless Republicans gain huge numbers in Congress, Romney likely would not have the votes to simply repeal the entire law. From the White House, he could instruct the Department of Health and Human Services to drag its feet, pushing back deadlines and turning to an army of lawyers and consultants to figure out how to exploit the law’s weaknesses. But that kind of administrative muscle flexing could bring its own political problems. "The simple answer is, there’s nothing Romney can do on the first day to repeal the Affordable [Care Act](http://www.standard.net/), but he could do a great deal to gum up the works," said Timothy Jost, a law professor at Washington and Lee University in Virginia.

#### Public support for healthcare is increasing - means repeal will be impossible

Pollack 12, Pollack is the Founding Executive Director of Families USA—Founding Board Chairman of Enroll America—One of the 100 Most Powerful People in Health Care, as named by Modern Healthcare—Appointed by President Clinton as the only consumer representative on the Presidential Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry, 7/10/12[Ron, “Repealing the Affordable Care Act Will Soon Be Considered Absurd” US NEWS, [http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-congress-repeal-the-affordable-care-act/repealing-the-affordable-care-act-will-soon-be-considered-absurd]ADravid](http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-congress-repeal-the-affordable-care-act/repealing-the-affordable-care-act-will-soon-be-considered-absurd%5dADravid)

Now that the Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, it is time to turn the historic promise of the new law into a living reality. At its heart, the Affordable Care Act is about keeping people healthy and giving Americans the peace of mind that healthcare will always be there when they need it. Irrespective of changes in any person's life circumstances—the desire to switch jobs or start a business, being laid off from work, changes in marital status, or the sudden loss of income—the Affordable Care Act ensures the availability of quality, affordable healthcare. The law makes sure that insurance companies treat people fairly. Under the law, it will be illegal for insurers to discriminate against women by charging higher premiums simply because of their gender. Nobody—male or female—will be denied coverage or charged higher premiums because of a pre-existing condition, like asthma or diabetes. No one will live in fear of their insurance being canceled. People will no longer be subject to arbitrary lifetime or annual caps in what insurers pay out, thereby denying coverage when it is needed the most. The act also comes with much-needed direct help for middle class families. They will receive substantial subsidies to make health insurance premiums affordable. Seniors will no longer fall into the huge prescription drug coverage gap in Medicare euphemistically-named the "doughnut hole." Comprehensive preventive care will be available at no cost for women, including mammograms and contraception. A significant number of these benefits, and many others, already are being provided in whole or in part, such as the millions of young adults (under 26 years of age) who are staying on their parents' policies. As more and more people feel the direct protections and benefits of the new law, repealing the Affordable Care Act will increasingly be considered an absurdity. Instead of playing politics with the act, it is time to fully implement it across the country. It's also time for Democrats and Republicans to come together to build on the act so that additional steps can be taken to moderate healthcare costs for America's families and businesses.

### AT: Healthcare - Kills Economy

#### Healthcare kills the economy

Nix 11 (Kathryn, Health Policy Analyst @ the Heritage Foundation, " Obamacare Takes a Double Shot at the Economy and the American Dream," April 26, http://blog.heritage.org/2011/04/26/obamacare-takes-a-double-shot-at-the-economy-and-the-american-dream/)

In a recent piece for The Wall Street Journal, Daniel Kessler, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, describes how the new health care law’s subsidy program to help low- and middle-income Americans purchase health insurance will have severe economic consequences. These will include discouraging work for qualifying individuals and other taxpayers, disrupting America’s labor markets, and reducing economic activity. Beginning in 2014, when the new health insurance exchanges will open for individuals and small businesses, subsidies will become available for those whose income falls between 134 percent and 400 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL). For a family of four living in a high-cost area, earning 134 percent of the FPL ($31,389 in 2014 dollars) would qualify them to receive $22,740 in assistance. A similar family earning an income at 400 percent FPL ($93,699) would qualify to receive $14,799 in subsidies. The problem is that as income increases, families will experience large reductions in government assistance, which will discourage striving to earn a higher income. According to Kessler, “Economists call large, discontinuous changes in program benefits like this ‘notches.’ Although notches might be administratively convenient, they have terrible incentive effects.” One of these is “a substantial punishment on work effort.” If a member of a family of four living at 400 percent of FPL earns just $1 more, they would receive no subsidy at all, making the family almost $15,000 poorer. This “cliff effect” will have profound implications on the labor market. Heritage analysts Brian Blase and Paul Winfree write, “the subsidy structure creates incentives for individuals to engage in unproductive activities, such as working less and retiring early.” These income “cut-offs,” which already present issues in Medicaid, induce sharp reductions in the labor supply—not good when the economy is already struggling to recover. In addition, the Obamacare health insurance subsidies create unfairness through the unequal treatment of equals. Families earning very similar incomes will receive vastly different levels of assistance from the government because of the notches. Moreover, as health policy expert James Capretta explains, two identical families could receive levels of help that differ by several thousand dollars, based on whether they receive employer-sponsored insurance or purchase coverage in the exchanges. By creating inequity, disincentives to work, and reducing the labor supply, Obamacare penalizes upward mobility and hinders the ability of the nation’s economy to grow. Kessler concludes, “Either leaving the notch in or smoothing the notch out seems impossibly unattractive…The only fix is to drastically reduce or eliminate the premium subsidies.”

#### Obamacare results in job loss-repealing it will help the economy

Boehner 2011, (John Boehner, Speaker of the House, “OBAMACARE: A BUDGET-BUSTING,

JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW”. 5/6/11. 7/14/12. http://www.speaker.gov/sites/speaker.house.gov/files/UploadedFiles/ObamaCareReport.pdf|Ashwin)

Consistent with respected economists‟ forecasts, the health care law contains a number of provisions that will eliminate jobs, reduce hours and wages, and limit future job creation. Specifically, the law:¶  Penalizes employers for failing to offer coverage deemed acceptable by the ¶ government; ¶  Imposes burdensome mandates on small businesses, including new paperwork ¶ requirements; and ¶  Compounds the uncertainty employers and entrepreneurs are facing amid a ¶ challenging economic climate. ¶ Independent analyses have determined that the health care law will cause significant job losses for the U.S. economy: the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has determined that the law will reduce the “amount of labor used in the economy by … roughly half a percent...,” an estimate that adds up to roughly 650,000 jobs lost.¶ A study by the National Federation of Independent Businesses (NFIB), the nation’s largest small ¶ business association, found that an employer mandate alone could lead to the elimination of 1.6 million jobs, with 66 percent of those coming from small businesses¶ Studies of the health care law reveal that it will cost taxpayers ¶ more than originally estimated, and may exacerbate the nation’s dire fiscal condition. ¶ Specifically, the law: Relies on accounting gimmicks that mask its true cost to taxpayers; ¶ Double-counts savings from Medicare that are widely viewed as unsustainable; ¶ and ¶  Requires additional government spending to direct its implementation.¶ According to an analysis by House Budget Committee Republicans, the health care law¶ will cost the nation $2.6 trillion when fully implemented, and add $701 billion to the deficit in its first ten years. Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) stated that “in its life,” the health care law would “create 4 million jobs --¶ 400,000 jobs almost immediately.”¶ viii¶ Speaker Pelosi’s estimates were derived from a Center for American Progress (CAP) ¶ analysis showing that the health care law would lead to the creation of 250,000 to 400,000 ¶ jobs over ten years.¶ ix¶ This study relies on cost estimates that are widely viewed as ¶ unsubstantiated. An analysis by Americans for Tax Reform and the Beacon Hill Institute ¶ using CAP‟s methodology, but with what was deemed more realistic cost estimates, finds ¶ that the law will destroy between 120,000 and 700,000 jobs over the same ten-year ¶ period.

#### Repealing “Obamacare” leads to creation of jobs

Pipes 2011, (Sally Pipes, President of the Pacific Research Institute, “The Best Jobs Program is a Full Repeal of ObamaCare”. 9/19/11 AD. 7/14/12. http://www.forbes.com/sites/sallypipes/2011/09/19/the-best-jobs-program-full-repeal-of-obamacare/2/|Ashwin)

President Barack Obama is currently barnstorming around the country to drum up support for his $447-billion plan to put unemployed Americans back to work.¶ But Congress need not hand him a check for half a trillion dollars in order to jump start the economy. If lawmakers are really serious about creating jobs, they should simply repeal ObamaCare.¶ Cheerleaders for the president’s reform package promised before its passage that the law would unleash a flurry of economic activity. Indeed, in February 2010, then-House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) stated that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act would create some four million jobs.¶ The current state of the American economy belies that rosy prediction. Unemployment is stuck above 9%, and 14 million Americans remain out of work.¶ In fact, the evidence suggests that ObamaCare has only made the American labor market worse.¶ Since the law’s enactment, job growth has fallen to rates one-tenth of what it was beforehand. From January 2009, the lowest point of the recession, through April 2010, employment numbers were improving by an average of 67,600 new jobs per month.¶ fter April 2010 — mere weeks after President Obama signed his reform measure into law — job creation came to a screeching halt, tumbling to a rate of just 6,500 new jobs per month.¶ that’s no coincidence. The law deters hiring by raising the costs of employment and by fomenting uncertainty for American businesses.¶ In 2012, companies will face health care costs approaching $12,000 per employee, according to the National Business Group on Health.¶ ObamaCare only adds to that burden, with its barrage of cost-inflating mandates, taxes, and penalties.¶ Beginning in 2014, companies with more than 50 employees will face fines of $2,000 per employee if they do not offer insurance.¶ Even firms that insure their employees won’t be safe from federal penalties. They can be subject to fines of $3,000 per worker if the benefits they provide are deemed insufficient by the government. And the plans the government will require, of course, will tend to be far more generous — and more expensive — than the ones that many businesses currently make available.¶ A study by the National Federation of Independent Business found that the law’s employer mandate could cause the elimination of 1.6 million jobs, with 66% of those coming from small businesses.¶ Instead of serving as an engine for American growth, 70% of small firms have no plans to hire in the next year. They claim that they can’t take on any more employees until they know just how hard a punch ObamaCare will pack.¶ If President Obama wants to create jobs, he needs to take a long look at the burden his health care law is already placing on American businesses’ balance sheets. As its many components take effect over the next few years, that burden is only going to grow.¶ The president may never admit it, but the best jobs program out there is the repeal of ObamaCare.

### AT: Iran Strikes - Inevitable

#### Iran war's inevitable - Obama also endorses strikes

Symonds 7/5, (Peter Symonds, World Socialist Website, “US-Iran confrontation enters dangerous new stage”. 7/5/12 AD. 7/11/12. http://www.wsws.org/articles/2012/jul2012/pers-j05.shtml|Ashwin)

The US-led confrontation with Iran over its nuclear programs has reached a dangerous new stage, following the stalling of international talks and the imposition of extra sanctions on Iran, designed to cripple its economy. The Obama administration has repeatedly declared that all options, including the military one, remain on the table if Tehran does not bow to US demands.¶ Speaking this week to the New York Times, US officials detailed the military build-up already underway in the Persian Gulf under the guise of keeping shipping lanes open. Two aircraft carriers—the USS Lincoln and the USS Enterprise—are in the region, together with their associated battle groups. The US Navy has doubled the number of mine sweepers in the Gulf, and the US Air Force has reinforced its presence with F-22 stealth bombers and F-15C warplanes.¶ The Pentagon has stationed a floating operations platform, the USS Ponce, in the Gulf. It can be used for a variety of purposes, including as a base for US special forces. As the platform is stationed in international waters, US troops could conduct operations inside Iran without having to consult regional governments regarding the use of their bases.¶ A senior US Defense Department official told the Times: “This is not only about Iranian nuclear ambitions, but about Iran’s regional hegemonic ambitions. This is a complex array of American military power that is tangible proof to all of our allies and partners and friends that even as the US pivots toward Asia, we remain vigilant across the Middle East.” The Obama administration has now reached the end game of a confrontational strategy toward Iran that was mapped out from its first days in office. The supposed “carrot and stick” approach was laid out in considerable detail in a September 2008 report by the Bipartisan Policy Center, whose authors included, among others, Dennis Ross, who became Obama’s top adviser on Iran. Limited US inducements for Iran to negotiate were to be backed by escalating sanctions and the threat of military strikes. Washington has now all but exhausted the “diplomatic option” and imposed what amounts to an economic blockade on Iran—itself an act of warfare. The next step is the military option. As the 2008 Bipartisan Policy Center report outlined: “We believe a military strike is a feasible option and must remain a last resort to retard Iran’s nuclear program.” The report explained that a US military attack “would have to target not only Iran’s nuclear infrastructure, but also its conventional military infrastructure in order to suppress an Iranian response.”¶ Nearly four years later, the Pentagon’s build-up in the Gulf has established the military capacity to carry out these plans. The Obama administration further ratcheted up regional tensions with the announcement of large joint US-Israeli war games in October or November, designed to test missile defense systems. The New York Times reported that the US would hold a major anti-mine exercise with 19 other countries in the Persian Gulf in September. Washington is also taking other steps to expand military ties with Iran’s regional rival, Saudi Arabia, and the Gulf states.¶ These menacing moves against Iran, even as the US and its allies threaten military intervention against Iran’s ally, the Syrian regime of President Bashir al-Assad, have transformed the Middle East into a dangerous powder keg. Regardless of the Obama administration’s immediate intentions, any military miscalculation or incident could become the starting point for a war that would quickly boil over into a regional conflict that could draw in the major powers.

#### Romney and Obama are both equally belligerent toward Iran

Duke 7/5 (David Duke, member of House of Representatives, “No Difference Between Romney and Obama on Iran”, <http://www.davidduke.com/?p=35097>, 7/05/12, Bhattacharyya)

There is no fundamental difference between Mitt Romney and Barack Obama on Iran and the Republican would-be contender will unconditionally support anything Israel does, including the expansion of the illegal settlements on Palestinian land. This revelation was announced by Aaron David Miller, a former Middle East negotiator for Republican and Democratic administrations in an article in the Jewish Press. Miller said that the two candidates differed little on Iran, the pressing Middle East issue of the day, “each emphasizing the urgency of keeping the Islamic Republic from acquiring a nuclear weapon. “Obama’s aggressive anti-terrorist policies make the traditional GOP ploy of depicting Democrats as weak on defense a nonstarter,” he said. “There’s not much different substantively on war and peace between Romney and Obama, and Romney cannot find a way in,” Miller said. “The notion that Romney’s predator drone is bigger than Obama’s predator drone doesn’t fly.”

### AT: Iran Strikes - No Romney Strike

#### Romney not likely to bomb Iran---Obama's more likely

Rosenberg 12, Senior Foreign Policy Fellow at Media Matters Action Network---Has worked on Capitol Hill for Democrats from the House and Senate---Former Clinton political appointee at USAID—Director of policy at Israel Policy Forum, 5/29/12[MJ, “Obama Is More Likely To Approve Bombing Iran Than Romney” MJ Rosenberg, [http://mjayrosenberg.com/2012/05/29/is-obama-more-likely-to-approve-bombing-iran-than-romney/]ADravid](http://mjayrosenberg.com/2012/05/29/is-obama-more-likely-to-approve-bombing-iran-than-romney/%5dADravid)

At the rate we are going, the pro-Iran war lobby could get the war it wants in the next few months, right during the U.S. election campaign. AIPAC and its leadership cadre in Congress (led by Rep. Howard Berman) are now insisting the United States permit ZERO enrichment by Iran, i.e, denying it its rights under the NPT. Berman is a Democrat, speaking for Democrats, and his defection to the full Netanyahu approach makes it likely Obama will fold and give up on negotiations. Given that no Iranian government would ever accept such terms, a war is much more likely. Many consider that impossible. After all, if President George W. Bush flat-out refused to give Israel permission to attack Iran , why would President Obama say “yes.” The big difference is politics. When the Israelis (via their neocon proxies Vice President Cheney, Elliot Abrams, and others) demanded that Israel be allowed to attack before the ostensibly dovish Obama became president, the hawks had no cards to play. Bush was leaving office and had no need to please the war crowd. Besides he knew that they had destroyed his presidency by duping him into invading Iraq. Why would he give them Iran when, as he told them, no one could predict the implications of attacking. In short, he responded to the idea of war in Iran as he should have reacted to the idea of invading Iraq: with skepticism. His “no” ended the discussion, leaving the war crowd despondent, believing that that their chances of success with Obama were nil. Bush would have been unlikely to agree (following the Iraq failure) even if he had political considerations to worry about. Bush did not rely on AIPAC oriented donors to bankroll his campaigns. Republican presidential candidates (and that includes the likely 2012 nominee, Mitt Romney) are almost entirely funded by business interests. Name a special interest (the old fashioned kind that donates to campaigns to ultimately put money in their own pockets like the Chamber of Commerce or Koch Brothers) and you will find it well-represented among GOP donors. But not the Israel lobby crowd which, no matter what you may think about it, is not about personal greed. Check out the list of Romney’s top donors. These are not people who care about the West Bank, Iran nuclear enrichment or foreign policy issues in general. Their special interest is themselves. This is not the case with Democratic donors. With corporate money flowing so heavily to the Republicans, Democrats need other sources. One of the Democrats’ largest sources of funding comes from the “pro-Israel” crowd which, like Hollywood executives, have stuck with Democrats through thick and thin. Although the single-issue Israel types, would like to see Jews move toward the Republicans, they don’t. To their credit, even Jewish multi-millionaire business people tend to be liberals who reject the Republican party as being alien and, to be frank, hostile to all minorities – including Jews. Most of these wealthy Jewish donors do not give to Democrats out of hawkishness on Israel although AIPAC and other “pro-Israel” organizations have successfully conveyed the falsehood that they do. In fact, as the polls demonstrate, Jews support Democrats because of their preference for a liberal, tolerant, economically just America not as a form of insurance that the U.S. will not push Israel toward peace. Nonetheless, the lobby has been very successful in conveying that if a donor’s name is Goldberg, the money is about Israel, and now Iran, even though it’s more likely to be about opposing racism or environmental destruction. That is why Obama treads so lightly on all issues that touch the Middle East. His aides tell him that even the slightest deviation from the Netanyahu line will cause “pro-Israel” money to start flowing to the Republicans. That is also why Vice President Biden met with pro-Israel groups right before the just-concluded Iran negotiations to assure them that the United States will not deviate an inch from Netanyahu’s. That commitment produced our refusal to even discuss the easing of sanctions in exchange for Iranian commitments to limit nuclear enrichment. And it was that refusal (and particularly the refusal to defer new onerous sanctions) that killed this round of negotiations and maybe negotiations altogether. After all, why would Iran give up anything unless we are prepared to lift sanctions? What country gives up anything in exchange for nothing or, at best, very little? All this leads me to conclude that Netanyahu may decide to attack during the Obama presidency rather than wait for Romney. One, Romney is unlikely to win. And, two, if he does win, why would he be more willing to approve an attack than George Bush was? Sure, his campaign rhetoric is stridently hawkish and he has indicated that neocons will dominate his foreign policy team. But that could be just campaign talk, just another Romney attempt to look crazy right to solidify support among the crazy right. As president, however, he is likely to understand, as Bush did, that, as a Republican, he is free to do what he wants to do on the Middle East including refusing to authorize an Israeli attack. After all, unlike Obama, AIPAC-connected donors will not have played a significant role in his election and are unlikely to support him for re-election. Besides, pure business types like Romney (and his supporters) can be surprisingly dovish when it comes to disrupting the world economy not to mention their beloved oil market. These calculations are all obvious enough that one can assume they have occurred to Netanyahu and his lobby too. Romney, for all his tough talk, is both a question mark and fairly immune to the intimidation of U.S. policymakers that is Netanyahu and his lobby’s stock-in-trade. Obama, on the other hand, has been led to believe he is utterly vulnerable to the lobby and its donors – which is why he has proven to be such a pushover for Netanyahu over the past three years. In short, unless somehow there is a breakthrough in the next round of Iran negotiations (June 18 in Moscow), a breakthrough Netanyahu and his lobbyare working hard to prevent, war could be looming. And not under President Romney. Under President Obama. Yes, that could, in the end, cost him the election, but that is not what he is likely to hear from his top advisers these days: the people who raise the money. As always, they will tell Obama that he has no choice but to give Netanyahu what he wants. If past is prologue, he will.

#### Romney won't strike Iran

Sefi Rachlevsky, 2012 (Sefi Rachlevsky is the author of the bestseller "The Messiah's Donkey, which some religious Israelis regard as anti-religious)< <http://www.haaretz.com/opinion/romney-could-prevail-on-israel-not-to-attack-iran.premium-1.437226>>

There are three men who can prevent a regional disaster. The first is Mitt Romney. Benjamin Netanyahu acts, first and foremost, like a member of the right-wing fringe of American politics. From there, he sees Obama as unpatriotic and hostile to Israel. The timing of the impending war was chosen on the assumption that Obama wins the upcoming election. According to Netanyahu, the only time Obama would not be able to stand in Israel's way is just before the U.S. elections. Once the war begins, Obama will be compelled, for political reasons, to bring in the U.S. military, the only military force capable of stopping the Iranian nuclear project for the long term. But now it is looking like the Republicans have a good chance of beating Obama. If this trend continues, Romney is likely to win - an outcome that requires Netanyahu to rethink the timing of attacking Iran. Romney is close enough to Netanyahu that he is able to prevail on Israel not to attack, since the presumptive Republican nominee has no interest in inheriting an America that has been sucked into an Israeli war.

### AT: Iran Strikes - No Econ Impact

#### Iran war won't cause oil shocks

Yetiv 2012, ( Steve Yetiv, Professor of Political Science at Old Dominion University, “The undue worry about oil and Iran”. 3/30/12 AD. 7/12/12. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/conflict-with-iran-unlikely-to-spike-oil-prices/2012/03/30/gIQAbqn7lS\_story.html|Ashwin)

Oil prices are up more than 30 percent from six months ago amid fears that Israel or the United States may strike Iran. Concerns have spread that military conflict would cause a major shock to oil prices, damaging the U.S. and global economies. While the situation is serious, such predictions are unlikely to pan out. Understanding how such fears are exaggerated would clarify the stakes in the standoff and underscore how scholars, market analysts and oil traders often overestimate the effect geopolitical events will have on prices.¶ For starters, Iran and Saudi Arabia have been at loggerheads since Iran’s 1979 revolution, with Tehran intermittently trying to undermine the Saudi regime. The last thing Sunni-dominated Saudi Arabia wants is a nuclear Shiite Iran to which it would have to kowtow. The Saudis are ready to use their spare and idle oil capacity to make up for any disruption in the 2.4 million barrels Iran exports per day, as the Saudi oil minister recently noted.¶ In the event of war, it is almost certain that the United States would coordinate an oil release with the International Energy Agency. The IEA requires each of its 28 members to hold enough oil in the form of international oil company stocks and/or strategic petroleum reserves to withstand a total cutoff of imports for 90 days. When the U.S.-led coalition attacked Iraqi forces in Kuwait in 1991, a U.S.-IEA joint release helped significantly lower world oil prices.¶ Even if the IEA does not act, the United States has strategic oil reserves it could release on its own. IEA members hold more than 1.6 billion barrels of oil, with the United States alone holding well over 700 million barrels. That capacity could be used to defray the loss of Iran’s oil exports for many months. President Obama referred to this capacity Friday when noting that new sanctions that target Iran’s oil exports on Iran would not harm allies.¶ Recent tensions sparked fears that Iran would close the Strait of Hormuz, through which 17 percent of the world’s oil flows. Tehran can certainly disrupt oil transit, but, whatever its threats, it does not have the capability to challenge the U.S. Navy for long. Such a fight would be one of history’s biggest mismatches. Those concerned about the fallout of a war with Iran should also consider that Libya’s oil exports, which were cut off from February to October last year during the revolt against Moammar Gaddafi, are likely to reach pre-conflict levels in the next three to six months. That is one less constraint on the global oil supply.¶ We should also consider that Europe’s economic woes, the lackluster U.S. economy and China’s slowing rate of growth are restraining the global demand for oil. Prices would jump much more if an Iran war coincided with higher global economic growth and oil demand

### AT: Russia Relations - Alt Cause

#### Putin dooms US-Russia relations

Kuchins 3/1 (Andrew, Senior Fellow and Director of the CSIS Russia and Eurasia Program, " The End of the 'Reset'" 2012, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137308/andrew-c-kuchins/the-end-of-the-reset, EMM)

But now those propositions look highly dubious. Putin's latest campaign article, "Russia and the Changing World," makes clear that the so-called reset in U.S.-Russia relations is over, and that tough times lie ahead. Addressing his own question -- "Who undermines confidence?" -- Putin pointed at the United States and NATO, but especially at the Americans, who "have become obsessed with the idea of becoming absolutely invulnerable." Some may write off Putin's anti-American tone as campaign rhetoric, but it has become increasingly clear that his brash posture toward Washington reflects what he actually thinks about the United States and its foreign policy. In fact, Putin has long held these views. Today it's as if Putin has dialed the U.S.-Russia relationship back to 2007, when he unleashed his anti-American diatribe at the Wehrkunde security conference in Munich. Then, Putin's anti-Americanism was angry and aggressive; now, as Russian foreign affairs expert Fyodor Lukyanov told a Washington audience this week, "his anti-Americanism is defensive." He sees foreign policy challenges at every turn, especially Europe's debt fiasco and China's rise; these are dilemmas over which he has little control. But domestic political stability is his principal concern, and Putin sees the United States as a threat to his sovereign rule. Anti-Americanism, at least to some extent, has been a staple of Russian political campaign rhetoric since the onset of the Putin era, but never like this. The rapprochement in U.S.-Russia relations had already begun to slow last spring over the Western military intervention in Libya and the breakdown in discussions about missile defense cooperation. Putin announced his return to the presidency on September 24, 2011, and subsequently the tone of Russian statements about differences with Washington on Syria, the Iranian nuclear program, and missile defense plans sharpened. Then came December's parliamentary elections, after which tens of thousands of Russian citizens took to the streets on three occasions. It was as if Russian domestic politics crashed into foreign policy. In response to U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's criticism of those elections as "flawed," Putin accused her of "sending signals" to support the opposition. When the new U.S. ambassador to Russia, Michael McFaul, arrived in Moscow, he was lambasted on Russian national television for his supposed mission to foment revolution in Russia. Even in the darkest days of the Cold War, no U.S. ambassador ever received such harsh treatment upon arrival. To add insult to injury, the Russian leadership knows very well that McFaul is a highly valued and trusted adviser to Obama; his poor treatment is on some level an affront to the president.

### AT: Russia Relations - No Accidental War

#### New systems contain the impact to accidental war

Slocombe 9 (Former Under-Secretary of Defense for Policy and Former Senior Advisor for Security and Defense to the Coalition Provisional Authority in Baghdad, "De-Alerting: Diagnoses, Prescriptions, and Side-Effects\*,” June 21st, <http://www.ewi.info/system/files/Slocombe.pdf>, EMM)

Moreover, in recent years, both the US and Russia, as well as Britain and China, have modified their procedures so that even if a nuclear-armed missile were launched, it would go not to a “real” target in another country but – at least in the US case - to empty ocean. In addition to the basic advantage of insuring against a nuclear detonation in a populated area, the fact that a missile launched in error would be on flight path that diverged from a plausible attacking trajectory should be detectable by either the US or the Russian warning systems, reducing the possibility of the accident being perceived as a deliberate attack. De-targeting, therefore, provides a significant protection against technical error. These arrangements – PALs and their equivalents coupled with continued observance of the agreement made in the mid-90s on “de-targeting” – do not eliminate the possibility of technical or operator-level failures, but they come very close to providing absolute assurance that such errors cannot lead to a nuclear explosion or be interpreted as the start of a deliberate nuclear attack.6 The advantage of such requirements for external information to activate weapons is of course that the weapons remain available for authorized use but not susceptible of appropriation or mistaken use. The drawback from a deterrence and operational point of view is, of course, that the system for transmitting the information must not be susceptible of interruption – that is, there must be assurance that an authorized decision maker will be able to act and have the decision – and the accompanying authenticated orders and unlock combinations – communicated to and received by the operators of the weapon systems. Accordingly, a system of combination-locked safeties requires a highly survivable network for decision and communication with the operators. Otherwise there would be pressures for early transmission of the codes, with their insertion subject to a later execute order or even more dangerous, pre-delegation of authority to issue the execute orders. In this, as in other aspects of measures to meet the “never” requirement, a highly capable and highly survivable command and control system is essential.

#### START solved

Isaacs 9 (John, Executive Director of Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, “How the New Start Treaty Increases US Security,” The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, <http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/nuclearweapons/articles/how_the_new_start_treaty_increases_us_security>)

New START will verifiably reduce surplus U.S. and Russian nuclear forces and ensure a stable and predictable U.S.-Russian nuclear relationship. The new agreement limits both deployed strategic missiles and bombers and deployed strategic warheads. The treaty’s streamlined verification and compliance provisions are tailored to the new limits and reflect the realities of the current U.S. and Russian arsenals. These provisions will also allow the U.S. to look into Russian missiles and count the actual number of warheads they carry, a first for an arms control treaty. They will give each side high confidence that the other is complying with the treaty’s limits and reduce the chances for misunderstanding and worst-case scenario planning that could lead to an accidental nuclear exchange. Moreover, the U.S. will still be able to maintain a robust and flexible nuclear deterrent. Without a new treaty the U.S. would have far less confidence in its ability to limit and monitor Russia’s still enormous nuclear arsenal.

### AT: India Relations - No ! and Resilient

#### No impact to relations

Tellis 7 - senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues. Former Department of State senior adviser to the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs. Former senior policy analyst at the RAND corporation

CHAPTER 8 Gauging U.S.-Indian strategic cooperation Edited By Henry D. Sokolski, Army War College (U.S.). Strategic Studies Institute WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT FROM INDIA AS A STRATEGIC PARTNER? Ashley J. Tellis http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:AN0FEcbqUQ0J:scholar.google.com/+india+author:%22Ashley+Tellis%22&hl=en&as\_sdt=0,23

It would not be an exaggeration to say that for the first time in recent memory Indian and American interests in each of these eight issue-areas are strongly convergent.10 It is equally true to assert that India’s contribution ranges from important to indispensable as far as achieving U.S. objectives in each of these issue-areas is concerned. That does not mean, however, that the United States and India will automatically collaborate on every problem that comes before the two countries. The differentials in raw power between the United States and India are still too great and could produce differences in operational objectives, even when the overarching interests are preeminently compatible. Beyond the differentials in raw power, bilateral collaboration could still be stymied by competing national preferences over the strategies used to realize certain objectives. And, finally, even when disagreement over strategies is not at issue, differences in negotiating styles and tactics may sometimes divide the two sides.

#### Indian relations resilient

Schaffer 10 (Teresita Schaffer, Ambassador Teresita C. Schaffer is director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “U.S.-India Initiative Series The United States and India 10 Years Out,” October 2010)

<http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_10YearsOut_Schaffer.pdf>

India and the United States have transformed their relationship in the past 20 years. Looking ahead a decade or more, this trend is likely to continue. The two countries can expect strong economic ties and a livelysecurity relationship, including increased defense trade and especially stronger cooperation in the Indian Ocean. Economic issues will remain important drivers of Indian foreign policy. Cooperation on the global scene will have ups and downs, but the two countries will gradually find more areas where they can work together. As India’s international trade encompasses more sophisticated and knowledge-based products, India will pursue economic interests that do not necessarily dovetail with those of the developing countries as a group. India-Pakistan relations are likely to remain brittle. India will continue to see China as its major strategic challenge. Over the next decade, India will become more comfortable with a higher international profile – but slowly, and with considerable nervousness about the risks involved in departing from its comfort zone focused on the nonaligned movement. The “wild cards” most likely to produce real discontinuities in U.S.-India ties relate to the domestic coherence and international behavior of Pakistan and China, to international conflict involving Iran and to changes in the global distribution of power over the next decade. In addition, externally driven changes in climate or technology could limit India’s economic growth and in the process make India a much more inwardoriented country. Looking behind this broad-brush projection, it is instructive to take apart the elements of continuity and change, and to see what lessons these hold for policymakers. Growing Economies, Expanding LinkagesIndia’s economic growth after 1990 was one of the most important factors in transforming U.S.-India relations. This economic growth had two consequences, both of which are likely to continue through the next decade: It led to an increasingly large and vibrant U.S.-India economic relationship, and it put economic success – trade, investment and securing energy supplies – at the heart of India’s foreign policy and strategic calculus.Projections for India’s economy over the next five years consistently foresee growth rates of upwards of 8 percent, possibly higher. Even if India’s economic expansion falls somewhat short of these levels, one can expect economics to remain one of the drivers of U.S.-India relations, and a very positive one. In the next decade, trade will continue to grow as a share of India’s economy. The United States will remain one of India’s top three trading partners, and probably the largest when one includes services and information technology trade as well as goods. India’s economic growth will make it an increasingly important partner for the United States, though its share of U.S. trade will not be as impressive (about 1.4 percent of U.S. trade in 2009; even dramatic growth will leave it well short of the top tier). The geography and composition of India’s trade will be increasingly diverse. India has already begun implementing free-trade areas with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and Korea, and will negotiate one with Japan. With each new trade opening, the next one will become slightly easier, and India will approach the next multilateral trade negotiation with more flexibility and a greater expectation that it can benefit from global trade liberalization. A free-trade agreement with the United States is conceivable toward the end of this period, but only if the U.S. economy picks up enough to counteract the politics of getting such an agreement enacted by the U.S. Congress. Investment flows will continue to increase, both into and out of India. As a result, Indian companies will become increasingly active participants in the U.S. economy. In particular, the close personal and corporate linkages that bind the leading information technology firms in both countries will continue. Trade and investment are private activities. They can be intensified through government policies that sustain India’s own economic growth, but fundamentally they will carry on regardless of the ups and downs in government-to-government ties. They will also help stabilize the rest of the relationship. Security and the Indian Ocean By the same token, India’s growing recognition that its economy is not only a critical domestic priority but also a determinant of its national power will reinforce ties with the United States – not only in the economic sphere but also in the security area. One of the established pillars of U.S.-India ties is a common interest in Indian Ocean security. For India, this is critical not only for the safety of the immediate neighborhood but also for the security of its most important economic supply routes. This common concern will reinforce the importance of naval cooperation and more generally of security ties. India and U.S. security perspectives on East Asia will remain closely aligned. Ten years hence, India will be more fully integrated into Asia than it is now. India’s leadership will continue to see China as their primary strategic challenge. Its foreign policy will seek friendly engagement with China, and this will lead to instances where India draws closer to China on certain global issues (as happened, for example, at the climate change meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark). But India’s leaders are acutely conscious that an assertive China will challenge India’s security and economic interests. India will compensate through growing economic and political ties with Japan, Korea and the ASEAN countries, which will also make it more of a player on the larger Asian scene. This approach has strong parallels with the way the United States looks at China. It will also, however, make India especially sensitive to any suggestion that the United States is giving preference to China in its approach to Asian security and institutions.

### AT: Interventionism - No Impact

#### Data disproves their interventionism impact

Fettweis 11 Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

### 

# Neg

### 1NC Uniqueness and Link

#### Obama will win the election now, but it's close - economy and deficit reduction are key

Mali 4/10 (Meghashyam Mali, Washington lawyer, “Obama leads Romney, but still vulnerable on economy, poll finds”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/220651-poll-finds-obama-tops-romney-on-key-issues-overall-likability>, 4/10/12, Bhattacharyya)

A new poll shows President Obama with a strong edge over likely GOP opponent Mitt Romney on a range of key issues, but still vulnerable on his handling of the economy. Obama holds double-digit leads over Romney on healthcare, foreign policy and women's issues, and voters say the president is more likable, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll released Tuesday. But the poll also finds Obama struggling to sell voters on his economic record. Forty-six percent of those polled say that Obama's handling of the economy would be a major reason to oppose his reelection, with 32 percent saying that issue would make them more likely to support him. Romney tops the president on handling the economy, with 47 percent preferring his approach to 43 percent for the president. On specific economic issues, the poll finds a small gap between the two candidates. Forty-seven percent polled say Obama would better support small businesses, to 45 percent for Romney. On creating jobs, Obama has a similarly small edge, with 46 percent preferring his positions to 43 percent for Romney. Those numbers fall within the poll’s 3.5 percent margin of error. Poll shows Obama’s gas price troubles persist. Overall, the poll finds Obama leading Romney by single digits among voters, 51 percent to 44, in a hypothetical November match-up. Obama has a strong margin among women, leading Romney 57 percent to 38. The president, however, trails among men by 8 points. Those surveyed find the president more "friendly and likable" than his opponent by 64 percent to 26. Fifty-five percent of those surveyed say Obama is more “inspiring,” to 29 percent for Romney. The president also enjoys a wide lead on many key issues. On healthcare, Obama has a 48 percent to 38 advantage. Those numbers are a positive sign for the campaign, which faces the prospect of the Supreme Court striking down the president’s signature domestic achievement, healthcare reform, ahead of the general election. On foreign policy, Obama holds a 17-point edge, with 53 percent of those surveyed preferring Obama's approach to 36 percent for Romney. On addressing women's issues, voters backed Obama 53 percent to 34. Romney, however, holds a double-digit lead on tackling the federal budget deficit. Fifty-one percent of those polled support Romney's position to 38 percent for Obama. The poll’s results come as both Romney and Obama have begun trading punches ahead of their expected November match-up. Romney holds a greater than two-to-one edge in delegates over his GOP rivals and has seen a wave of endorsements from prominent Republicans eager for him to wrap up a protracted nomination fight and redirect his attention to the president. Obama's campaign has made efforts to paint Romney, the former CEO of Bain Capital, a private equity firm, as out of touch with the concerns of Americans struggling in the recovering economy. Forty-nine percent of those surveyed said Obama would do better "protecting the middle class," with 39 percent picking Romney. Similarly, 49 percent of voters say Obama better understands the country's economic concerns, to 37 percent for Romney. But the poll also shows that Democratic attacks on Romney's wealth may be failing to rally voters. While 19 percent say Romney's personal wealth is a reason to oppose his candidacy, 71 percent say it would not affect their vote. On Tuesday, the president will travel to the key battleground state of Florida to push for the Buffett Rule, which calls for the wealthiest to pay more in taxes, an issue Democrats are also using to hammer Romney on his own tax record. Romney paid approximately 14 percent on his income of $21 million in 2010, his records show. On Monday, Obama campaign manager Jim Messina blasted Romney, claiming his economic agenda would only aid millionaires. “Romney’s plan looks out for people just like him,” said Messina. “He’s trying to obscure how much he would benefit by hiding his own tax records.”

#### More deficit spending would swing the election to Romney

Kraushaar 12 (Josh, National Journal writer, 5/14/12, <http://decoded.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/romneys-targeted-deficit-messa.php>)

If unemployment was the only factor driving this presidential election, Mitt Romney would not be spending much time campaigning in Iowa, where the state's agricultural economy is relatively healthy, and the state boasts a 5.2 percent unemployment rate, the lowest for any battleground state. But spending and debt are big issues in the American heartland, too. And that's why Romney spent time on the trail in Des Moines Tuesday, with a speech decrying excessive government spending. Concern over federal spending is what drove the tea party movement into existence in 2009, and it's an issue that hasn't gone away in 2012. It's what's driving Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's momentum in next month's gubernatorial recall, with a deficit-conscious GOP base showing high levels of enthusiasm. (It's also an effective message with independents: Check out this new ad from Republican New Mexico Senate candidate Heather Wilson that's focused squarely on the debt, deficit and spending -- in a Democratic-leaning state.) When pollsters ask voters what their most important issue is, the catch-all "jobs and the economy" comes first. But the number of voters naming the deficit rose in 2010 and has remained largely constant, and it's an issue that's driving conservatives to the polls. It's also a way for Romney to criticize the president on the economy in states that haven't suffered the brunt of the downturn. New Hampshire is another state with a solid economy, but one receptive to Romney's small-government messaging. Indeed, the RNC held a conference call today, featuring former New Hampshire Gov. John Sununu and former New Hampshire Rep. Jeb Bradley, decrying Obama's record on debt and deficits. Obama may be leading in early Granite State polls, but the Romney campaign is optimistic about their chances there, hoping to take advantage of the state's "live free or die" sentiment. If Obama needs high levels of youth and minority turnout to win a second term, Romney needs a restive base anxious about the fiscal future of the country to show up in big numbers. That's the ticket to a Romney victory in states like Iowa, New Hampshire, and Virginia -- where the economy is pretty good but voter dissatisfaction still runs high.

### Obama Win Now - Polls

#### Obama's solidly winning now - polls prove

West 7/12, Tribute Washington Bureau—National political correspondent for the LA Times, 7/12/12[Paul, “Obama holds 'significant lead' over Romney in new national poll” LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jul/12/news/la-pn-obama-holds-significant-lead-over-romney-in-new-national-poll-20120712]ADravid

**With the election still four months away, President Obama holds “a significant lead” over Republican challenger Mitt Romney, according to a new Pew Research Center poll released Thursday**. The national survey, completed July 9, showed **Obama outpacing Romney by 50 percent to 43 percent**. That’s a more substantial gap than most recent surveys have registered, but Obama has held at least a small lead in earlier polling by Pew. The independent polling operation said there had been “no clear trend in either candidate’s support” since Romney secured the GOP nomination in early spring. When it comes to fixing the economy—the top issue of the campaign--“Romney has not seized the advantage,” Pew’s analysis concluded. “In fact, he has lost ground on this issue over the past month.” Of potentially greater significance than the overall national figures, **Obama continues to lead Romney in battleground states.** In the 12 states considered most competitive at this point, the president holds a seven percentage-point edge, 51 to 44, the Pew survey found**. A Wall Street Journal survey, released late last month, also showed Obama with an eight-point advantage in battleground states**. **The national figures found no overall improvement in Romney’s standing with voters over the past two months, a period in which Obama has attempted to keep his rival on the defensive with negative ad attacks on his business record and personal wealth.** **Some Republicans outside the Romney camp have become increasingly jittery about what they regard as insufficient progress by their party’s unofficial nominee against a vulnerable incumbent.** As the campaign heads into mid-summer, a period in which public attention will be diverted, at least in part, by the Olympic games in London, Romney has failed thus far to capitalize on deep voter dissatisfaction with the way things are going in the country. At the same time, **Obama’s job-approval rating has ticked up slightly**. In the latest poll, it stood at 50 percent, the first time Pew found that he had reached positive territory on that score since March. Voters were asked which candidate was best suited to fix the U.S. economy, and by a six-point margin they favored Obama over Romney, 48 percent to 42 percent. That’s a sharp turnaround from June, when Romney held the advantage on that question by eight points, 49 percent to 41 percent. A similar shift was reflected among independent voters, a prized target for both candidates, who are now almost evenly divided on who would best improve the economy. In June, Romney enjoyed a 13-point edge among independents on that question. The latest survey, like most polling at this stage of the campaign, did not attempt to narrow the contest down to likely voters. Obama’s lead, Pew found, stemmed from the fact that more voters currently identify themselves as Democrats than Republicans, and that virtually identical proportions of each say they will back their party’s nominee. Put another way, the results of the survey are yet a further indication that voter mobilization will be crucial in determining the winner of this year’s election. **Obama has increased his lead among younger voters**—historically the least likely to turn out on Election Day. It’s now 24 percentage points, down from 34 points in the 2008 election. Independent voters—who typically decide close elections—remain split, with 46% favoring Romney and 45% supporting Obama, a statistical tie. Romney has a “particularly strong” advantage among working-class whites, the poll found. White voters with less than a college degree favored him by 58 percent to 38 percent over the president. College-educated whites, meantime, were split (50% Obama, 47% Romney). **Obama, attacked by Romney as “weak” on foreign policy, held a solid advantage over the former Massachusetts governor when voters were asked which candidate would do the best job of defending America from terrorist attacks and making wise foreign policy decisions**. Romney’s only issue advantage came on the question of who would do the best job of reducing the federal budget deficit. However, that issue trailed jobs and healthcare when voters were asked what mattered most to them in deciding their vote for president this year.

#### Newest polls prove

Robert Sobel, July 13, 2012 (Robert Sobel has a degree in communications and media production. He has written, directed and edited four short films as well as creating his own blog on politics and entertainment. A constant, outspoken American, Robert will not pull back any punches when it comes to delivering his opinions.) < <http://www.examiner.com/article/new-poll-president-obama-leading-nationally-ahead-on-health-care-and-taxes>> (Shah)

According to a new Pew Research poll, the majority of the American people are siding with President Obama rather than make the switch to the former CEO of Bain Capital, Mitt Romney. The Pew Research poll shows that 50% of Americans polled are now in favor of President Obama compared to only 43% who would vote for Mitt Romney. President Obama has increased his national lead over Romney from four points in June, to seven points in July. Romney is lacking in many areas, most notably in enthusiasm. Only 34% of Romney supporters said they favor him strongly compared to 64% of President Obama supporters. Getting the vote out in November will be the key issue and if Mitt Romney can't get his base riled up, it will be very difficult for him to take the While House on election night. Another area that was surprising was the economy. After three straight months of disappointing jobs reports, President Obama still leads Mitt Romney on the issue of handling the economy. When asked who they thought would be better "improving economic conditions," 48% of voters polled said they favored the president, compared to 42% who thought Romney would do a better job.

#### Obama's ahead, but only barely

Ryan Witt, July 14, 2012 (Ryan Witt is a graduate of Washington University Law School in St. Louis and has extensive experience teaching government and politics. His articles have been cited by The Washington Post, NPR, Politics Daily, The Guardian, The Huffington Post, Media Matters, Daily Kos, and Think Progress among others) (Shah)

The national polls have generally been trending towards President Obama over the last two weeks, with the exception of Rasmussen Reports, who has still shown Mitt Romney with a lead contrary to nearly every other pollster. However, now even Rasmussen has changed, as a new Rasmussen tracking poll released today shows Obama ahead of Romney by one point. The poll, of 1,500 likely voters, shows Obama garnering 46 percent of the vote compared to 45 percent for Mitt Romney. The poll was taken over three days, from Wednesday to Friday. It should be noted that Gallup’s tracking poll now has the race tied, and that Rasmussen could go back to showing a Romney lead as soon as tomorrow.

#### Obama holds a significant lead now

Goddard 7/12 Taegan Goddard is a former policy adviser to U.S. Senator Donald Riegle and Governor Lowell Weicker, "Obama Retains Significant National Lead," 2012, http://politicalwire.com/archives/2012/07/12/obama\_retains\_significant\_national\_lead.html

Despite a stagnant economy and broad dissatisfaction with the nation's direction, a new Pew Research survey finds President Obama holds a significant lead over Mitt Romney, 50% to 43%.

Key finding: "Of 12 issues tested, Obama has the edge on eight; Romney is seen as stronger than Obama on only one, reducing the federal budget deficit. In June, Romney led as the candidate best able to improve the economy, but today Obama holds a slight lead on this issue. However, neither candidate has a clear advantage on the job situation, the top issue for voters: 46% say Romney and 42% say Obama can do a better job improving the job situation."

#### **Obama will win now - economy, optimism, and momentum**

Reuters 7/11 "Obama expands lead on Romney, voters more optimistic," 2012, http://newyork.newsday.com/news/nation/obama-expands-lead-on-romney-voters-more-optimistic-1.3830955

President Barack Obama expanded his lead over Republican challenger Mitt Romney to 6 percentage points in the White House race this month as voters became slightly more optimistic about the economy, a Reuters/Ipsos poll showed on Tuesday.

Four months before the November 6 election, Obama leads Romney among registered voters 49 percent to 43 percent. In June, Obama held a slim 1-point lead over the former Massachusetts governor.

Obama's improved standing was fueled in part by a slight rise in optimism about the future, with the number of Americans who think the country is on the wrong track dropping 5 percentage points to 58 percent.

Obama's approval ratings ticked up 1 point to 48 percent and the number of Americans who disapprove of his job performance dropped 3 percentage points to 47 percent.

The shift follows a low point for Obama in June as economic worries deepened and Romney consolidated Republican support after clinching the party's nomination to challenge him in November. Obama had led Romney by 7 points in May's poll.

"Last month was a particularly bad time for Obama but now the race seems to have returned to its normal position, which has Obama up a few points," pollster Chris Jackson said.

The poll of 1,154 adults, including 885 registered voters, was taken between Thursday and Monday. During the period, a weak labor report was issued on Friday that showed sluggish job gains and an unchanged unemployment rate of 8.2 percent in June.

It also followed a long-anticipated Supreme Court decision late last month upholding Obama's landmark healthcare overhaul. At the same time, gas prices have dropped as the summer driving season gains steam and concerns about the European debt crisis have eased slightly.

'PEOPLE FEEL A LITTLE BETTER'

"It's not like consumer confidence has turned a big corner, but people feel a little better about where they are and where they are going," Jackson said. "Nothing bad has happened recently, and when nothing really bad happens people start feeling more optimistic."

#### Obama's way ahead with swing state voters - they are key

Gallup 7/8, (Susan Page, Staff Writer for USA Today/Gallup, “Swing states poll: Amid barrage of ads, Obama has edge”. 7/8/12 AD. 7/9/12, http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/story/2012-07-08/swing-states-poll/56097052/1|Ashwin)

The swing states survey focuses on a dozen states that aren't firmly aligned with either Democrats or Republicans. That puts them in a position to tip the outcome in the Electoral College. The states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin.¶ In a new USA TODAY/Gallup Poll of swing states, an overwhelming majority of voters remember seeing campaign ads over the past month; most voters in other states say they haven't. In the battlegrounds, one in 12 say the commercials have changed their minds about President Obama or Republican Mitt Romney — a difference on the margins, but one that could prove crucial in a close race.¶ At this point, Obama is the clear winner in the ad wars. Among swing-state voters who say the ads have changed their minds about a candidate, rather than just confirmed what they already thought, 76% now support the president, vs. 16% favoring Romney. To be sure, Obama's ads have done more to win back Democrats than to win over independents or Republicans: Thirteen percent of Democrats say their minds have been changed by ads, compared with 9% of independents and 3% of Republicans.¶ Only 8% acknowledge the ads changed their minds about a candidate, for better or worse, though analysts say the actual number is probably higher because some voters don't want to admit or may not even realize their views were affected. Obama leads among those voters nearly 5-to-1.¶ Even Rosemark, a conservative, says Democratic ads criticizing Romney's history in Massachusetts got his attention. "It did make me look a little bit about what his record was," he says.¶ "There's passive learning, passive effects," says Michael Franz of Bowdoin College in Maine, co-director of the Wesleyan Media Project. "Voters may not know per se that an ad has changed their mind. … It may be moving their perceptions slightly in ways they're not cognizant of."¶ Ken Goldstein, a political scientist and president of Kantar Media CMAG, which monitors political ads, says even a small effect could have decisive consequences. He cites the razor-thin margins in Florida and elsewhere in the 2000 election. "Listen, I think the political-advertising impact is pretty modest — a small effect that only matters on the margins," he says. "But ask Al Gore if the margin matters."

#### Obama will win the election now but the election is close

Burns 7/11 Alexander Burns is a Politico election writer. He is a graduate of Harvard where he edited the Harvard Political Review. "Quinnipiac: Obama 46, Romney 43," 2012, http://www.politico.com//blogs/burns-haberman/2012/07/quinnipiac-obama-romney-128611.html

More or less in line with the other polling we've seen this week, Quinnipiac University shows a close race with the slightest of advantages for Obama:

Driven by a yawning marriage gap, and a 2-1 lead among single women, President Barack Obama gets 46 percent of American voters to 43 percent for Gov. Mitt Romney, largely on the support of singles, according to a Quinnipiac University national poll released today.

#### Obama will be reelected - leads in battleground states

Bloomberg News/NYT 6/27, Bloomberg News- A news network delivering mostly business and financial news distributed across the world----New York Times- Daily American newspaper running since 1851. The paper has won 108 Pulitzer prizes and continues to be one of the most popular news organizations today, 6/27/12[News Organizations, “Poll shows Obama tops Romney in 3 key states,” Bloomberg News/New York Times, <http://seattletim>es.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2018546321\_campaign28.html]ADravid

WASHINGTON — President 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 Wednesday. 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. 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. A move by Obama to stop deportations of some illegal immigrants brought to the United States 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. In Florida, Obama leads Romney 45 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. 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 to 39 percent. In the latest poll, Obama's lead over Romney among this bloc has grown to 24 points, 56 to 32 percent. Voters in the other two states in the poll were also supportive, backing the policy 52 to 38 percent in Ohio and 51 to 41 percent in Pennsylvania. In Ohio overall, Obama leads Romney 47 to 38 percent, the poll showed. In the May 3 swing-state poll, Obama was up 44 to 42 percent. The president benefits from positive views about him among Ohio voters — 50 percent rate him favorably, compared with 44 percent who have an unfavorable opinion of him. By comparison, 32 percent of Ohio voters say they view Romney favorably, while 46 percent don't. While Democrats and Republicans in the state allied overwhelmingly with their party's candidate, independent voters backed Obama 45 to 36 percent. "The president's lead is largely due to his lead among independent voters, the group that usually decides Ohio elections," Brown said. In Pennsylvania, Obama leads 45 to 39 percent in the latest poll; in the survey released May 3 he was backed by 47 percent to Romney's 39 percent. Obama has a 12-point edge with women voters in the state in the latest poll. In all three states, Obama is holding his own against Romney on the handling of the economy — the central argument the Republican has made for replacing the president. In Ohio, voters back Obama 47 to 42 percent when asked whether he or Romney would do a better job on the economy. In Pennsylvania, voters tie on this question — 44 percent for each — while in Florida, Romney has a slight edge, 46 percent to 44 percent for Obama. "For much of last year, more voters in these swing states have said Romney would do a better job on the economy," Brown said. "That advantage has largely disappeared." Ohio has been carried by the winner of every presidential election since 1964, and Florida sided with a loser only once over that period — in 1992, when it backed then-President George H.W. Bush over Democrat Bill Clinton. Pennsylvania has been reliably Democratic in presidential races since the 1992 vote. The poll's margin of error in each state is plus or minus 2.8 percentage points. Quinnipiac surveyed 1,200 voters in Florida, 1,237 in Ohio and 1,252 in Pennsylvania. **Victory for Floridain voting case** MIAMI — A federal judge Wednesday rebuffed the Department of Justice's emergency request to stop Florida's attempt to remove people who are not U.S. citizens from its voter-registration rolls. Judge Robert Hinkle of U.S. District Court in Tallahassee said federal laws did not bar the state from identifying and removing ineligible voters from its rolls, although the Aug. 14 primary is less than 90 days away. The laws, Hinkle said, are to block the removal of legitimate voters, not illegitimate ones. But Hinkle, who delivered his ruling from the bench, chastised the state for its cavalier handling of the matter. "Determining citizenship is not as easy as the state would have it," Hinkle said, according to the Sun-Sentinel of South Florida. "Questioning someone's citizenship isn't as trivial as the state would have it." Still, ineligible voters should not be allowed to vote, he said because it can cause "irreparable harm" to legitimate voters. "People need to know we are running an honest election," added Hinkle, according to The Associated Press. Wednesday's ruling lets the suit move forward. Gov. Rick Scott, who pushed for the review of voter rolls for noncitizens, hailed the ruling as a "common-sense decision." A lawyer for the state said in court that the broad review of potential noncitizen voters would stop until Florida's election officials had more reliable data on citizenship status. The review began after Florida's department of elections compared voter registration rolls to a state driver's license database to come up with a list of names of potential noncitizens. The master list contained 182,000 names of potential noncitizens.The state forwarded an initial roster of 2,600 names to independent county election supervisors, asking them to send letters to voters requesting proof of citizenship. If no proof was provided, the voters would be dropped from the rolls. The state would then send more names. But the list was flawed; many voters on the list who had been contacted came forward to say they were either born in America or were naturalized citizens. County election supervisors quickly grew critical of the list, saying more accurate information was needed. Soon, advocates for voters and minorities began to complain, saying the voter scrub was unjust.

#### Obama's leading Romney in polls now but is on the brink

Babington 7/7 Charles Babington, White House reporter for the Associated Press, "Republicans Hope Lumbering Economy Dooms Obama Bid For Second Term," 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/07/obama-economy\_n\_1656067.html

Yet Obama runs even with, or slightly ahead of, Republican rival Mitt Romney in poll after poll. Campaign strategists debate the reasons.

They might include Obama's personal likability, gaps in Romney's strategy or Americans' grudging acceptance of a new normal in which millions of jobs are gone for good and no single person is responsible.

If high unemployment "was a killer, he'd already be dead," said Republican pollster and consultant Mike McKenna. "The survey data tells you he's not dead."

#### Obama's consistently led in the polls

Gallup 7/2, (Frank Newport, Staff Writer for Gallup Polls, “Obama Now Leads Romney, 48% to 43%”. 7/2/12 AD. 7/9/12, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/155465/Obama-Leads-Romney.aspx>|Ashwin)

President Barack Obama has maintained at least a slight margin over Mitt Romney in each of the last six Gallup Daily tracking averages, including a 48% to 43% lead among registered voters in the July 2 report, spanning June 25-July 1.Obama's current five-percentage-point lead is the same as the margin reported three days ago, and marks his biggest lead in Gallup Daily tracking since April, when for two reporting periods he had a seven-point lead over Romney. The current stretch of six days in which Obama has led Romney in each day's average is also the longest such streak for the president since April.¶ Romney has not been ahead of Obama by more than two points since mid-May, and Romney's largest lead of five points occurred in April.¶ Each Gallup Daily tracking seven-day average includes more than 3,000 registered voters.¶ The current June 25-July 1 average includes four days of interviewing after the June 28 Supreme Court decision upholding the Affordable Care Act. Obama's prior five-point lead, from June 22-28, was based on interviews conducted mostly before the decision. Therefore, although the Supreme Court decision may be a reason for Obama's currently more positive position, he was gaining on Romney prior to the decision.

#### Obama will win reelection now but it's not guaranteed

Silver 6/7 Nate, New York Times Politics Writer, "Election Forecast: Obama Begins With Tenuous Advantage," 2012, http://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.

### Obama Win Now - Public

#### **Public predicts Obama to win - they're empirically accurate**

Jones 5/15(Jeffrey M. Jones: investment policy specialist & Staff Writer/Journalist, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/154670/americans-see-obama-solid-favorite-win-election.aspx>, 5/15/2012) Kerwin

Fifty-six percent of Americans think Barack Obama will win the 2012 presidential election, compared with 36% who think Mitt Romney will win. Democrats are more likely to believe that Obama will win than Republicans are to believe Romney will. Independents are nearly twice as likely to think that Obama, rather than Romney, will prevail. The results are based on a May 10-13 USA Today/Gallup poll. The poll was conducted at a time when U.S. registered voters are evenly divided in their vote preferences. Gallup's latest Daily tracking update, based on May 8-14 interviewing, shows 46% of voters preferring Obama and 45% Romney. It is unclear why Americans are more inclined to predict an Obama than a Romney victory when the two are essentially tied in Gallup's latest election polling. It may be that Americans recognize the advantages Obama has as the incumbent and that historically, presidents seeking re-election usually win. For example, in March 2004, when President George W. Bush and John Kerry were about tied in voter preferences, more said Bush (52%) than Kerry (42%) would win. Or, Americans may expect in the months between now and the election that conditions in the U.S. will improve, which would make the incumbent's re-election more certain. Americans are a bit more likely now to say Obama has a better chance of winning than they were at a similar point in 2008. A June 2008 Gallup poll found 52% predicting Obama would win, while 41% thought Republican John McCain would. By October 2008, weeks after the financial crisis, Americans were more certain Obama would win that election, 71% to 23%. Including the 2008 election, Americans' predictions of the four prior presidential elections were also generally accurate. In three separate measurements in 2004, Americans thought Bush would be the winner in two and were split in their predictions in the other, conducted immediately after the Democratic convention. In the final prediction, from mid-October, 56% thought Bush would win and 36% thought Kerry would. The accuracy of the 2000 election prediction is harder to evaluate, given that Al Gore won the popular vote and George W. Bush the electoral vote. In four out of five measurements that year, Americans thought Bush would win, though in the final measurement, taken in mid-September, Americans gave Gore the edge. In an August 1996 poll, Americans overwhelmingly believed incumbent Bill Clinton (69%) would defeat Bob Dole (24%). Implications Americans currently see Obama as a solid favorite to win re-election. This is perhaps a slightly more optimistic assessment than is currently warranted, given that registered voters' candidate preferences are evenly split between Obama and Romney. However, Americans have typically given an edge to the incumbent in years in which a president was seeking re-election. In addition to the close division in current Obama-Romney vote intentions, other key election indicators also point to a more uncertain outcome at this point, including Americans' sub-50% approval ratings of the president and their more negative than positive assessments of the U.S. economy. At the same time, both of those measures are improved from where they were last fall, indicating Americans are feeling a bit better about the job Obama is doing and about the economy than they were earlier in his presidency.

### Obama Win Now - Multiple Warrants

#### Obama will win - winning in swing states and GOP is weak

Tomasky 7/15, Tomasky is a columnist, journalist and author---He acts as the editor and chief of Democracy and is a special correspondent for Newsweek and The Daily Beast. He is also the contributing editor for The American Prospect and contributes to The New York Review of Books, 7/15/12[Michael, “Michael Tomasky: Obama Is Winning Because of the Shrinking GOP” The Daily Beast, [http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/07/15/michael-tomasky-obama-is-winning-because-of-the-shrinking-gop.html]ADravid](http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/07/15/michael-tomasky-obama-is-winning-because-of-the-shrinking-gop.html%5dADravid)

**Mitt Romney’s** present travails must surely seem shocking and offensive to Republicans, both panjandrums and rank and file alike: “His is a great American success story. How can this be bad? The controversy must be all the fault of that evil liberal media and the Democrat Party!” Well, folks, sorry, but it’s not. If you’re willing to spend two minutes scouring the landscape for explanations rather than enemies, it might strike you that outsourcing is a real issue in American life—millions of citizens have been affected by it, and by definition, none of them for the better. That the **ongoing Bain saga is such a shock and outrage to conservatives shows me only that conservatives are profoundly out of touch with the moderate center of the country:** It helps explain why you selected this man as your nominee, and it further helps explain why he’s losing to an incumbent who, given the current economic conditions, ought to be pretty easy to take out. Supporters stand in 100-degree temperatures to listen to President Barack Obama speak at a campaign event on the College of Fine Arts Lawn at Carnegie Mellon University July 5, 2012 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. (Chip Somodevilla / Getty Images) The race is close, and of course **Romney** has a decent shot at winning. But the fact **is** that by every measure, he’s behind. He’s behind, a little, in **national polls.** **He’s behind by more in the swing states. And behind by still more in the electoral college conjectures**, **where** Nate Silver gives Obama 294 votes. **Obama leads**—narrowly, but outside the margin of error—**in Virginia, Ohio, Colorado, and Nevada. If he wins those and holds the usual Democratic states**—and yes, he’s up in Pennsylvania, where Romney has been sinking fast; only Michigan is really close—**he will have won**, even with maybe $1.5 billion thrown at him**, a not-particularly close election**. Okay, I’m getting ahead of myself. But the fact is, as I wrote at the beginning of the week, Romney should be six points ahead. At least four. The congressional Republican strategy—disgraceful but successful—of opposing Obama on everything has largely worked. The biggest thing Obama did manage to pass was wildly unpopular, though matters are improving for him a bit on the health-care front. Obama was soundly rebuked in the mid-term elections. And yet for all that and more, Silver has Obama pegged at roughly a 66 percent chance of winning. That’s not insurmountable in July, but if that’s still the number after both conventions, it’s pretty close to over. Why? One reason is that, as Peter Beinart argued yesterday, **Obama is simply a lot more likeable than Romney.** Certainly no arguing with that. Blech! But there’s more to it. **It’s the whole Republican Party that’s not likeable.** Thomas Jefferson argued roughly that it was in the nature of mankind to divide itself, wherever there be free government, into two basic factions: an aristocratic party that wishes to “draw all powers...into the hands of the higher classes,” as he once put it; and a party that opposes that one, representing the broader people. The GOP has, I admit, done a marvelous job of convincing the media and even some liberals that it is the party of the people, because of its hold on the white working-class majority (a segment that is fast dwindling, by the way—electoral demographer Ruy Teixeira reported recently that this bloc will constitute a sizeable 3 percent less of the electorate this year than it did in 2008—the minority vote will overtake the white working-class by 2016 or certainly 2020). **The GOP has no moderate faction anymore. It’s a rump amalgamation of plutocrats and the people who service their air conditioning**. **The Republican hold on this bloc is real, but it is, as we all know, completely about race and culture.** I say this not to insult these voters. Far from it, in fact. I don’t think they’re stupid people. I think they’re entirely rational and have decided that culture is more important to them than economics, and so they’ve thrown in with the GOP on cultural grounds, even while they must know on some level that the party does not represent them in the least economically. But they accept the deal, and it permits the people who are the real heart and soul of the GOP, the corporate titans and the plutocrats, to call whatever economic shots they wish. But their crossover appeal, shall we say, is limited. Throw in their lickspittles on Capitol Hill and in the right-wing media, and their neo-Leninist political tactics, and the picture gets even worse. The lot of them look like a bunch of grim Pharisees, and it’s all too obvious that all they really care about is cutting rich people’s taxes. It’s not a coincidence that, just a year after the Republicans took power in the House, and the public had a good chance to size them up, the GOP as of January was at its lowest point in terms of party-identification percentage since 1988, just 27 percent. The Democrats have lost ground, too, but at least they’re still in the low 30s. Back to Bain. It’s interesting to think back now to the GOP primary. Romney’s Bain experience was nothing but a plus then. Oh, yes, he was attacked on “vulture capitalism” grounds by Rick Perry and Newt Gingrich. But those attacks did in Perry and Gingrich, not Romney. They elevated Romney. The base rallied around him at that point, and the establishment ditto. It wasn’t so much that people suddenly decided they loved Romney. They were punishing Gingrich and Perry for resorting to “left-wing” attacks. But **if the Bain controversy is hurting Romney, and most indications are that it is, that would appear to mean that more Americans than just left-wingers are taking the issue seriously.** But Republicans high and low couldn’t see this, because the party has no moderate faction anymore. The GOP today is a rump amalgamation of plutocrats and the people who service their air conditioning. Its middle has been hollowed out. If it had had a middle, someone within the party might have been able to issue warnings that Romney’s c.v. maybe carried some downsides. This may sound ironic, since Romney is considered the moderate of the group that sought the nomination, but in terms of biography, he’s the least moderate of all of them. In terms of biography, he’s a pretty perfect expression of what the GOP has become. Mitt might win. A presidential election is a menu with only two options, meat and fish. And if fish has $1.5 billion behind it, and is financing a successful drive to keep meat supporters from being able to vote in key states, then fish can pull out a victory. But the odds are against it for a good reason, a reason that Jefferson identified.

#### Obama winning - multiple reasons

Kludt 7/12 Tom Kludt is a staff writer for TPM (“Pew: Obama Leads By 7, Beats Romney On The Economy”, <http://2012.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/07/pew-obama-romney-economy.php>, 7/12/2012) Kerwin

President Barack Obama has a 7-point cushion over Mitt Romney, according to a new poll from [Pew Research Center](http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/7-12-12%20Political%20Release.pdf) released Thursday. Fifty percent of registered voters nationwide prefer Obama, compared with 43 percent who plan to vote for Romney. The president has held a lead over Romney in every Pew poll this year. It’s also the second consecutive Pew survey that shows Obama polling at 50 percent. In Pew’s June survey, Obama edged the presumptive Republican nominee, 50 percent to 46 percent. Pew also found that Romney has lost ground on the issue that has been central to his campaign: the economy. In June, 49 percent of voters said Romney was the best candidate to improve the nation’s beleaguered economy, compared with 41 percent who gave the nod to Obama. Thursday’s poll shows a flip over the last month, with 48 percent of voters now saying Obama is the best candidate to turn the economy around, compared with 42 percent who named Romney. That’s emerging as a problematic trend for the former Massachusetts governor, who has been unable to seize a clear advantage over Obama despite the country’s ongoing economic woes.¶ Pew also finds that Romney hasn’t gained traction in most other areas: Of 12 issues tested, Romney is seen as stronger than Obama on only one - reducing the federal budget deficit - while Obama has the edge on eight. By two-to-one (60%-30%) Obama is seen as the candidate who would better deal with the problems of poor people. By a 50% to 36% margin, more voters say Obama better reflects their view on social issues like abortion and gay rights. Obama also holds 12-point leads as the candidate better able to defend against terrorist attacks and deal with the nation’s energy problems.

### Obama Win Now - Swing States

#### **Obama will win - multiple key swing states are**

Burns 7/11 Alexander Burns is a Politico election writer. He is a graduate of Harvard where he edited the Harvard Political Review. "Obama super PAC poll: Anti-Romney offensive moves swing states," 2012, http://www.politico.com//blogs/burns-haberman/2012/07/obama-super-pac-poll-antiromney-offensive-moves-swing-128614.html

Voters in five 2012 swing states have moved noticeably away from Mitt Romney since the Obama super PAC began attacking his business background on the air, according to polling conducted for the group Priorities USA Action.

In a memo out this morning, Democratic pollsters Geoff Garin of Garin-Hart-Yang Research Group and Jefrey Pollock and Nick Gourevitch of Global Strategy Group outline their findings and conclude that Romney has taken a meaningful hit as a result of Bain-themed negative ads.

“Mitt Romney’s business experience – the centerpiece of his case for the presidency – has proven to be much more of a liability than an asset in key swing states,” the pollsters write. “Clear negative trends have emerged in recent polling conducted in Colorado, Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.”

The Democrats’ survey tested 3,800 likely voters in those five states, in the period from June 25 to July 3. The top line findings: by a 10-point margin – 37 percent to 27 percent – voters now say that Romney’s background at Bain Capital makes them less likely to vote for him.

According to the poll, 58 percent of voters now agree with the statement that Romney’s priority in the private sector was “making millions for himself and his investors, regardless of the impact on jobs and the employees.”

Overall, Obama leads Romney in the five swing states by 6 points, 48 percent to 42 percent. Romney’s favorability rating in those battlegrounds is 7 points underwater: 36 percent of voters have a positive view of him, versus 43 percent who have an unfavorable view.

Romney looks damaged in the swing states, across the board, but the pollsters write that his problems are a bit more pronounced in the 11 media markets where Priorities has focused its advertising. The group has spent $10 million so far on dark, negative ads casting Romney as a cold-hearted businessman who fired workers and walked away with millions.

In the advertising markets where the super PAC has attacked Romney, his favorability rating is 9 points in the negative direction (versus an average of 7 points overall) and 40 percent of voters say Romney’s business background makes them less likely to vote for him (versus 37 percent overall.)

### Obama Win Now - Econ

#### Obama will win - economy

Lee 7/8 MJ Lee is a writer at Politico, citing Bill Kristol of the Weekly Standard, "Kristol says Romney campaign should 'worry'," 2012, http://www.politico.com/blogs/politico-live/2012/07/bill-kristol-romney-campaign-should-worry-128267.html

The Weekly Standard’s Bill Kristol gave a stark warning to the Romney campaign Sunday, saying the presumed Republican presidential nominee will not be able to beat President Barack Obama if voters don't believe he has a clear plan to turn around the economy.

“President Obama had three disappointing months, but he's holding his own. And if I were in the Romney campaign, that would worry me,” Kristol said on “Fox News Sunday.”

Kristol cited numbers from a recent Fox News poll, which showed that just 41 percent of voters think the president has a clear plan for improving the economy.

“Not great for an incumbent president -- the economy is slow and you’re only at 41-53,” he said. But the numbers were even worse for Romney, Kristol pointed out.

“Do you think his challenger, Gov. Romney, has a clear plan for improving the economy or not? Yes 27, no 55. I don't think you can beat an incumbent president even if the economy’s slow if 27 percent of the voters think you as the challenger don't have a clear plan for improving the economy,” he said.

### Obama Win Now - AT: Historical Precedent

#### Historical precedent concerning elections doesn't apply to Obama - multiple empirics prove

Babington 7/7 Charles Babington, White House reporter for the Associated Press, "Republicans Hope Lumbering Economy Dooms Obama Bid For Second Term," 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/07/obama-economy\_n\_1656067.html

There's a problem with applying historical precedents and conventional wisdom to Obama. He sometimes defies them.

Before the 2008 campaign took shape, how many people thought the United States would elect a black president? Or that a man four years removed from the Illinois Legislature would outmaneuver Bill and Hillary Clinton's political machine?

Besides, no senator had been elected president in more than four decades.

Obama's political resilience has left Republicans quarreling over how best to combat him.

### AT: Romney Win - Econ

#### Economy isn't a win for Romney and won't determine the election - GOP pundits agree

Limbaugh 7/9 Rush Limbaugh is a conservative political commentator. "Limbaugh: Economy "Not An Automatic Win-Win For Romney," 2012, Real Clear Politics, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2012/07/09/limbaugh\_economy\_not\_an\_automatic\_win-win\_for\_romney.html

RUSH LIMBAUGH: Now, my whole point in the last hour -- I want to sum this up for Mitt Romney -- and I hate to say this. It pains me to say this. I can't tell you how sad it makes me, but I don't care. Reality is reality, and the economy and its condition is not an automatic win-win for Romney or the Republicans right now. It just isn't. Snerdley is looking at me with a expression of disbelief on his face, and I'm sure many of you are, too, because that's so revolutionary. It was only back in 1992 where "It's the economy, stupid," was the reason Clinton won. I'm here to tell you that the economy today is worse by factors of geometric proportion than it was in 1992. I had calls in 1992 from people saying, "It can't get any worse, Rush." I had guys that I played golf with at various clubs I belong to, educated, successful businessmen, Democrats telling me in 2004, "It can't get any worse, Rush."

Well, it's worse by factors indescribable, and the same guys are still telling me that we gotta vote Democrat to fix it because it's all Bush's fault. The sad truth is -- and the Romney people are gonna have to learn this right now -- the sad truth is that employment is not pivotal. The unemployment rate, the jobs circumstance in this country is not pivotal and it's not something Obama can lose the election on. Not by itself. It's not something Romney can win. (interruption) What do you mean, how can I say that? I'll tell you how I can say it. We have 48 million Americans, 47 million on food stamps, and the regime is advertising for more. We have 47, 48% who pay no income taxes.

### AT: Romney Win - Pennsylvania

#### Voter ID in Pennsylvania won't swing the election - doesn't affect many and will cause high Democratic turnout

Baer 7/11 John is a Daily News Political Columnist for the Philadelphia Daily News. "GOP voter-ID law could backfire," 2012, http://www.philly.com/philly/columnists/john\_baer/20120711\_GOP\_voter-ID\_law\_could\_backfire.html

YOU CAN actually feel the impact of the state's new voter-ID law coming. I don't mean whether it's successful in fighting fraud, as Republican leaders claim, or whether it's successful in allowing Mitt Romney to win the state, as one Republican leader claims.

I mean in the sense that it's starting to look like a Republican overreach that could end up benefiting Democrats.

It's starting to jump the shark.

Thanks largely to House GOP Leader Mike Turzai saying last month that the law will help Republican Romney, we have ongoing national attention.

The Washington Post on Sunday editorialized against the law, mentioned Turzai and urged courts to halt it.

On Monday, a Boston Globe editorial singled out Turzai for "making it so clear" that the law isn't about voter integrity but about who wins elections.

The Associated Press this week reports problems in other states with provisional or temporary ballots cast by voters who forget to bring or do not have photo ID.

The report, noting that the 2000 presidential election was decided by 537 votes in Florida, said that more than 1,200 votes were tossed out in Indiana and Georgia in 2008 and hundreds more during primaries this year in those states and Tennessee.

(Pennsylvania allows for provisional or temporary ballots, too. A voter then has six calendar days to provide election officials with a valid ID.)

Add to this recently released figures showing more than 758,000 voters don't have PennDOT photo IDs — including nearly one in five Philly voters — and you start to sense fallout to come.

Never mind that the 758,000 number is not the true number since it includes nonactive voters and voters who might well have other photo ID; even if it's half that, or a third, or a quarter, it's problematic.

It's enough to sway a close election and far more than officials predicted.

So no matter the outcome of pending litigation against the law, this GOP effort to change voting requirements is and will be fervently labeled by Democrats as trying to deny President Obama a second term.

(This could have been easily avoided by having the law take effect in 2013.)

And anyone who thinks such labeling won't ascribe, fairly or not, at least some racial motive is blind to the nature of politics.

For Democrats, this law could be a turn-out-the-vote booster.

They have a case.

There's little beyond anecdotal evidence of fraud problems. The AP says a Republican National Lawyers Association report intended to support ID laws found less than one fraud case per year per state over the past decade.

As to cost of implementation, there's $1 million in the budget for "free" IDs (I guess the tooth fairy pays for these), but it certainly will cost more.

The state plans to contact the 758,939 voters without PennDOT IDs by mail this summer. There's no specific cost yet, but when I ask if it's fair to figure a 45-cent stamp for each, Department of State spokesman Ron Ruman says, "That might be the fairest." That's $341,522.

PennDOT says 2,477 "free" photo IDs have been issued so far. Each costs the state $13.50. If only one-third of the 758,939 voters targeted get a "free" ID, that's $3.4 million.

State officials must believe those without IDs won't seek them, or else the $1 million allocated was a woefully underestimated shot in the dark.

The state already plans spending about $5 million in federal funds (about what's spent under the Help America Vote Act in presidential years), much of it to promote the voter-ID law.

Your tax dollars at work.

And lawsuits and inevitable appeals will eat more government resources as the law's impact, financially and politically, continues to grow.

So it could be a bumpy ride: for taxpayers and Republicans.

### AT: Romney Win - Blacks

#### Romney can't win black voters

Burns 7/11 Alexander Burns is a Politico election writer. He is a graduate of Harvard where he edited the Harvard Political Review. "NAACP whacks Romney hours after speech," 2012, http://www.politico.com//blogs/burns-haberman/2012/07/naacp-whacks-romney-hours-after-speech-128650.html

“We are pleased that Governor Romney addressed our convention today,” stated NAACP Chairman Roslyn M. Brock. “This morning Governor Romney laid out his policy agenda for this nation. Unfortunately, much of his agenda is at odds with what the NAACP stands for – whether the issue is equal access to affordable health care, reforming our education system or the path forward on marriage equality. We appreciate that he was courageous and took the opportunity to speak with us directly.”

“While we are glad that Governor Romney recognized the power of the black electorate, he laid out an agenda that was antithetical to many of our interests,” stated NAACP President Benjamin Todd Jealous. “His criticism of the Affordable Care Act – legislation that will improve access to quality health care for millions – signals his fundamental misunderstanding of the needs of many African Americans.”

### AT: Link N/U - Spending Now

#### False - Obama's been fiscally responsible

Kennon 5/23 Joshua Kennon is the Chairman and CEO of Kennon Green Enterprises and the long-time investing for beginners guide at About.com. "Obama Has Overseen the Slowest Federal Spending Increase Since Eisenhower in the 1950's" 2012, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2887629/posts

In fact, in the four years the encompass his first (possibly only) term in office, President Obama has increased Federal spending by only 0.4% per annum, or 40 basis points. Strip out inflation, and real government spending is actually falling. There has been no massive increase in spending. It has to do with how various government budgets are approved and implemented, but it’s phenomenal that the average person doesn’t know this. They see a, say, 12.5% increase in the national debt in a given year and apparently don’t even consider that it could have been due to a law from two years ago just now hitting the nation’s balance sheet. Charlie Munger was right. Humanity invented charts as a way of coping with the unfortunate reality that most people can’t process numbers.

#### Obama is being fiscally responsible---spending growth slowing down

Medeiros 12, Ray is the owner of USAprogressive Media Group---interviews various public figures for the website---acts as a news source for politics and current events, 5/23/12[Ray, “Obama Is The Most Fiscally Responsible President In a Generation” POLITICUS http://www.politicususa.com/obama-fiscally-responsible-president-generation.html]ADravid

**Obama is slowing the growth in spending better than any other President in 60 years**! **The growth in the federal budget has grown 1.4% in President Obama’s first term, compared to President Reagan who increased the rate of spending by 8% in his first term.** In fact in **fiscal year 2010**, **Obama’s first budget, the growth fell,** 1.8%. **If** President **Obama wasn’t facing the Bush era financial collapse, the outcome would be even better. In fact let’s take the recession factor out of the Obama budgets, and see where that leads us.** In 2010, the federal budget increased unemployment insurance by 58%. If we take out the recession factor, it would have only increased by 2%, taking into consideration historical budgets. The same is true for Medicaid. The baseline we are using is the 2009 budget which was passed in October of 2008 under George Bush. Unemployment insurance was about $360 billion and Medicaid was $224 billion. This is just in line with historical increases of about 2%. So, in Obama’s budget for 2010, rather than $571 billion dollars, it would have only been $367 billion. ($360 billion + 2% = 367 billion) That is already a $204 billion dollar savings! If we add on Medicaid, the 2010 budget for that was $290 billion. If we take out the recession, it would have only been about $230 billion, a savings of $60 billion. ($224 billion +2% = 230 billion) Actually if we took out the entire stimulus package of $900 billion growth in spending would have DROPPED more than 2%, something that hasn’t happened in generations. My point here is that President **Obama is not a spending obsessed socialist, in fact contrary to what conservatives believe, he is very responsible. A drop in growth of 1.8% in 2010 during the height of crisis is pretty significant. President Obama is turning out to be a very tight walleted leader, and more fiscally responsible, than George W Bush and Reagan, both of whom saw growth in federal spending of 7- 8% in their terms.**

#### Obama exercising fiscal constraint---spending has not increased dramatically

Thompson 12,Derek Thompson is a senior editor and business writer at The Atlantic, where he oversees business coverage for the website—Staff editor at the business channel-oversees business coverage for the website @theatlantic.com, 3/16/12[Derek, “Obama: Most Fiscally Conservative President in Modern History?” The Atlantic, [http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/03/obama-most-fiscally-conservative-president-in-modern-history/254658/]ADravid](http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/03/obama-most-fiscally-conservative-president-in-modern-history/254658/%5dADravid)

Economist Justin Wolfers tweets a graph from Mark Thoma that's very much worth talking about. It measures per capita growth in government spending for the last seven presidents' first term in office. This is what he finds: The graph tells a simple story that I've recounted before. **For all the talk you hear about Obama's historic spree, government spending actually hasn't increased so dramatically under this president. The stimulus was big, but it's over. It's been replaced by, if not austerity** (which has struck our states and cities) then **a hard correction to the center**. Here's another way to tell the story ... It's a quiz! **I present to you the first three years in spending for three** recent **presidents**: Barack **Obama**, George **Bush**, **and** Ronald **Reagan**. To make it a game, I've removed their names **and indexed the spending increases to their first month of office.** And I've replaced the dates with integers from 1-10 so you can't guess by looking at the years. Can you guess which president is which? President #1 President #2 President #3 The hint that solves the puzzle: They're in chronological order. **It goes Reagan, Bush, Obama. Going by federal expenditures** (and note these are nominal figures), **it would seem that if Obama's a socialist, Ronald Reagan is Karl Marx with an ICBM.** Let me anticipate some of your objections before you make them. (1) Reagan was fighting a war, he jacked up defense spending instead of discretionary spending, and he inherited a recession with inflation that might, well, inflate his numbers. This is all true, but expanding defense was Reagan's choice, and a dollar spent, on no matter what, is a dollar taxed or borrowed. (2) Bush was fighting a war and battling a recession, too. Yes, but he has neither inflation nor a Great Recession. (3) Don't play relativity games with me, Derek, too much government spending is too much government spending, even if **Obama's predecessors were worse**! There is a time for government cuts, but it's not when you have 9 percent unemployment and your interest rates are below 2%. (4) The language of Obamacare and financial reform are better indicators of big government than federal spending. It's fair to measure government size by its total involvement in people's lives, but that deserves a longer post. (5) We should be more concerned about the taxes and spending to come than the spending that has past. But they haven't happened yet, so they're not part of the president's record. Maybe I missed some objections -- I'm sure you'll let me know -- and I'll answer in the comment section. But the bottom line is that **it is really, truly time for the myth about Big Spender Obama to die**. If anything, **it is remarkable that, after a recession and a private sector implosion, the public sector expanded less under this administration than it did under Bush or Reagan, especially when you consider the government cuts made at the state and local levels.**

#### Obama is very fiscally responsible - he's decreased government spending

Ray Medeiros, 2012 (Fellow reporter for Politics USA ) <<http://www.politicususa.com/obama-fiscally-responsible-president-generation.html>>(Shah)

So, in Obama’s budget for 2010, rather than $571 billion dollars, it would have only been $367 billion. ($360 billion + 2% = 367 billion) That is already a $204 billion dollar [savings](http://www.politicususa.com/obama-fiscally-responsible-president-generation.html)! If we add on Medicaid, the 2010 budget for that was $290 billion. If we take out the recession, it would have only been about $230 billion, a savings of $60 billion. ($224 billion +2% = 230 billion) Actually if we took out the entire stimulus package of $900 billion growth in spending would have DROPPED more than 2%, something that hasn’t happened in generations. My point here is that President Obama is not a spending obsessed socialist, in fact contrary to what conservatives believe, he is very responsible. A drop in growth of 1.8% in 2010 during the height of crisis is pretty significant. President Obama is turning out to be a very tight walleted leader, and more fiscally responsible, than George W Bush and Reagan, both of whom saw growth in federal spending of 7- 8% in their terms.

#### Obama’s not a big spender

Nutting 5/22 (Rex Nutting, writer for The Washington Times, “Obama spending binge never happened”, <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/obama-spending-binge-never-happened-2012-05-22?pagenumber=1>, 5/22/12, Bhattacharyya)

As would-be president Mitt Romney tells it: “I will lead us out of this debt and spending inferno.” Almost everyone believes that Obama has presided over a massive increase in federal spending, an “inferno” of spending that threatens our jobs, our businesses and our children’s future. Even Democrats seem to think it’s true. Government spending under Obama, including his signature stimulus bill, is rising at a 1.4% annualized pace — slower than at any time in nearly 60 years. But it didn’t happen. Although there was a big stimulus bill under Obama, federal spending is rising at the slowest pace since Dwight Eisenhower brought the Korean War to an end in the 1950s. Even hapless Herbert Hoover managed to increase spending more than Obama has. Here are the facts, according to the official government statistics:¶ In the 2009 fiscal year — the last of George W. Bush’s presidency — federal spending rose by 17.9% from $2.98 trillion to $3.52 trillion. Check the official numbers at the Office of Management and Budget. In fiscal 2010 — the first budget under Obama — spending fell 1.8% to $3.46 trillion. In fiscal 2011, spending rose 4.3% to $3.60 trillion. In fiscal 2012, spending is set to rise 0.7% to $3.63 trillion, according to the Congressional Budget Office’s estimate of the budget that was agreed to last August. Finally in fiscal 2013 — the final budget of Obama’s term — spending is scheduled to fall 1.3% to $3.58 trillion. Read the CBO’s latest budget outlook. The big surge in federal spending happened in fiscal 2009, before Obama took office. Since then, spending growth has been relatively flat. Over Obama’s four budget years, federal spending is on track to rise from $3.52 trillion to $3.58 trillion, an annualized increase of just 0.4%.¶ There has been no huge increase in spending under the current president, despite what you hear. Why do people think Obama has spent like a drunken sailor? It’s in part because of a fundamental misunderstanding of the federal budget.

#### Obama is not a big spender

Sahadi 6/22 (Jeanne Sahadi, senior writer for CNNMoney.com, “Is Obama a big spender?”

<http://money.cnn.com/2012/06/22/news/economy/obama-spending/index.htm>, 6/22/12, Bhattacharyya)

,

Is President Obama a big spender who has blown up the national debt? Republicans say he is, and Democrats say he isn't. And they both use numbers and past presidents' records to make their point. Trouble is, "you can make the numbers tell you what you want if you torture them enough," said Rudolph Penner, a former director of the Congressional Budget Office. Here's what we know about spending and deficits during the Obama administration: They started climbing sharply in late 2008, even before he took office, and have remained high since. In fact, both spending and debt have been far above their historical norms as a percent of GDP. Revenue, meanwhile, has been treading near 60-year lows. But those numbers alone don't fully address the question. The context matters. Among the factors to consider: 1. Obama took office when the economy was sinking: Economic conditions were seriously deteriorating at the end of the Bush administration and descended into God-awful during the first year that Obama was in office. For fiscal year 2008, which ended on Sept. 30, 2008, the country had racked up $459 billion in deficits, or 3.2% of GDP. In September, the world's financial system imploded and the U.S. economy's decline accelerated. The country racked up $563 billion in deficits in the first four months of fiscal year 2009 alone. Bush was president for three and a half of those months. For the whole of 2009, the deficit clocked in at $1.43 trillion, or 10.1% of GDP. The story improved only slightly for 2010.Those eye-popping numbers arose in large part because Congress passed the $700 billion TARP bank bailout in October 2008 under Bush and then the $787 billion Recovery Act in February 2009 under Obama. Safety-net spending on unemployment benefits, Medicare and Medicaid rose during that time. Tax revenue plummeted. "It was entirely appropriate to increase spending in the recession," Penner said. And since that kind of recession spending is intended to end, he added, "it doesn't tell you much about the long-term spending growth pattern for either [Bush or Obama]." What's more, the fact that safety-net spending automatically rose during economic distress was to be expected no matter who sat in the Oval Office. 2. Tax cuts played a role in digging the fiscal hole: The story gets more complicated in fiscal year 2011. The economy was in the midst of a slow recovery and the deficit topped $1 trillion for the third year in a row. While Republicans often blame the outsized deficits under Obama on spending, a key reason the 2011 deficit was so high was tax cuts. Obama and the Republicans cut an $858 billion tax compromise that extended the Bush tax cuts for two years. It also enacted a one-year Social Security tax holiday and reduced the estate tax. All told, the tax cut compromise added about $410 billion to the 2011 deficit, the CBO estimated. 3. When it comes to fiscal policy, no president is an island: That tax cut deal raises another factor to consider when judging Obama's spending record. Congress and prior presidents have a big say in determining the budget policies of a sitting president. For example, Obama walked into large increases in defense spending and veterans' health care because of the ongoing military efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. And no president has control over the interest spending required on debt that accrued over the country's history. Because of the outsized growth in debt during the past few years, this is an issue that will be a big one for future presidents. "Assigning blame or credit to presidents ignores the fact that they must work with an entire Congress to pass legislation. [And] their budget can be significantly affected by the decisions of previous Congresses and presidents," the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget noted recently. 4. Obama's future plans might be more telling: Given the economic circumstances Obama walked into, a better view on the question of whether he's a big spender may be in his 2013 budget proposal, Penner said. Under Obama's 2013 proposal, spending as a percent of the economy would average 22.5% over the next decade, below where it's been in the past few years but above the historical average of 20.8%, according to the CBO. Mandatory spending on entitlements would average 14.2% over the next decade, up from 13.5% today. That increase is partly due to demographics. "You can't blame Obama for the population aging," said Donald Marron, a former acting director of the Congressional Budget Office. The surge of baby boomer retirements is going to increase entitlement spending regardless of who is president. And partly it's due to health reform -- Obama's signature piece of legislation. The 2010 Affordable Care Act permanently increases entitlement spending because of a new insurance subsidy. But overall, it's estimated that health reform will reduce deficits modestly -- in the first decade -- because of cost-reducing measures and tax hikes. Of course, there is concern that some of those cost-saving measures won't deliver as hoped.¶ Meanwhile, so-called discretionary spending under Obama's budget -- the money that goes to many of the government's most basic programs including defense -- would fall to the lowest level of GDP in 50 years, the CBO said.¶ That's in part because of spending controls put in place under the Budget Control Act, which Republicans pushed hard for. So is Obama a big spender or not? The political answer will always be yes for Republicans and no for Democrats. For independent budget experts, the political debate is not productive at a time when policymakers face truly pressing fiscal decisions. Indeed, the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget noted: "[T]he blame game is much less important than trying to find a bipartisan solution to our budget problems."

### Spending Kills Obama Win

#### Obama is winning swing state independents, but new government spending causes backlash

Galston 5/10 (Walliam A., Ezra Zilkha Chair in the Brookings Institution’s Governance Studies Program, where he serves as a senior fellow. A former policy advisor to President Clinton “Six Months To Go: Where the Presidential Contest Stands as the General Election Begins” 5/10/12 http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/5/10%20obama%20campaign%20galston/Where%20the%20Presidential%20Contest%20Stands.pdf)

According to the 2008 exit polls, Obama carried Independents by eight points—52 to 44 percent. Today, his standing with this important group is significantly weaker. The most recent Quinnipiac poll gave Romney a 46 to 39 percent edge over the president; Pew found Romney enjoying a similar 48 to 42 percent advantage. 48 It is hard to see how Obama can win a majority of the popular vote unless he rebuilds his standing among Independents. But it is not clear his current strategy is the one best calculated to bring about this result. Independents care more about economic growth and equal opportunity than they do about reducing gaps in wealth and income. While half of them believe that the U.S. economic system is unfair, 57 percent think that they themselves have been treated fairly. Perhaps that is why only 47 percent think that income and wealth gaps need to be fixed through public policy. 49 A recent report 50 found Obama statistically tied with Romney among Independents in swing states, with 36 percent of these Independents up for grabs. Among these “Swing Independents,” Obama now enjoys a lead of 44 to 38 percent. But there are some warning signs. These voters are split on Obama’s economic management, and they strongly prefer Republicans both on the budget deficit and government spending, issues of great concern to them. And according to the report, they are not much moved by the fairness argument. By 57 to 38 percent, they said it was more important to fix the budget deficit than to reduce the income gap. A plurality—42 percent—thought that reducing the budget deficit was the single most effective way of strengthening the economy. For this key group, the themes of growth and opportunity trump both the conservative focus on economic freedom and the liberal emphasis on economic inequality. They are most worried about the national debt (64 percent), congressional gridlock (55 percent), and the ability of the next generation to achieve the American dream (40 percent). And they are much angrier about the failure of Congress to address our problems than they are about Wall Street bailouts or the suggestion that the wealthy don’t pay their fair share of taxes.

#### Obama is hinging the election on REDUCING spending – the plan causes independents to vote Republican

Kirchgaessner 11 (Stephanie, “Obama looks to independent voters,” April 15 2011, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7dd54d5c-678c-11e0-9138-00144feab49a.html#axzz1T844vB9m)

Barack Obama is betting that his attack on the Republican deficit reduction plan, which he has derided as un-American, will resonate with independent voters as he prepares to hit the campaign trail next week. The president will hold town hall meetings in California and two swing states: Nevada and Virginia. The political winds seemed to shift in favour of Democrats this week, with Mr Obama looking – for the first time in months – as if he is primed to lead his party into the difficult fiscal battles that lie ahead. It was, at the same time, a tumultuous week for the increasingly divided Republican majority in the House of Representatives. Party lawmakers called for their leaders to be more aggressive in demanding spending cuts and almost unanimously endorsed a 2012 budget plan that could have dire political consequences in the next election. The proposal by Republican Paul Ryan to cut $5,800bn in the next decade and transform Medicare, the insurance programme for the elderly, passed 235 to 193 in the House without a single Democratic vote. House passes 2012 budget Republicans in the House of Representatives united on Friday behind a 2012 budget plan slashing trillions of dollars in government spending while cutting taxes. The vote effectively serves as the Republicans’ opening gambit in what are likely to be contentious negotiations with President Barack Obama and his Democrats over debt and deficits in the coming months. The U.S. Congress must decide within weeks on raising the $14,300bn US debt ceiling. By a vote of 235-193, the House passed the plan written by House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan for the 2012 fiscal year beginning October 1. Democrats rejected the measure, which proposes slashing spending by nearly $6 trillion over a decade and reducing benefits for the elderly and poor. All but four Republicans supported it. There is almost no chance of the Senate approving the measure in its current form. The White House swiftly condemned the measure but said it was committed to working with Republicans to bring down record deficits that all sides acknowledged imperil the country’s economic future. Reuters “I think Obama has had his best week in a while,” said Democratic strategist James Carville. “His speech really has got Democrats excited again. Also, they feel they are on the right side of public opinion here.” Mr Obama’s address on Wednesday satisfied the liberal base by reaffirming his support of tax increases for the wealthy to pay for entitlement programmes for the poor and elderly. It also spoke to independent voters who abandoned Democrats in last year’s congressional election by reassuring them that he believed the deficit required immediate action.

#### Empirics show deficit spending unpopular—Plan will cause Obama to lose his 2012 reelection bid

Lowry 12, Editor of the National Review and a syndicated columnist. Contributor to Real Clear Politics, 5/30/12[Richard, “Spending? What Spending?” Real Clear Politics, http://www.realclearpolitics .com/articles/2012/05/30/spendin g\_what\_ sp nding\_114318.html]ADravid

Franklin Delano Roosevelt never denied that he created Social Security. Lyndon Baines Johnson didn’t forswear any responsibility for Medicaid. Ronald Reagan never argued that his defense buildup didn’t happen. **The Obama White House, in contrast, wants to wish away the historic federal spending that is one of its signature accomplishments**. White House press secretary Jay Carney, whose job it is to dodge questions and elide facts without betraying any embarrassment, urged reporters the other day to steer clear of “the BS that you hear about spending and fiscal constraint with regard to this administration.” Not one to be outclassed by his press secretary, President Barack Obama kept up the edifying livestock theme by calling Mitt Romney’s attacks on his deficit spending “a cow pie of distortion.” The White House has a deeply conflicted relationship to its own record. It is saddled with a bad case of spender’s denial, a rare psychological disorder afflicting committed Keynesians facing reelection at a time of record debt. On the one hand, spending is the lifeblood of “Forward.” It saved us from another Great Depression. It is forging a glorious new future of green energy. It is the only thing standing between the American public and the untold devastation of the Paul Ryan budget. How do we know? Because President Obama says so. On the other hand, **the deficits and the debt that come with all this spending are alarming and unpopular**. So Obama calls himself the most fiscally conservative president in more than half a century. When the president isn’t extolling his transformative expenditures, he has a Walter Mitty life as the second coming of Dwight Eisenhower. He needs to consult an accountant and a therapist, and not necessarily in that order. If you torture the numbers just the right way — the Office of Management and Budget meets the Spanish Inquisition — you can come up with a 0.4 percent rate of spending growth during the Obama administration. To get there, you have to ignore part of **the stimulus** (on grounds that Obama didn’t have complete control of the budget in 2009) **and play games with the** **bailouts** (crediting Obama with spending cuts when they are paid back). **Even fact-checkers with mainstream-media outfits have merrily stomped all over the statistical legerdemain**. Andrew Taylor of the Associated Press writes that “Obama bears the chief responsibility for an 11 percent, $59 billion increase in non-defense spending in 2009. Then there’s a 9 percent, $109 billion increase in combined defense and non-defense appropriated outlays in 2010, a year for which Obama is wholly responsible.” **Spending growth slowed after that, under the influence of the very same congressional Republicans that President Obama excoriates for not allowing him to spend more. There’s no doubt that the president inherited a fiscal nightmare. Spending spiked as the economy tanked. His response has been to spend yet more every single year.** Spending was $2.98 trillion in 2008, and the president’s budget calls for it to hit $3.72 trillion in 2013. As a percentage of GDP, spending has been at post–World War II highs throughout his term. If fiscal probity is truly his aim, President Obama is a miserable failure of a skinflint. The laughable claim to fiscal restraint is meant to recapture some of Obama’s former ideological indistinctness. Back in 2008, he could say — with no direct evidence to contradict him — that he wanted a net cut in federal spending, in his guise as a post-partisan pragmatist. That was several $1 trillion deficits ago. Now, the president can say whatever he wants, but his budgets are a matter of public record. He should embrace those budgets in all their Keynesian majesty. They are one of his most consequential contributions to our national life, and a true expression of his philosophical core and that of his party. In his tawdry denials, the president almost acts as if $5.5 trillion in new debt were something to be ashamed of.

New spending upsets key independents - they're okay now but on the brink

Gould and Walter ‘11

[Martin & Kathleen, Newsmax writers, 7-12, <http://www.newsmax.com/Headline/Gillespie-Obama-economy-leadership/2011/07/12/id/403350>]

Voters in the focus groups mainly still give Obama a positive job approval rating but believe he spent too much of his first two years in office concentrating on healthcare instead of jobs and the economy, Gillespie said. But Gillespie warned Republicans that efforts to repeal Obamacare also will be seen as a distraction unless the party couches it the right way. “There’s a need for Republicans to educate voters that there’s a direct connection between the enactment of the Obama healthcare bill with its punitive mandates, and the job-killing impact of that. “If we repeal Obamacare, we will help unleash job creation in the economy. But we need to make that connection more clear to independent voters,” he said. Independents are very concerned about government spending, Gillespie said. “They are not in favor of any blank check when it comes to raising the debt ceiling. They want to see reforms made and spending cuts made before any increase in the debt ceiling, they don’t want to see business as usual,” he said. “They see it as a huge disconnect between Washington, D.C., and their daily lives. When I run up against the limit on my credit card, I don’t just get to say I’ll increase the limit by $2,000, I have to cut back on my spending and change my habits. “In Washington, they don’t seem to have those kind of rules and it’s very frustrating to these voters.”

#### Deficit spending destroys Obama's public support

Bossie 11 (David N. Bossie: chairman of Citizens united & receiver of the [Ronald Reagan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ronald_Reagan) Award from the [Conservative Political Action Conference](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservative_Political_Action_Conference) in 1999, “Join the Debate”, <http://www.politico.com/arena/archive/will-president-obama-lose-2012.html>, 8/4/2011) Kerwin

Americans were sold a false prophet in 2008, and with the Obama recession they will turn their backs on President Obama in 2012. With 9.2 percent unemployment, and a crushing $14.3 trillion debt - with more spending on the way - America is off course due to the failed liberal policies of the Obama administration. President Obama continues to think that spending will solve our nation’s problems when in fact it has only worsened them. The proof that President Obama and his faltering administration are doing irreparable harm to America can be found in the right track, wrong track number. According to Rasmussen, an astonishing 80 percent of Americans believe that our country is on the wrong track. If I were at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, I'd be looking over my shoulder for the Republican nominee to send me packing.

#### Government expenditure unpopular with public and congress

Kohut 12 (Andrew Kohut, president of Pew Research Center, “Debt and Deficit: A Public Opinion Dilemma,” Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 6/14/12, <http://www.people-press.org/2012/06/14/debt-and-deficit-a-public-opinion-dilemma/>)

The issue of the debt and the deficit – and what to do about it – has paralyzed Washington lawmakers. But when it comes to measures for reducing the deficit on which they might reach common ground, they will get little help in building support for an agreement by turning to public opinion. In my years of polling, there has never been an issue such as the deficit on which there has been such a consensus among the public about its importance – and such a lack of agreement about acceptable solutions. When the public was asked in March to volunteer the most important problem facing the nation, only unemployment and the economy were cited more often. The deficit has also risen in importance in the public mind when Americans are asked at the beginning of each year what they believe to be the top national priorities for the president and the Congress. The Pew Research Center began measuring national priorities in 1997. Jobs, education, Social Security, Medicare and the budget deficit were at the top of the list then just as they are now, in 2012. The deficit had earlier slipped as a priority during the last years of the Clinton administration when the budget was in surplus and following the 9/11 attacks when terrorism rose as a priority. Today, however, the budget deficit stands out as one of the fastest growing priorities for Americans, rising 16 percentage points since 2007 and ranking third with 69% calling it a top priority. Only the economy and jobs, ranking first and second at 86% and 82% respectively, have registered bigger increases over this period – hardly surprising, given the financial meltdown that began in 2008 and whose impact is still being felt today.

#### Government expenditure unpopular – public wants deficit reduction

Drake 11 (Bruce Drake, staff to Poll Watch Daily, “Nearly Two-Thirds of Americans Want Deficit Reduction Plan be a Combination of Budget Cuts & Tax Increases, Press, 11/18/11, <http://www.pollwatchdaily.com/2011/11/18/big-majority-of-americans-want-deficit-reduction-plan-to-be-combination-of-budget-cuts-tax-increases/>)

As Democrats and Republicans on the congressional supercommittee wrangle over to what extent if any tax increases should be part of a deficit reduction plan, a new [Pew Research Center poll](http://www.people-press.org/2011/11/17/section-3-the-deficit-and-the-super-committee/) finds more than six-in-ten Americans believe that tax increases as well as cutting major programs should be part of any proposal. Sixty-two percent said a “combination of both” should be used to tackle the nation’s debt, while 17 percent preferred a budget-cutting approach and 8 percent favored eliminating red ink with the help of tax increases.

#### Government Spending unpopular with public

Edwards 5/21 (Chris Edwards, Cato Institute, “We Can Cut Government: Canada Did,” 5/21/12, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/v34n3/cprv34n3-1.pdf>)

In 2010, American voters demanded cuts to government spending and debt. Some members of Congress are heeding the call and introducing plans to restructure entitlements and terminate programs. However, most policymakers are still resisting the major spending cuts, privatization, and other Canadian-style reforms that we need to avert a fiscal crisis and restore strong economic growth to the United States.

#### Increased deficit spending leads to Romney victory

Edsall, 2-5-12, an American journalist and academic, best known for his 25 years covering national politics for the Washington Post [Thomas, The New York Times, “Debt Splits the Left” <http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/debt-splits-the-left/>]

Instead of more stimulus spending, Taylor contends, “the best economic stimulus would be for the government to set a clear path now to reduce the deficit and to bring down the debt in the future.” A 2012 election agenda dominated by the specter of debt is ideal for conservatives seeking to shrink the welfare state. It creates an optimal environment for Grover Norquist and his anti-tax group, Americans for Tax Reform, to operate in. Norquist has famously committed himself to whittling government “down to the size where we can drown it in the bathtub.”

#### Debt hurts democrats in congress and the white house

Edsall, 2-5-12, an American journalist and academic, best known for his 25 years covering national politics for the Washington Post [Thomas, The New York Times, “Debt Splits the Left” <http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/debt-splits-the-left/>]

In 2010, the debt-and-deficit issue, driven by the Tea Party, devastated the Democratic Party, turning majority power back to Republicans in the House, who picked up 63 seats. Going into the 2012 election, it is still a central issue. The Pew Research Center has found public concern over the deficit continues to grow. No matter what the merits are of the opposing positions within the Democratic coalition on the debt and deficits, a divided Democratic party is in a weakened position to counter Republican assaults on the issue of red ink. This is a vulnerability that the party and its candidates will take into the 2012 election. It poses a problem that cannot be easily resolved.

### Infrastructure Spending Unpopular

#### Infrastructure investment NOW is unpopular—Americans unwilling to pay

Alden 6/14 Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, (Edward, “The First Renewing America Progress Report and Scorecard: The Road to Nowhere” 6/14/12, CFR, http://blogs.cfr.org/renewing-america/2012/06/14/the-first-renewing-america-progress-report-and-scorecard-the-road-to-nowhere/]

Americans understood this once upon a time, building the most impressive network of roads and airports in the world, as well as a solid freight rail system. But for far too long we have been living on that inheritance. Two data points from the Scorecard stand out: Since 1980, the number of highway miles traveled by American drivers has doubled, but the miles of road on which they’re driving have increased just 5 percent. It’s no mystery, as the report notes, why traffic congestion takes more than $700 out of the pocket of the average commuter each year. Two-thirds of Americans say that fully funding transportation infrastructure is either “extremely important” or “very important” to them. Yet solid majorities are opposed to any of the usual ways of funding new roads, including higher gas taxes or new tolls. It would be easy to point a finger at Congress, and we certainly do in the report. Reauthorization of the surface transportation bill, usually known as the highway bill, has always been contentious, but nevertheless it used to win approval routinely. But the last multi-year bill expired in 2009 and has been replaced by a series of short-term extensions that make rational construction planning all but impossible for state and local governments. The bill expires again June 30th, and congressional leaders again look unlikely to reach agreement and are predicting another short-term extension. It will be the 10th; as a Miami Herald editorial put it recently, this marks “a new low in congressional irresponsibility.” But congressional inaction in many ways reflects public ambivalence. Americans want uncluttered highways, efficient airports, and seamless mass transit systems, but they are either reluctant to pay for these things or doubt the ability of governments to deliver. The overdue backlash against pork barrel politics for favored projects, for instance, seems to have hardened into a deeper public cynicism about the ability of government to deliver any needed public works. Even proposals like using a federal seed money to create a National Infrastructure Bank that would funnel private investor (not taxpayer) money into new projects have been unable to get through Congress.

#### Public hates infrastructure spending - none of their link turns apply

Orski 2012, (Ken Orski, as Associate Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. founded a transportation consultancy counseling corporate clients and agencies in federal, state and local government. served on state and federal transportation advisory bodies, “WHY PLEAS TO INCREASE INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING FALL ON DEAF EARS”. 5/2/12 AD. 7/14/12. http://www.newgeography.com/content/002662-why-pleas-increase-infrastructure-funding-fall-deaf-ears|Ashwin)

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.¶ The oft-cited "D" that the American Society of Civil Engineers has given America’s infrastructure (along with an estimate of $2.2 trillion needed to fix it) is taken with a grain of salt, says Lane, since the engineers’ lobby has a vested interest in increasing infrastructure spending, which means more work for engineers. Suffering from the same credibility problem are the legions of road and transit builders, rail and road equipment manufacturers, construction firms, planners and consultants that try to make a case for more money.¶ This does not mean that the country does not need to invest more resources in preserving and expanding its highways and transit systems. The "infrastructure deficit" is real. It’s just that in making a case for higher spending, the transportation community must do a much better job of explaining why, how and where they propose to spend those funds. Usupported claims that the nation’s infrastructure is "falling apart" will not be taken seriously.¶ People want to know where their tax dollars are going and what exactly they’re getting for their money. Infrastructure advocates must learn from state and local ballot measures to justify and document the needs for federal dollars with more precision so that the public regains confidence that their money will be spent wisely and well.

#### The public doesn't care about infrastructure spending - seen as unnecessary

Orski 2/5 (Why Pleas to Increase Infrastructure Funding Fall on Deaf Ears by Ken Orski 02/05/2012 <http://www.newgeography.com/content/002662-why-pleas-increase-infrastructure-funding-fall-deaf-ears->)

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. 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. The oft-cited "D" that the American Society of Civil Engineers has given America’s infrastructure (along with an estimate of $2.2 trillion needed to fix it) is taken with a grain of salt, says Lane, since the engineers’ lobby has a vested interest in increasing infrastructure spending, which means more work for engineers. Suffering from the same credibility problem are the legions of road and transit builders, rail and road equipment manufacturers, construction firms, planners and consultants that try to make a case for more money. This does not mean that the country does not need to invest more resources in preserving and expanding its highways and transit systems. The "infrastructure deficit" is real. It’s just that in making a case for higher spending, the transportation community must do a much better job of explaining why, how and where they propose to spend those funds. Usupported claims that the nation’s infrastructure is "falling apart" will not be taken seriously. People want to know where their tax dollars are going and what exactly they’re getting for their money. Infrastructure advocates must learn from state and local ballot measures to justify and document the needs for federal dollars with more precision so that the public regains confidence that their money will be spent wisely and well.

### HSR Unpopular

#### Public hates HSR spending

Reason 11(“Poll Finds Support for Toll Roads, Public-Private Partnerships”, Reason Foundation, December 20, 2011, http://reason.org/news/printer/poll-finds-support-for-toll-roads-p)

In terms of transportation spending priorities, 62 percent want to prioritize funding for road and highway projects, while 30 percent want to prioritize funding for mass transit projects. As the debate over high-speed rail continues in California and elsewhere, a solid majority of Americans, 55 percent, say the private sector should build high-speed train systems where it thinks riders will pay to use rail. Just 35 percent of Americans believe federal and state governments should build high-speed rail systems where they think the trains are needed.

#### California proves

Huffington Post 6/3 ("California High Speed Rail Doesn’t Have the Support of Majority of Californians: Poll”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/04/california-high-speed-rail\_n\_1566807.html)

LOS ANGELES -- A new poll finds California voters are experiencing buyers' remorse over a proposed $68 billion bullet train project, as the number of lawsuits against the rail system grows. Fifty-five percent of voters want to see the high-speed rail bond issue that was approved in 2008 back on the ballot, and 59 percent say they would now vote against it, according to the USC Dornsife/Los Angeles Times survey (lat.ms/N9tTcm) published Saturday. Since the $9 billion borrowing plan was passed, the projected cost of the bullet train between Los Angeles and San Francisco has roughly doubled, and it will now share track with slower commuter and freight trains in some areas, the Times said. A majority of voters have turned against the ambitious undertaking just as Gov. Jerry Brown is pushing lawmakers to approve the start of construction in the Central Valley later this year. Powerful agriculture groups and freight railroads maintain that proposed routes would damage their interests and compromise safety. Schools, churches, businesses and homeowners are also opposed to the project. On Friday, Central Valley farm groups filed a major environmental lawsuit in Sacramento County Superior Court, asking for a preliminary injunction to block rail construction. Plaintiffs include the Madera and Merced county farm bureaus and Madera County. The suit is one of several already on the books, and still more agricultural interests in the Central Valley are threatening to sue. "We think a preliminary injunction against construction will occur because there were so many violations in the authority's environmental impact report," Anja Raudabaugh, executive director of the Madera County Farm Bureau, told the Times. The plaintiffs say the rail project would affect 1,500 acres of prime farm land and 150 agribusinesses in their region. The poll found that concerns about the project extend across regions, ethnic groups, income brackets and even political affiliations, according to the Times. Among Democrats, initially the strongest supporters of the plan, only 43 percent would support the bond in a new vote, while 47 percent would oppose it. Seventy-six percent of Republicans would vote against it. Voters have reconsidered their support for high-speed rail as lawmakers slash public programs to cope with a widening budget gap, said Dan Schnur, director of the poll and head of the Unruh Institute of Politics at USC. "The growing budget deficit is making Californians hesitant about spending so much money on a project like this one when they're seeing cuts to public education and law enforcement," Unruh said. "But they also seem to be wary as to whether state government can run a big speed rail system effectively." In Southern California, 67 percent of voters said they would reject issuing high-speed rail bonds if they could vote again. If the bullet train system is built, 69 percent said they would never or hardly ever ride it. No respondents – **zero percent** – said they would use it more than once a week. Just 33 percent of respondents said they would prefer a bullet train over an airplane or car on trips between LA and San Francisco The USC Dornsife/Times survey heard from 1,002 registered voters in mid-May. It was conducted by Democratic polling firm Greenberg Quinlan Rosner and Republican polling firm American Viewpoint. The sample has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

#### Cost and skepticism make HSR massively unpopular

Koenig 6/7 (Brian, 6/7/12, “California Voters Turn on High-Speed Rail Project”, The New American, http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/11646-california-voters-turn-on-high-speed-rail-project)

After enduring a series of financial and logistical hiccups, California’s landmark high-speed rail project has become increasingly unpopular among voters, as the project’s enormous price tag continues to inflate and as the state’s budgetary woes grow more severe. Without a concrete plan for funding, supporters of the state’s high-speed rail project pitched a revised proposal in April to lawmakers and the general public. Due to severe budget constraints, the updated plan narrowed the scope of the project while speeding up construction to save money. Furthermore, about $1 billion in voter-approved bonds will be available to revamp existing tracks, which will purportedly make rail service more efficient and potentially bring in more customers. In a previous article, The New American reported on the revised proposal: The newly minted plan expedites completion of the first true U.S. high-speed rail system, moving it to 2028, trimming the project timeline by five years and shaving $30 billion off the original budget drafted last year by the California High-Speed Rail Authority. In 2008, when residents first voted to authorize the bonds, they were told the overall cost of the project would be $45 billion — and four years later, the total became $98 billion. The new proposal has reduced that number to $68.4 billion, still $23.4 billion more than the original total. However, despite the purported cost savings, the rail system still relies heavily on shaky federal funding and speculative private-sector investments. "We've seen numbers in the $30 billion, $40 billion, the $90 billion range, and now we're back in the $60 billion range," Sen. Joe Simitian (D-Palo Alto) said at the time. "I think there is understandably both some confusion and skepticism about what is the system going to cost, and then there's the question of where is the money going to come from?" Due to such uncertainty, voters in the state are turning on the project, as a new poll conducted by USC-Dornsife and the Los Angeles Times found that 55 percent of California voters want the $9-billion bond issue — which was approved in 2008 to fund early stages of the rail system — back on the ballot. And a startling 59 percent affirmed that they now would vote against it. While labor unions have been staunch supporters of the project, a sizable 56 percent of union households now oppose the funding plan, the poll added. Even Democrats, the project’s most prominent supporters, have become skeptical, as 47 percent now reject the bond issue. The Times explained that revenue projections and overall use of the high-speed rail are also in question: The poll found that most voters don't expect to use it. Sixty-nine percent said they would never or hardly ever ride it. **Zero percent** said they would use it more than once a week. Public opinion surveys cannot predict the revenues and ridership a rail service might generate. The poll results raise questions about whether the system would serve as a robust commuter network, allowing people to live in small towns and work in big cities or vice versa. On the other hand, 33% of respondents said they would prefer a bullet train over an airplane or car on trips between L.A. and the Bay Area. Since voters approved the $9-billion borrowing scheme, the state’s economic condition has become bleaker, and many initial promises about the rail line have been altogether abandoned. The estimated cost has nearly doubled, and it is now scheduled to share track with freight trains and slower commuter trains in certain areas, which will severely hamper the very intent — that is, speedy and efficient transportation — of the project. Moreover, agriculture groups and freight rail lines have warned that the routes would compromise their interests; schools, businesses, and homeowners have also voiced their concerns over the project. Last Friday, farm groups filed an environmental lawsuit in Sacramento County Superior Court, requesting a preliminary injunction to halt rail construction. This suit has been added to a growing list of other filings, and more agricultural interests are threatening suits as well. "We think a preliminary injunction against construction will occur because there were so many violations in the authority's environmental impact report," stated Anja Raudabaugh, executive director of the Madera County Farm Bureau. “California voters have clearly reconsidered their support for high-speed rail,” said Dan Schnur, who directed the USC Dornsife/Times Poll. “They want the chance to vote again — and they want to vote no. The growing budget deficit is making Californians hesitant about spending so much money on a project like this one when they’re seeing cuts to public education and law enforcement.” The public has become even more skeptical of the high-speed rail line as Gov. Jerry Brown has threatened severe cuts in education spending — among other public programs — due to the state’s expanding budget gap. "The growing budget deficit is making Californians hesitant about spending so much money on a project like this one when they're seeing cuts to public education and law enforcement," Schnur noted. "But they also seem to be wary as to whether state government can run a big speed rail system effectively."

#### Media coverage proves - HSR is controversial

O’Toole 4/6-- Cato Institute Senior Fellow working on urban growth, public land, and transportation issues (Randal, “The Post: Not Even Loans for High-Speed Rail” CATO, 4/6/12, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/the-post-not-even-loans-for-high-speed-rail/]

The Washington Post is somewhat of a bellwether of public opinion on high-speed rail. Back in 2009, when President Obama first proposed to build a high-speed rail network, Post editorial writers were all for it as a way of reducing congestion. Then in 2010, the paper published an op-ed by a National Geographic travel writer who argued that the “benefits of high-speed rail have long been apparent to anyone who has ridden Japan’s Shinkansen trains or France’s TGV.” By 2011, though, the Post was having second thoughts. In January of that year, the paper argued that the nation should “hit the brakes” on the California high-speed trains, the only true high-speed rail project in Obama’s plan (since Florida dropped out). (This editorial led to a letter expressing the opposite view from Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood.) In February 2011, the Post argued that joining China, France, and Japan in a high-speed rail race would be joining “a race everyone loses.” Then in May, the Post again hammered the California project in light of new reviews questioning both the claimed costs and benefits of the project. “Somebody, please, stop this train” the paper added that November. Yesterday, the Post even opposed just loaning federal money to a private high-speed rail company. A private company wants a $4.9 billion loan to help build a rail line from southern California to Las Vegas. But the memories of Solyndra and other solar companies getting federal loans, giving huge amounts of money to executives, and then going bankrupt may be too recent. The Post even understands opportunity costs, noting that, “As for jobs, any that the Vegas train creates will come at the expense of alternative uses of the money,” a reality not always recognized by journalists. The Nevada group, which is backed by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, may get its money, although that money would come from a fund that has never been used for this kind or size of project before. But any expectation by Californians that D.C. pundits will support more federal funding for even a modified high-speed rail plan must be considered wildly optimistic.

### HSR Unpopular - AT: Link Turns

#### The link turn's empirically disproven - public rejects arguments in favor of HSR

Matthews 7/14 Joe Matthews is an associate writer and staff writer (“With High-Speed Rail's Approval, the Sales Job Begins”,http://www.nbclosangeles.com/blogs/prop-zero/High-Speed-Rail-California-Sales-161661635.html, 7/14/2012) Kerwin

High-speed rail needs to be sold to the public. Again.¶ That's strange to say, just after a big push to get the state Senate to -- barely -- approve the spending of funds, some from state bond moneys and some from the feds, to build the first 130 miles of the project in the Central Valley. Some improvements for existing rail systems in Northern and Southern California were part of the package, too.¶ Indeed, this was the second big sales push for high-speed rail. The first was for the 2008 ballot initiative that authorized high-speed rail and billions in bond money to pay for it. But the public still needs to be sold. Polls show big majorities of Californians oppose it. And to complete the project -- estimated at $68 billion currently -- may require some reversal in those numbers, and a softening of the objections among opponents. With little financing in place, public support could be important to getting the money -- either from the feds, from new state revenue streams (pollution credit fees?), or from private investors (who will want to see some public interest before investing in a train to serve the public

### Florida UQ + Link Scenario

#### Obama's winning Florida now

King 6/21 Neil R. King Jr. is a writer for the Wall Street Journal (“Obama Is Back Up in Florida, Poll Finds”, http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2012/06/21/obama-is-back-up-in-florida-poll-finds/,6/21/2012) Kerwin

In the topsy turvy world of early summer polls, President Barack Obama is back up again in Florida thanks in large part to an unusual resurgence in support among the state’s independent voters. A new poll by Quinnipiac University found Mr. Obama leading his Republican rival, Mitt Romney, 46% to 42% among all Florida voters. The poll revealed a nearly 10 percentage point swing in the two men’s support since the same pollsters surveyed the state in May. See the WSJ.com poll gizmo showing changes in the Quinnipiac poll in Florida, plus dozens of other state and national polls. Much of that shift was driven by sharp swing among independents, who backed Mr. Romney 44% to 36% but now sided with Mr. Obama, 47% to 41%.

#### Florida voters hate deficit spending

Viewpoint Florida 2/16- Viewpoint Florida is a joint public opinion research effort with Data Targeting Inc. and Public Concepts, LLC. (“Florida voters divided on the urgency - and means - of dealing with deficit”, Viewpoint Florida, Feb 16, 2012, http://viewpointflorida.org/index.php/site/article/florida\_voters\_divided\_on\_the\_urgency\_-\_and\_means\_-\_of\_dealing\_with\_deficit/)

We have a fascinating set of responses to share from our latest statewide survey of likely general election voters in Florida. Our survey focused on America’s fiscal woes and the importance of addressing the national budget deficit. As expected, almost every respondent we interviewed said that balancing the federal budget was at least somewhat important for America’s economic future. Only 2% of the voters we interviewed stated that dealing with the national deficit was not at all important for our future. However, in the very next question, when asked whether or not deficit spending was necessary to grow the American economy, 30% of respondents stated that such spending was in fact necessary, while 61% said the economy could be boosted without deficit spending. Predictably, Republicans were far more likely to agree that deficit spending was not necessary to boost the economy. But 60% of Independent voters disagreed with the necessity for deficit spending, while just a 49% plurality of Democratic voters believed deficit spending was necessary. We see similar numbers when voters are asked if raising revenue or cutting spending should be the primary focus of Congress or the Florida Legislature in dealing with budget deficits. Just 26% of respondents said the federal government should focus on raising revenue to balance the budget, to 67% who prefer it focus more on cutting spending. The preference for spending cuts rises to 72% when voters are asked the same question about Florida’s state government, with just 20% of respondents saying Tallahassee should focus more on raising revenue.

#### Florida alone determines the election

Stanage 11 (Niall, The Hill Writer, “Obama, Republicans prepare for 2012 Florida election showdown,” 6/20, <http://thehill.com/homenews/news/167239-a-storm-brews-in-florida-ahead-of-2012-election>, EMM)

In the 17 months between now and Election Day 2012, innumerable theories, some esoteric, will be advanced about how President Obama can get reelected. Math provides a starker answer: Win Florida. Obama in 2008 carried nine states that former President George W. Bush won four years previously. If Obama loses eight of those battlegrounds and holds Florida — and the other states remain unchanged — he will secure another four years in the Oval Office.

### Economy Key to Election

#### Economy swamps all other issues - it is the key election issue

Man 12 (Anthony, Sun Sentinel staff, 5/13/12, <http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2012-05-13/news/fl-economy-jobs-election-20120512_1_florida-voters-job-outlook-swing-voters/3>)

Forget gay marriage. Put aside the war in Afghanistan. Ignore illegal immigration. All are dwarfed by the big gorilla of 2012 — the economy. Election 2012 is all about the economy — especially jobs — the one issue with the power to determine if President Barack Obama or Republican Mitt Romney wins Florida's critical electoral votes and, perhaps, the presidency. "That's the No. 1 priority," said Jansew Sang, of Hollywood. Laid off in 2009 from her job as Latin America sales manager for a manufacturer of networking devices, she's still relatively fortunate, being able to work as a translator and banking consultant. "I have the advantage of being able to keep myself afloat in this economy," she said. Advertisement Ads by Google Sang is an independent — the kind of voter coveted by every candidate because independents decide close elections. She voted for Obama in 2008, but hasn't decided if she'll vote for him or Romney this year. She was among 646 people seeking work last week at a career fair in Miramar along with city residents Jenni Ressler and Jim Richardson. Like Sang, they're swing voters and haven't decided which candidate will get their votes this year. Richardson, out of work since August 2011, said jobs are the issue in 2012. And Ressler, who's been looking for two months, said the economy "would play a big role, obviously." Jobs are a salient issue for many more people than the 9 percent of Floridians who were unemployed in March — when the jobless rate was again higher than the national average and the percentage of people with jobs was 43rd in the country. New state unemployment numbers, for April, are due out Friday. Dave Welch, who lives west of Boca Raton, said he feels the employment squeeze — even though he still has his job as a copier mechanic. "I know several people who have lost their jobs: good, hard-working people who have lost their jobs because the economy is in the tank," he said. "We're not selling the products that we have in the past, therefore we don't need the people that we've had. It's been a cascading effect." He blames Obama and the Democrats, and decided long ago to vote for Romney, even though the Republican candidate isn't as conservative as he'd like. Welch's concerns about jobs are far from unique. A Suffolk University/WSVN-Ch. 7 poll conducted last week found 81 percent of Florida voters said the state's job outlook is poor or fair. Just 13 percent termed it good or excellent. More than 80 percent believe the state is still mired in a recession. And 52 percent of the 600 Florida voters surveyed rated the economy as the most important issue facing the country. None of the other nine issues came anywhere close, a finding Suffolk polling director David Paleologos termed "amazing." Troy Samuels, a Miramar city commissioner, Republican Party committeeman and co-chairman of Romney's campaign in Broward County, said there isn't a single event he's attended in the past three years when at least one person hasn't asked him for job leads. He said even plenty of people with a job are concerned about what the near future might bring. "If there's a bump in the economy … will my company all of a sudden lay off 100 people, and I'm one of those 100?" he said. "Those are still serious concerns in the minds of people no matter what party they're from, and they think about it every single day." Advertisement Ads by Google And those kind of worries have a big impact on elections if "the unemployment rate gets reported and people sort of look around and say things don't look so good," said Kevin Wagner, a political scientist at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton. And that's bad for incumbents. Conflicting trends mark the all-important unemployment picture, said Xu Cheng, senior economist atMoody'sAnalytics, a leading independent economic forecasting firm. From 2010 to today, the Florida unemployment rate has come down more than 2 percentage points, "In normal times, this would be great," the economist said. "In normal times, if we put this variable in the [election forecasting] model, Obama would win Florida for sure." But there's another factor in play: A state unemployment rate higher than 8 percent produces the "grumpy voter effect," Cheng said. "Despite Florida's relatively strong recovery in the last two years, given that Florida unemployment figures will still be very high — and we believe at the time of the election it will still be about 9 percent — we believe this grumpy voter effect will kick in." That means Floridians are much less likely than normal to give the president any credit for the decline in the unemployment rate, he said.

#### Economy will remain key issue for election

Rogers 2/06 (Ed Rogers, group Chairman of the BGR Group, formerly Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC (BGR), “Economy will remain key issue of election”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-insiders/post/economy-will-remain-key-issue-of-election/2012/02/06/gIQAucOUuQ_blog.html>, 2/06/12, Bhattacharyya)

Today at the Ronald Reagan Library, there is a ceremony celebrating the 101st anniversary of President Reagan’s birth. Haley Barbour, my friend and partner at BGR Group, is a featured speaker. Former governor Barbour was the White House Political Director under President Reagan from 1985 to 1986, and I was his deputy. Barbour witnessed Reagan’s political instincts up close and in person. Barbour’s remarks today make a major point of how pragmatic Reagan really was. At times during the 2012 Republican nomination contest, the candidates have gotten lost in their rhetoric and tried to claim that they were the most stubborn conservative ideologue and the most Reaganesque at the same time. Well today, Barbour’s comments include this perspective: “President Reagan set the highest goals, but accepted progress toward those goals, one or a few steps at a time. Ronald Reagan had an ideology, a strong philosophy with matching principles; he was not an ideologue. He didn’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good.” Another point in Barbour’s comments address Carter’s recent post about the economy as an election issue in 2012. The election will be about the economy and, assuming it does get better, Romney or any other Republican nominee should not allow their campaign to be reduced to carping that the improvement doesn’t exist, or they make themselves vulnerable to the charge that they are talking down the economy. Republicans must make a big offer regarding the economy and not just stand on a vague promise to be better than Obama. I’m for setting a firm goal of a five percent growth rate, explaining how we get there, and what America would look like if we did: then, let Obama explain why it’s just not possible. Anyway, Carter’s quote about “nascent signs of economic recovery . . . [and a] strong jobs report” come with an asterisk that Barbour clearly explains. Barbour says, “What kind of recovery is it when 1.2 million Americans became so discouraged that they quit looking for work last month alone? In January, five times more people quit looking for work than got a job!” Obama can’t claim economic improvement yet, because it’s not true. The contrasting views of our economic future could very well determine the outcome of the election in November. But so far, it appears if Obama is held to an honest standard, he will not achieve or even be a able to credibly claim that he has produced a recovery anything like what President Reagan did by 1984.

### Independents Key to Election

#### Independents are key

Galston 5/10 (Walliam A., Ezra Zilkha Chair in the Brookings Institution’s Governance Studies Program, where he serves as a senior fellow. A former policy advisor to President Clinton “Six Months To Go: Where the Presidential Contest Stands as the General Election Begins” 5/10/12 http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/5/10%20obama%20campaign%20galston/Where%20the%20Presidential%20Contest%20Stands.pdf)

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

### AT: Obama Won't Get Blame

#### Independents will credit Obama

Resurgent Republic 11 (according to a poll by Resurgent Republic, “VOTERS BELIEVE AMERICA IS WORSE OFF THAN WHEN OBAMA TOOK OFFICE” 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.

### Healthcare Scenario - Bioterror (1NC)

#### Romney win causes healthcare repeal

Klein 6/29 Ezra Klein is a political columnist for the Washington Post, Bloomberg, and MSNBC. "If Romney wins, he can repeal health reform. And he should." 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/06/29/if-romney-wins-he-can-repeal-health-reform-and-he-should/

It won’t be easy, of course. Which is why Romney is often careful in his language on this. ““What the Court did not do on its last day in session,” he said on Thursday, “I will do on my first day if elected President of the United States. And that is I will act to repeal Obamacare.”

You catch that? I will “act to repeal Obamacare” is not the same as “I will repeal Obamacare.” Nevertheless, if Romney has a Congress willing to act with him, he can do quite a lot, quite quickly.

Romney won’t have 60 votes in the Senate. But if he has 51, he can use the budget reconciliation process, which is filibuster-proof, to get rid of the law’s spending. One objection to that is that budget reconciliation is supposed to be used for laws that reduce the deficit, and the Congressional Budget Office would score repeal of the Affordable Care Act as increasing the deficit by about $300 billion.

But so what? This is a rule Republicans have already shown themselves perfectly willing to break. The Bush administration passed both rounds of its deficit-busting tax cuts through reconciliation, using the novel interpretation that the reconciliation process simply prohibited laws from increasing the deficit after the first 10 years — that’s why Bush’s tax cuts had a sunset date of 2010.

When Democrats returned to power in 2006, they reasserted that reconciliation had to be used for real deficit reduction — a move, by the way, that they got no credit for, and that served to make their life harder over the next few years — but nothing about their decision is permanent. Republicans can, and likely will, reverse it in order to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Getting rid of the law’s spending does not get rid of the law. As Lizza writes:

The process can only be used for policies that have budgetary effects and a C.B.O. score. Much of the A.C.A., such as the insurance exchanges and subsidies, would fall under these categories. But a lot of it, including the hated individual mandate, does not. Repealing the exchanges and subsides without repealing the mandate and the other regulations and cost controls in the law would create a health-care Frankenstein that a President Romney would be rather nuts to support.

Sure, but Romney wouldn’t be the one supporting this health-care Frankenstein. He and other Republicans would be working to repeal it. And are Democrats really going to stand together on the floor of the United States Senate and filibuster in order to keep the individual mandate in place, which will now be forcing people to buy insurance they can’t afford without the subsidies that made the whole thing work? They’d have to be suicidal to do that.

And to go even a bit further, if Mitt Romney wins the election and Republicans take control of the Senate, they should repeal the Affordable Care Act. At that point, they will have won two straight elections atop a platform in which repealing the ACA was a central, explicit promise. The American people will have spoken with unusual clarity, and part of what they will have said, whether they meant to say it or not, is repeal the ACA. If Republicans failed to follow through, they would be breaking a central campaign promise.

#### Healthcare's key to solve bioterror

Sklar 2

[Holly, Coauthor of “Raise the Floor”, Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, “Rolling the Dice on Our Nations’ Health”, December 19, <http://www.commondreams.org/views02/1219-07.htm>]

Imagine if the first people infected in a smallpox attack had no health insurance and delayed seeking care for their flu-like symptoms. The odds are high. Pick a number from one to six. Would you bet your life on a roll of the dice? Would you play Russian Roulette with one bullet in a six-chamber gun? One in six Americans under age 65 has no health insurance. The uninsured are more likely to delay seeking medical care, go to work sick for fear of losing their jobs, seek care at overcrowded emergency rooms and clinics, and be poorly diagnosed and treated. The longer smallpox--or another contagious disease--goes undiagnosed, the more it will spread, with the insured and uninsured infecting each other. Healthcare is literally a matter of life and death. Yet, more than 41 million Americans have no health insurance of any kind, public or private. The uninsured rate was 14.6 percent in 2001--up 13 percent since 1987. The rate is on the rise with increased healthcare costs, unemployment and cutbacks in Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). One in four people with household incomes less than $25,000 is uninsured. One in six full-time workers is uninsured, including half the full-time workers with incomes below the official poverty line. The share of workers covered by employment health plans drops from 81 percent in the top fifth of wage earners to 68 percent in the middle fifth to 33 percent in the lowest fifth, according to the Economic Policy Institute. As reports by the American College of Physicians, Kaiser Family Foundation and many others have shown, lack of health insurance is associated with lack of preventive care and substandard treatment inside and outside the hospital. The uninsured are at much higher risk for chronic disease and disability, and have a 25 percent greater chance of dying (adjusting for physical, economic and behavioral factors). To make matters worse, a health crisis is often an economic crisis. "Medical bills are a factor in nearly half of all personal bankruptcy filings," reports the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine. The U.S. is No. 1 in healthcare spending per capita, but No. 34--tied with Malaysia--when it comes to child mortality rates under age five. The U.S. is No. 1 in healthcare spending, but the only major industrialized nation not to provide some form of universal coverage. We squander billions of dollars in the red tape of myriad healthcare eligibility regulations, forms and procedures, and second-guessing of doctors by insurance gatekeepers trained in cost cutting, not medicine. Americans go to Canada for cheaper prices on prescription drugs made by U.S. pharmaceutical companies with U.S. taxpayer subsidies. While millions go without healthcare, top health company executives rake in the dough. A report by Families USA found that the highest-paid health plan executives in ten companies received average compensation of $11.7 million in 2000, not counting unexercised stock options worth tens of millions more. The saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," couldn't be truer when it comes to healthcare. Yet, we provide universal coverage for seniors through Medicare, but not for children. We have economic disincentives for timely diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Universal healthcare is a humane and cost-effective solution to the growing healthcare crisis. Universal coverage won't come easy, but neither did Social Security or Medicare, which now serves one in seven Americans. Many proposals for universal healthcare build on the foundation of "Medicare for All," albeit an improved Medicare adequately serving seniors and younger people alike. Healthcare is as essential to equal opportunity as public education and as essential to public safety as police and fire protection. If your neighbor's house were burning, would you want 911 operators to ask for their fire insurance card number before sending--or not sending--fire trucks? Healthcare ranked second behind terrorism and national security as the most critical issue for the nation in the 2002 Health Confidence Survey released by the Employee Benefit Research Institute. The government thinks the smallpox threat is serious enough to start inoculating military and medical personnel with a highly risky vaccine. It's time to stop delaying universal healthcare, which will save lives everyday while boosting our readiness for any bioterror attack.

#### Bioweapons cause extinction

Ochs 2 | Past president of the Aberdeen Proving Ground Superfund Citizens Coalition, Member of the Depleted Uranium Task force of the Military Toxics Project, and Member of the Chemical Weapons Working Group [Richard Ochs, , June 9, 2002, “Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately,” <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>]

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a “nuclear winter,” resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE. Ironically, the Bush administration has just changed the U.S. nuclear doctrine to allow nuclear retaliation against threats upon allies by conventional weapons. The past doctrine allowed such use only as a last resort when our nation’s survival was at stake. Will the new policy also allow easier use of US bioweapons? How slippery is this slope?

### Healthcare - XT Romney Repeals HC

#### GOP victory ensures repeal of Obamacare or at the very least gutting of funding

Kuhn 11 [citing Tom Mann of the Brookings Institute]

[Daniel, Chief Political Correspondent for RealClearPolitics and the author of The Neglected Voter. He covered the 2008 campaign for Politico and the 2004 campaign for CBSnews.com. Kuhn got his start in national politics as the domestic news intern for Time magazine during the 2000 campaign;    ; “Health Care Law Could Fall, and With It Obama's Legacy”; <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/printpage/?url=http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2011/06/17/health_care_reform_repeal_could_fall_obama_legacy_democrats_2012_court_senate_reconciliation-full.html>]

It was the first minutes of Monday's Republican debate. Michele Bachmann pledged more than to simply "not rest until I repeal Obamacare." Her subsequent words betrayed the higher stakes ahead: "This is the symbol and the signature issue of President Obama, during his entire tenure." Obama's signature legislation is indeed on the line. As is his tenure. His legacy. This vision of liberal governance. It could all still, after so much, fall apart. There are myriad potential scenarios. The Supreme Court overturns the health care law (or at least its individual mandate). Republicans win a Senate majority in 2012. Obama is defeated. These scenarios set the stage for (potentially) lethal blows to Obama's definitive legislation. One legislative tactic, called reconciliation, empowers Republicans to take down critical components of the law with only a simple majority in the Senate -- though that move is far easier written than done. Definite predictions are a professional hazard this far out. As top-shelf congressional scholar Tom Mann, of the Brookings Institution, put it, "I honestly don't know what will happen." But? "But listen, I think the 2012 election is hugely consequential," Mann continued. "If Republicans took control of the White House, as well as the Senate, even being a few votes short of cloture, I'm convinced they would succeed in repealing most or all" of the health care law. However it's done, if it is done, much of Obama's legacy would also be undone. Obama and the Democratic leadership made decisions in 2009 that will reverberate politically for decades. Democratic philosophy -- active-state liberalism, government as a means to promote the common good -- [was fully invested in the choices of Obama's first year](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/09/10/obama_confronts_deeper_debate_role_of_government_98242.html), a point this writer has admittedly [belabored](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/12/04/dems_doing_liberalism_badly_99401.html). Democrats made immense legislative sacrifices to win their prize. Those sacrifices could be for naught. The new New Deal that [never came](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/07/13/the_raw_deal_and_americas_he-cession_97384.html) to pass. Recall that rare chance. A president had the political capital to cobble a bill large enough to substantially impact the economy. But the average American worker was never bailed out. We cannot know what might have been. What if Obama had focused his first year on the great issue of this time, as FDR did in his time? Obama won the health care overhaul, which was never popular. He could have certainly won a major jobs bill, which was always popular. Would that have granted Obama momentum for more? A financial bill that actually ended "too big to fail"? Other Democratic ambitions -- some measure of legislation on climate change or immigration? Obama sought the great liberal dream instead -- universal health care. The White House seemingly did not grasp the gamble. Obama was [wrongly said to have remade our politics](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/01/democrats_year_less_change_tha.html), whereas his majority was born with the September 2008 crash and in time, [fell as that fact was forgotten](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2010/09/15/september_15_crash_explains_obama_democrats_woe_107164.html). The distance between mandate and actions grew. His coalition predictably fissured with that distance, as he learned [demographics are not destiny](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/03/for_dems_demographics_are_not.html). Even the everyman concern for [health care costs](http://www.usatoday.com/news/health/2004-03-16-healthcost_x.htm) went largely unaddressed. Independents [predictably](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/03/can_obama_hold_the_center.html) left Obama his first summer in office. The economy was recovering but health care consumed DC. Bailout for the big guy. Health care for the little guy. The [middleman was forgotten](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/12/22/obama_and_the_invisible_workingman__99636.html). Independents never returned. Yet at least, from Democrats' perspective, they had something historic to show for all they sacrificed. And if the law holds, 32 million more Americans will have health insurance. Not small sacrifices. But no small feat. That historic consolation could, however, be undone. As for conservatives, on this matter history is synonymous with notoriety. Newt Gingrich was once a supporter of a mandate. At Monday's debate, even he agreed that opposing the individual mandate should be a litmus test in the GOP primary. That individual mandate is the keystone of the law. Without it, reform surely fails. Last year, House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan, R-Wis., acknowledged that Republicans wouldn't be able to repeal health care -- if they can -- until at least 2013. This spring, Gingrich predicted that the legislation "will be repealed ... probably by March or April 2013." He added that even with Obama in office, the president "can block them from repeal; I don't think he can coerce them into funding." Gingrich has always been a [no-shot](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2010/08/31/newts_gingrich_unlikely_presidential_prospects_2012_106951.html) presidential candidate. Yet the former House speaker certainly knows the machinations of Congress. Should Republicans control Congress, Democrats' vulnerability is real. "Republicans could refuse to fund aspects of its implementation," Mann said of this scenario. "Fail to confirm nominees to get the job done. Put other pressure on the regulatory front. They can really weaken it and make it extremely difficult to really move forward with everything from the effectiveness research to the changes in the basis of payment. Yeah, they can make it really tough."

#### Romney will either repeal Obamacare or prevent its implementation

Somashekar 7/10, (Sanhdya Somashekar, The Washington Post, “Romney would face tough road trying to repeal ‘Obamacare’ if elected president”. 7/10/12 AD. 7/11/12. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/mitt-romney-would-face-tough-road-trying-to-repeal-obamacare-if-elected-president/2012/07/10/gJQAh4nmaW\_story.html|Ashwin)

¶ Mitt Romney has vowed that on his first day as president, he would act to repeal President Obama’s health-care law, thus fulfilling a long-standing promise.¶ But the reality for a President Romney would be more complicated.¶ Unless Republicans gain huge numbers in Congress, he probably would not have the votes to simply repeal the entire law.¶ From the White House, he could instruct the Department of Health and Human Services to drag its feet, pushing back deadlines and turning to an army of lawyers and consultants to figure out how to exploit the law’s weaknesses. But that kind of administrative muscle flexing could bring its own political problems.¶ “The simple answer is there’s nothing Romney can do on the first day to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but he could do a great deal to gum up the works,” said Timothy Jost, a law professor at Washington and Lee University.¶ Nearly two weeks after the Supreme Court upheld most of the law, its future remains unsettled, with the November election its next major hurdle. Americans have been stubbornly divided over the law, with Republican voters highly unified in their opposition to the largest new federal social program in decades.¶ In what has become a common Washington ritual, House Republicans are scheduled again Wednesday to vote on a repeal of the law. It will be the 33rd time Republicans have tried to undo all or part of the law since its passage in 2010 and the first since the court decision. As in those previous attempts, it is almost purely symbolic because it is unlikely to pass muster in the Democratic-led Senate.¶ Despite Romney’s role in passing a similar overhaul while governor of Massachusetts, he has been steadfast in his opposition to the law, a factor that has been key to his winning over deeply conservative voters.¶ As a result, many predict that he would move decisively and aggressively to make good on that promise if elected. He belongs to a very conservative party that hates this bill, many members of which have sworn that they’d rather eat ground glass than let this law go forward,” said Henry J. Aaron, a senior fellow of economic studies at the Brookings Institution. “But there is the conflicting problem of, ‘If you break it, you own it.’ [He will own] anything that goes wrong with the health-care system down the road.”¶ Then there is the matter of what Romney would be able to do as president. Romney campaign officials say they have a blueprint.¶ ¶ ¶ “Governor Romney’s Day One plan includes an executive order instructing federal agencies to return maximum possible authority to the states,” spokeswoman Andrea Saul said in an e-mail. “This will include as much flexibility as the law permits, including waivers wherever possible under the law. He will then begin the work of fully repealing Obamacare and replacing it with common-sense reforms that will ensure Americans have access to the highest quality health care in the world.”¶ Without Congress, Romney could ask federal agencies to slow down implementation and turn off funding spigots. In cases in which the law remains ambiguous — for example, who would be exempt from the requirement that all Americans buy health insurance — he could instruct officials to write the regulations in a way that exempts the largest number of people.¶ A Mitt Romney presidency would be very unhelpful to the Affordable Care Act, no doubt about it,” said Neera Tanden, president of the left-leaning policy group Center for American Progress and a former Obama adviser. “He could make implementation difficult in a lot of ways, but I don’t think he can just not [implement the law].”¶ A better scenario for Romney would be if Republicans control both chambers of Congress. Even without a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate, Republicans could use a process called “reconciliation” to repeal parts of the bill that relate to spending. That could carve out such significant portions as the government subsidy that helps poor people buy the mandatory insurance and the penalty levied against people who don’t comply with the mandate.¶ “What he could do even if he does not have the 60 votes in the Senate, which seems unlikely, is use the budget process to repeal all of the portions of the Affordable Care Act that relate to spending money, which is where all the controversy is,” said Gail Wilensky, a senior fellow at Project HOPE who was a top health-care policymaker in both Bush administrations.

#### It's Romney's top priority

Shear & Parker 6/28 Staff Writers (“Romney Says He Will ‘Repeal Obamacare’ if Elected”, <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/28/romney-says-he-will-repeal-obamacare-if-elected/>, 6/28/2012) Kerwin

Mitt Romney declared Thursday that he would “act to repeal Obamacare” if he was elected president, saying that he agreed with the dissenting justices in the Supreme Court ruling on Thursday.¶ With the Capitol over his shoulder and standing in front of a podium with a sign that read “Repeal and Replace Obamacare,” Mr. Romney said the health of the American economy depended on getting rid of the health care law.¶ “Our mission is clear: if we want to get rid of Obamacare, we are going to have to replace President Obama,” Mr. Romney said. “That is my mission. That is our work. And I’m asking the American people to join me.”

#### More evidence

Gottlieb 11 (Alan Gottlieb. May 15 2011. “Five Reasons Not to Reelect Obama”. Ameripac.org. Gottlieb is the Chairman of the AmeriPac political organization, and was educated in the Institute on Comparative Political & Economic Systems, Georgetown University. Has authored 19 books.)

1. Obamacare

The latest Rasmussen poll shows 57% of Americans SUPPORT repealing Obamacare. If that's not a clear sign to the administration that this 2,700 page monstrosity was a colossal failure - they'll never understand. What Obamacare promised and what it delivered couldn't be more distant. At first, Obama promised a public option. Luckily, he didn't follow through. Also promised were lower costs (premiums are now rising across the country) and the ability to keep your current healthcare plan if you like it. However, with costs rising and the economy in such poor shape, many businesses are facing the tough decision whether to cut jobs or healthcare. The latter usually prevails. 27 states are challenging the constitutionality of the bill. A section of the bill mandates that Americans purchase health insurance, or face a penalty. Obama and his administration claim that this falls under the Commerce Clause; however, the government cannot charge people for something they don't buy. Of course, liberals are doing everything they can to stop this from reaching the Supreme Court expediently, thereby furthering the burden on taxpayers. The whole process of this legislation has been flawed from its conception. We were promised - under false pretenses - that adding 32 million people to the healthcare system (free of charge to them) would somehow LOWER health care costs. Well, Americans have caught on, and the more we learn about the bill, the less we want it to take effect. Interesting side note: all of the controversial and damaging portions of this bill conveniently don't take place until AFTER the 2012 elections, so Obama can claim only good has come from the bill. In 2014, however, the mandates take effect, and hardworking Americans who feel they don't NEED health insurance will be forced to purchase it or pay a monthly fine. And businesses will be forced to supply medical coverage to its employees or face penalties. Let's also not forget the 1,100 businesses - mostly labor unions - that have been waived of all responsibility for this massive healthcare takeover. Is that right? It looks like we are stuck with Obamacare - unless we vote Obama out!

### Healthcare - XT HC Solves Bioterror

#### An effective health care system is key preventing the spread of disease – stops bioterror

Green 4 ("Bioterrorism and Health Care Reform : No Preparedness Without Access" Shane K PhD. is Program Leader in Ethics Interim Program and Leader in Commercialization McLaughlin-Rotman Centre for Global Health http://virtualmentor.ama-assn.org/2004/05/pfor2-0405.html)

The temporal correlation between the occurrence of wars or epidemics and attempts at health care reform exists in large part because the health of the public gains importance when its absence threatens a nation's integrity and security. The US learned this valuable lesson during the Revolutionary War, when American colonial forces were weakened early on as nonimmunized soldiers fell victim to smallpox, while British soldiers, who had encountered the disease in England and had thus acquired immunity, were relatively unaffected. Recognizing that protecting national interests in times of war necessitates a healthy fighting force, the US government instituted health care coverage for members of the US Armed Forces and Merchant Marine [1]. But with the US presently engaged in a "war on terror," in which not only soldiers but also civilians are targets, a healthy fighting force is no longer enough to ensure national security; the time has come for this country to take up reforms that promote the health of *all* Americans. Reassuringly, this is not a novel proposal. Reflecting upon statements made in 1944 by American medical historian Henry E. Sigerist, MD, concerning the power of external security threats to stimulate reform, a recent editorial in the American Journal of Public Health suggested that, "[t]his incendiary moment may be just the time for rekindling reform" [2]. Similarly, emergency physician and medical ethicist C. Griffin Trotter, MD, PhD, recently declared: "National security, I submit, is the new banner for health care reform" [3]. Consider the threat of bioterrorism: the potential use of biological weapons against this country raises the specter of a unique kind of war in which battles will be fought not against soldiers and artillery but against epidemics. Without significant reform to ensure access to health care for all Americans, the US will be unable to fight such battles effectively. Why Access? Using infectious diseases as weapons, bioterrorism threatens to weaken the civilian workforce and, hence, a nation's ability to go about its daily business. Moreover, in the case of diseases that are transmissible person to person, each infected individual becomes a human weapon, infecting others, who then infect others, and so on, tying up medical responders and overwhelming medical resources. A nation's greatest defense against bioterrorism, both in preparation for and in response to an attack, is a population in which an introduced biological agent cannot get a foothold, ie, healthy people with easy access to health care. Yet, in spite of spending significantly more *per capita* on health care than any other developed nation, the US is peppered with communities in which many people have little or no access to health care. This may be due to a lack of adequate health insurance—a fact of life for over 43 million demographically diverse Americans—or to cultural barriers that inhibit proper utilization of available services, or to inadequate distribution of health professionals and services. These communities are more vulnerable to infectious diseases [4] and therefore might be considered the nation's Achilles' heal in a bioterrorism attack. Take, for example, vaccination. A lack of access to health care among US citizens, particularly immigrant populations and those living in poverty, is associated with a failure to be vaccinated. This can have a serious impact on the spread of contagion, as evidenced by a rubella outbreak in 1997 in Westchester County, New York, in which a readily containable virus managed to infect a community composed largely of immigrants who had not been immunized [5]. Granted, US federal law permits all persons, including immigrants living here illegally, to receive emergency health care, immunizations and treatment of communicable diseases; those who are unable to pay can receive these services through Medicaid. Studies have shown, however, that immigrants are often disinclined to apply for Medicaid for fear that doing so will compromise their residency status or citizenship applications [6]. Still others avoid the health care system altogether due to mistrust or language barriers [7].

### Healthcare - Econ Scenario

#### Repeal of healthcare collapses the economy

Stephanie Cutter 11, Deputy Senior Advisor to President Barack Obama, “Repealing the Affordable Care Act will Hurt the Economy,” White House Blog, http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/01/07/repealing-affordable-care-act-will-hurt-economy

The House Republican Health Care Plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act and take away all the new freedom and control it gives the American people over their health care and give it back to insurance companies will not only raise costs for individuals and businesses, but it will hurt our economy.

Since the President signed the Affordable Care Act into law last March, the economy has created over 1 million private sector jobs, including the 113,000 private sector jobs created in December announced today. So, at a time when our economy is getting stronger, repealing the law would hamper that important economic progress by increasing costs on individuals and businesses, weakening the benefits and protections that Americans with private insurance are already enjoying, and adding more than a trillion dollars to our deficits.

Opponents’ claim that the law is “job-killing” is in direct contradiction to what has actually been happening in the economy since enactment. In fact, repealing the law would likely slow down the growth of our economy. Here are the facts:

•Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the economy has created over 1 million private sector jobs. The unemployment rate is 9.4%, lower than it was in March 2010—9.7%.

•In the period during and right after the enactment of the law, the economy grew by 2.7%.

•Consumer confidence in a range of areas have improved, including retail and food sales by 4%, and auto sales by 7% since the enactment of the law.

•Slowing the growth of health care costs—as the Affordable Care Act does—will have the likely impact of creating more jobs since businesses will have to spend less on health care for their employees. This reduction could create more than 300,000 additional jobs.

•The law widely expands coverage to Americans, thereby reducing the hidden tax of about $1,000 that families with insurance pay each year in additional premium costs to cover the uncompensated costs of the uninsured.

•The law reduces small businesses’ health care expenses by giving them $40 billion worth of tax credits, and through the creation of new, competitive state-based insurance Exchanges. Exchanges will enable individuals and small businesses to pool together and use their market strength to buy coverage at a lower cost, the same way large employers do today, giving them the freedom to launch their own companies without worrying whether health care will be available when they need it.

•The law will lower the deficit by over $100 billion this decade and by over $1 trillion in the following decade.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act would have a devastating impact on our economy. In addition to hurting some of the economic progress that has been made over the past ten months the Congressional Budget Office found that repealing the law would add over a quarter of a trillion dollars--$230 billion—to the deficit in the first decade, and more than a trillion dollars in the second decade; increase the number of uninsured by 32 million Americans; increase premiums for large employers; and will force consumers who buy coverage on the individual market to pay more out of pocket for fewer benefits.

In addition, Harvard Economist David Cutler found in a report released today by the Center for American Progress that repealing the law would significantly increase costs and reduce job growth. It will “…revert us back to the old system for financing and delivering health care and lead to substantial increases in total medical spending” by:

•Adding up to $2,000 annually to family premiums and increasing overall medical spending $125 billion by the end of this decade.

•Preventing 250,000 to 400,000 jobs from being created annually over the next decade.

•Suppressing entrepreneurship among workers who may have started new businesses, or sought new opportunities in the economy since they will no longer be free from worrying whether affordable coverage would be available to them in the new Exchanges, when they need it the most.

#### Economic decline causes global nuclear war

Harris and Burrows 9 - PhD in European History @ Cambridge and Counselor of the US National Intelligence Council AND Member of the National Intelligence Council’s Long Range Analysis Unit (Mathew J. and Jennifer, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis,” April, Washington Quarterly, <http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr_Burrows.pdf>)

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

### Healthcare - Econ Scenario - XT Solves Econ

#### Healthcare key to economic growth

Gruber 9 (Jonathan Gruber is a professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a board member of the Massachusetts Health Insurance Connector Authority, New York Times, “Medicine for the Job Market,” pg online @ <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/04/opinion/04gruber.html?_r=1&ref=opinion>)

As the country slips into what is possibly the worst downturn since the Depression, nearly all experts agree that Washington should stimulate demand with new spending. And one of the most effective ways to spend would be to give states money to enroll more people in Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Plan. This would free up state money for rebuilding roads and bridges and other public works projects — spending that could create jobs. Health care reform can be an engine of job growth in other ways, too. Most proposals call for investments in health information technology, including the computerization of patient medical records. During the campaign, for example, Mr. Obama proposed spending $50 billion on such technology. The hope is that computerized recordkeeping, and the improved sharing of information among doctors that it would enable, would improve the quality of patient care and perhaps also lower medical costs. More immediately, it would create jobs in the technology sector. After all, somebody would need to develop the computer systems and operate them for thousands of American health care providers. Expanded insurance coverage would also drive demand for high-paying, rewarding jobs in health services. Most reform proposals emphasize primary care, much of which can be provided by nurse practitioners, registered nurses and physician’s assistants. These jobs could provide a landing spot for workers who have lost jobs in other sectors of the economy. Fundamental health care reform would also stimulate more consumer spending, as previously uninsured families would no longer need to save every extra penny to cover a medical emergency. When the federal government expanded Medicaid in the 1990s, my own research has shown, the newly insured significantly increased their spending on consumer goods. Universal health insurance coverage would also address economic problems that existed before this downturn began — and that are likely to linger after growth resumes. In our current system, people who leave or lose their jobs often must go without insurance for months or years, and this discourages people from moving to positions where they could be more productive. Most reform proposals call for the creation of pools of insurance coverage that would guarantee access to high-quality, affordable care for people who are self-employed or out of work, increasing their mobility. If this coverage focuses on disease prevention and wellness, it could also improve the health, and thereby the productivity, of the workforce. In the long term, the greatest fiscal threat facing this nation is the growth in the costs of health care. These costs have more than tripled as a share of our economy since 1950, and show no signs of abating. The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that the share of the economy devoted to health care will double by 2050. Experts have yet to figure out how to restrain cost increases without sacrificing the quality of care that Americans demand. Yet cost control would be easier in an environment of universal coverage. Nations like the Netherlands and Switzerland, which have achieved universal coverage within a private insurance structure, control costs better than we do. And in my home state, Massachusetts, an ambitious plan to cover all residents has focused the attention of all stakeholders on the importance of controlling costs as a means of ensuring the plan’s success in the long run. These are challenging times. The economic crisis of 2008 has left politicians of all stripes in shock and unsure where to move next. But rather than sit back and lick our wounds, we must move toward healing them. Fundamental health care reform that features universal insurance coverage is an important place to start.

#### Repeal reverses the economic recovery - causes collapse

Reuters 11, London-based international news company, covering stories from all around the world—ranging from politics to economics, 1/19/11[Reuters, “Geithner says healthcare repeal bad for U.S. economy,” Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/01/19/us-geithner-healthcare-idUSTRE70I50520110119>]ADravid

(Reuters) **- U.S. Treasury Secretary** Timothy Geithner on Wednesday **said repealing healthcare reforms would damage the economy, as the House of Representatives debated the law's repeal.** **"Repealing the Affordable Care Act would be bad for business and bad for the economy,"** Geithner said in a blog posting on the Treasury's website. "**We are at a crucial stage of the economic recovery.** While the private sector has expanded payrolls for 12 straight months, the unemployment rate remains at an unacceptable level," Geithner said. "**Given where we are, we must do things that help bolster the recovery, and repealing the Affordable Care Act would be a step in the wrong direction."** The House is expected to vote on the repeal late on Wednesday, pressed by many newly elected Republicans who made campaign promises to repeal President Barack Obama's overhaul of the healthcare sector passed last year. While the Republican-controlled chamber is expected pass the bill, it looks certain to die in the Senate, which is still controlled by Democrats. Republicans have characterized the Obama healthcare law as "job-killing," arguing that it saddles businesses with high costs and complicated regulations and encourages firms to shed employees to avoid certain requirements to provide coverage. But Geithner said **the act will help reduce health insurance premiums charged to businesses and government by eliminating hidden costs to cover the uninsured. Nearly 95 percent of Americans will be covered under the law. He also said the reforms will slow spiraling growth in healthcare costs, which otherwise would make it increasingly difficult for businesses and government to provide insurance. It will redirect resources from unnecessary healthcare spending toward more economically productive priorities**, he said. "**It provides businesses and the government certainty that health care costs will be contained in the future**," he said, encouraging businesses and families to invest.

#### Repealing Health Care kills jobs—destroys chances of economic recovery

Cutler 11, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress—Served as assistant professor of economics at Harvard—Was named the John L. Loeb Associate Professor of Social Sciences (1995)—Recently, he is the Otto Eckstein Professor of Applied Economics at the Kennedy School of Government, January 2011[David, “Repealing Health Care Is a Job Killer: It Would Slow Job Growth by 250,000 to 400,000 Annually,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/pdf/PPM182\_110107\_cutler.pdf]ADravid

**Repealing Health Care Is a Job Killer**: **It Would Slow Job Growth** by 250,000 to 400,000 **Annually** David M. Cutler January 2011 **The imminent effort in the House of Representatives to repeal health care reform is a major step in the wrong direction if promoting economic recovery is job one.** The new House leadership proposes to repeal the new health care reform law formally known as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 and the subsequent Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. **That** combined **legislation** **guarantees** **health insurance** coverage to all Americans **and promotes significant cost reductions in public and private medical care** programs. It is the culmination of 70 years of effort by Democrats and Republicans alike. A successful **repeal** **of health care reform** **would revert us back to the old system** for financing and delivering health care **and** lead to **substantial increases in total medical spending**. The consequences of this spending increase would be far reaching. **It would hurt family incomes, jobs, and economic growth.** **Repealing** health **reform** **would**: · **Increase medical spending** by $125 billion by the end of this decade **and add** nearly $2,000 **annually to family insurance premiums** · **Destroy** 250,000 to 400,000 **jobs** annually over the next decade · **Reduce the share of workers who start new businesses, move to new jobs, or otherwise invest in themselves and the economy** This memo will review these effects in more detail with a particular focus on jobs. High medical spending harms employment and economic growth Before getting to the effects of repeal let’s look at how health costs affect the economy. Health **insurance costs are a major issue for Americans**. Family health insurance **premiums have increased** 80 percent in the past decade after adjusting for inflation, **while** median **income has fallen** by 5 percent.1 This is among the reasons why **American families are increasingly uneasy about the economy.** **Businesses are worried as well**. **Small businesses have consistently ranked the cost of health insurance as their number one problem since 1986**.2 Finally**, rising medical costs are the major contributor to the long-run federal deficit, and they hamper state and local governments,** too. These costs affect four aspects of economic activity. First, **increasing costs reduce net income for workers.** The increase in the premiums that employees pay for coverage is most noticeable, but 1 family income is affected in other ways as well. The first response of employers to rising health insurance costs is to reduce salary increases. **Salaries** for high-income workers **have grown less rapidly than productivity** as health insurance costs have accounted for a growing share of total compensation.3 Less rapid growth of wages is not possible for all workers—many of whom have already experienced stagnant or declining take-home pay. For those workers the only viable response to rising medical costs is reduced employment—both involuntary part-time work and layoffs. Several studies show that health insurance costs and employment are negatively related. Neeraj Sood, Arkadipta Ghosh, and José Escarce recently compared employment growth across industries in the United States that differ in how likely they are to provide health insurance. They compared employment in the same industries in the United States and Canada, where medical costs are lower and not paid for by businesses. The study found that every 10 percent increase in excess health care cost growth (cost growth above GDP growth) led to 120,000 fewer jobs.4 In other words, the high and growing cost of health care means that American firms that offer health coverage create fewer jobs than Canadian firms who need not offer these benefits. These results are consistent with a recent study by Katherine Baicker and Amitabh Chandra, as well as estimates from the president’s Council of Economic Advisers.5 Beyond the impact on employment, **high health insurance costs discourage long-term investments in economic growth**. Fear of losing health insurance deters people from moving to new entrepreneurial jobs, from retiring when their health deteriorates, or from switching to parttime work as family needs arise.6 In the public sector, **high medical spending crowds out investment in education, transportation, and electronic infrastructure, which translates into slower growth over time. Health care reform aims to bring rising health costs down, but repealing it would do the opposite and make the above problems worse.** The alternative proposals conservatives are offering would lead to continued cost increases as well. I focus primarily on how employment would be affected by health care repeal in this analysis. But the other effects of repeal on the economy are certainly important. Medical spending is rapidly increasing Health care analysts are virtually united in their view that medical spending is higher than it should be. They also agree that the approach taken in the Affordable Care Act is the right one to reduce this excessive spending. Excessive medical spending is seen in several areas. A large literature shows that spending on acute and post-acute care exceeds appropriate levels.7 To take just a few examples, rehospitalization rates in the nation as a whole average twice what they are in the areas with the best care. Imaging has increased rapidly with little sense of whether prior rates were too low or that current rates are right. And care at the end of life is far more intensive than people and their families desire. Estimates suggest that about 30 percent of acute and post-acute care could be eliminated with no adverse health impact, and in many cases health improvements. 2 Prevention is also limited. Medications to control hypertension, high cholesterol, diabetes, depression, and other chronic conditions have been available for decades. Yet no more than one in three people with chronic disease are successfully treated. Lack of access to care, high out-ofpocket costs, and an excessive focus on acute illness over prevention are all factors in this poor performance. The result is **too many people becoming sick and needing the expensive armamentarium of the medical system.** Finally, **administrative costs eat up significant resources that would better be directed elsewhere.**  Insurance companies’ administrative expenses are widely noted. But they are only the tip of the iceberg. Providers incur costs verifying enrollment, adjudicating claims, and ensuring appropriate reimbursement.8 Estimates suggest that such costs account for as much as 15 percent of overall medical spending. The Affordable Care Act takes steps to bring costs down **The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act takes steps to address each of these cost drivers.**  On the administrative end, the legislation **establishes insurance** **exchanges**, **mandates** **minimum** **loss ratios for insurance companies**, **and streamlines transactions** between medical care providers and insurers. Together, these provisions will significantly reduce the administrative costs of medical care. By far the most changes are in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The philosophy underlying the Affordable Care Act is to make Medicare and Medicaid smarter purchasers of medical care so that providers are rewarded for creating value—not just for providing additional services. The specific changes that promote this philosophical viewpoint include: · Payment innovations including greater reimbursement for preventive care services and patient-centered primary care; bundled payments for hospital, physician, and other services provided for a single episode of care; shared savings approaches or capitation payments that reward accountable provider groups that assume responsibility for the continuum of a patient’s care; and pay-for-performance incentives for Medicare providers · An Independent Payment Advisory Board with the authority to make recommendations that reduce cost growth and improve quality in both the Medicare program and the health system as a whole · A new Innovation Center within the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or CMS, charged with streamlining the testing of demonstration and pilot projects in Medicare and rapidly expanding successful models across the program · Profiling medical care providers on the basis of cost and quality and making that data available to consumers and insurance plans, and providing relatively low-quality, highcost providers with financial incentives to improve their care · Increased funding for comparative effectiveness research · Increased emphasis on wellness and prevention 3 The exact amount that will be saved from these provisions is uncertain. Partly as a result of this uncertainty, the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, and the Office of the Actuary at CMS assume only minor savings. CBO, for example, estimated that the major parts of the law including these provisions will cost $10 billion over the 2010–2019 period, while the Office of the Actuary determined savings of only $2 billion. Other studies suggest much larger changes. Melinda Beeuwkes-Buntin and I estimate a 1.5 percentage point reduction in cost increases annually from significant health care reform.9 Similarly, Peter S. Hussey, Christine Eibner, and M. Susan Ridgely in the New England Journal of Medicine estimate that savings of more than 10 percent are possible largely from payment reforms like bundled-payment systems.10 Realizing these savings over a decade implies cost reductions of nearly 1.5 percentage points annually. Finally, a Commonwealth Fund report indicates that provisions like these will slow annual growth in national health expenditures from 6.5 percent to 5.6 percent over the 2010–2020 period.11 Taking all these studies into consideration, Karen Davis, Kristof Stremikis, and I estimate that the Affordable Care Act will reduce medical spending by 1.0 percentage points annually, beginning in 2014.12 Repealing the law would increase medical spending Accordingly, repealing health reform would increase spending by the same amount. I also consider a scenario where repeal would increase cost growth by 1.5 percentage points annually to account for the higher estimates in some studies. The implications of repealing health care for national medical spending (public and private) are shown in Figure 1. Repealing health reform would add $25 billion to spending in 2014 and $185 billion to spending in 2019. The impact on family premiums will be equally large (see Figure 2). Repealing health reform would add 9 percent or nearly $2,000 annually to family health insurance premiums in 2019. 4 Families would continue to pay more for health insurance Effect of health reform repeal on family health insurance premiums How health reform repeal would affect jobs Any proposal that adds $200 billion to our medical spending after a decade will have enormous economic implications. The employment impacts of health care repeal will be particularly severe because many of these costs will fall on businesses. As we’ve already seen, employers facing higher health costs will hire fewer people, lay workers off, and pay lower wages. To estimate these employment impacts, I followed the methodology of myself and Neeraj Sood.13 That paper took estimates of the medical spending change associated with health reform 5 and combined that with the econometric model of Sood, Arkadipta Ghosh, and José Escarce that estimated the employment impacts of changes in medical costs. I use the model to estimate the employment impact of repealing reform. Figure 3 shows the net impact of repealing health reform on total employment. **The baseline estimates show that 250,000 jobs will be lost annually if health reform is repealed. Annual job losses would average 400,000 using the greater estimate** of 1.5 percentage point cost increases annually resulting from repeal. Figure 4 shows the estimated employment change by industry in 2016 (omitting health care, which will have more employment). More than 200,000 jobs will be lost in manufacturing and nearly 900,000 jobs will be lost in nonhealth care services. A total of 250,000 jobs will be lost annually if health reform is repealed Jobs lost from health care repeal, 2011–2019 Repeal will lead to more than 200,000 jobs lost in manufacturing and nearly 900,000 jobs lost in nonhealth care services Jobs lost from repealing health reform by industry, 2016 Figure 4: Jobs lost from repealing health reform, by industry Industry Change in employment, 2016 Agriculture, mining, and construction Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting -6,026 Mining -10,738 Construction -76,339 6 Manufacturing -202,109 Trade Wholesale trade -87,750 Retail trade -154,557 Transportation and communication Transportation and warehousing -66,689 Utilities -10,219 Services Information -48,606 Financial activities -141,480 Professional and business services -231,262 Educational services -55,808 Leisure and hospitality -89,638 Other services -304,537 These job losses are not the only impact of repealing health reform, however. **Family incomes would fall** by as much as $2,000 annually as medical costs increase beyond forecasted levels. Federal **deficits also would rise**. The Congressional Budget Office has predicted that repealing health reform would add $230 billion to federal deficits in the next decade because provisions in the law intended to bring down costs would be repealed. **Job transitions would also be affected. Millions of people are “locked” into their current job because they fear becoming uninsured or underinsured if they were to change.** **Repealing health reform would thus stifle job transitions, new business startups, and movements into and out of the labor force.** Millions more workers would be affected. Conclusion **Medical care accounts for one-sixth of the economy, which means that any health reform that improves the efficiency of medical care will boost economic performance. Conversely, legislation that raises medical spending will be a job killer.** The House leadership has set as one of their first agenda items the repeal of health reform that would guarantee coverage and lower costs. They promise to “repeal and replace” health care reform with an unspecified alternative. The alternative proposals will cost more money than the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, however. In some cases, such as malpractice reform, the savings from reform are universally agreed to be modest.14 In other cases, such as in conservatives’ “Roadmap for America’s Future” budget plan, the savings to the government come from shifting costs to individuals—not from lowering costs overall. This alternative would increase medical spending under any viable scenario. **The implications of these plans for employment are profound. If successful, the effort to repeal health care reform would reduce employment** by 250,000 to 400,000 jobs annually over the next decade and lower wage growth. Our economy has recently lost millions of jobs and wages for 7 almost all workers have stagnated for years. **The effects of repeal would add more medical burdens to the public and private sectors. That is bad economic policy.** The effort to repeal health reform will make our current problems worse. David M. Cutler is Otto Eckstein Professor of Applied Economics, Harvard University, and a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress. Endnotes 8 1 Data on premiums are from: Kaiser Family Foundation and the Health Research and Education Trust, “Employer Health Benefits, 2010 Annual Survey” (2010); data on median income and inflation are from: Bureau of the Census, Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2009 (Department of Commerce, 2010), available at http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p60-238.pdf. 2 Bruce D. Phillips and Holly Wade, “Small Business Problems & Priorities” (National Federation for Independent Businesses, 2008). 3 Jonathan Gruber, “The Incidence of Mandated Maternity Benefits,” American Economic Review 84 (3) (1994): 622–641. 4 Neeraj Sood, Arkadipta Ghosh, and José Escarce, “Employer-Sponsored Insurance, Health Care Cost Growth, and the Economic Performance of U.S. Industries,” Health Services Research 44 (5) (2009): 1449–1464. 5 Katherine Baicker and Amitabh Chandra, “The Labor Market Effects of Rising Health Insurance Premiums,” Journal of Labor Economics 24 (3) (2006): 609–634; Council of Economic Advisers, The Economic Case for Health Care Reform (Executive Office of the President, June 2009); Council of Economic Advisers, The Economic Case for Health Care Reform: Update (Executive Office of the President, December 2009). 6 Brigitte Madrian, “Employment Based Health Insurance and Job Mobility: Is there Evidence of Job-Lock?”, Quarterly Journal of Economics 109 (1) (1994): 27–54. 7 Elliott S. Fisher, et al., “The implications of regional variations in Medicare spending. Part 1: the content, quality, and accessibility of care,” Annals of Internal Medicine 138 (4) (2003): 273–287; Elliott S. Fisher and others, “The implications of regional variations in Medicare spending. Part 2: health outcomes and satisfaction with care,” Annals of Internal Medicine 138 (4) (2003): 288–298. 8 Lawrence P. Casalino and others, “What does it cost physician practices to interact with health insurance plans?”, Health Affairs 28 (4) (2009): w533–w543. 9 Melinda Beeuwkes-Buntin and David Cutler, “The Two Trillion Dollar Solution: Saving Money by Modernizing the Health Care System” (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2009). 10 Peter S. Hussey and others, “Controlling U.S. Health Care Spending—Separating Promising from Unpromising Approaches,” New England Journal of Medicine 361 (22) (2009): 2109–2111. 11 Cathy Schoen and others, “Fork in the Road: Alternative Paths to a High Performance U.S. Health System” (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, June 2009). 12 David Cutler, Karen Davis, and Kristof Stremikis, “Health System Impacts of Health Reform Proposals” (New York and Washington: The Commonwealth Fund and the Center for American Progress Action Fund, 2009). 13 David Cutler and Neeraj Sood, “New Jobs Through Better Health Care” (Los Angeles and Washington: The Center for American Progress Action Fund and the Leonard D. Schaeffer Center for Health Policy and Economics, 2010). 14 Michelle Mello and others, “National Costs Of The Medical Liability System,” Health Affairs 29 (9) (2010): 1569–1577. This article estimates that medical malpractice as a whole adds only 2 percent to national medical spending. Malpractice reform would not eliminate all of this cost.

#### Newest evidence confirms healthcare boosts consumer spending and growth

Johnaton, Gruber; July 9, 2012 (Dr. Jonathan Gruber is a Professor of Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he has taught since 1992. He is also the Director of the Health Care Program at the National Bureau of Economic Research, where he is a Research Associate. He is an Associate Editor of both the Journal of Public Economics and the Journal of Health Economics. In 2009 he was elected to the Executive Committee of the American Economic Association. He is also a member of the Institute of Medicine, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the National Academy of Social Insurance.)< <http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/104791/gruber-care-act-job-killing>>

By now, most people who follow politics know that the law will result in more than 30 million additional Americans getting [health insurance](http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/104791/gruber-care-act-job-killing). But what few realize is that, by expanding insurance coverage, the law will also increase economic activity. These newly insured individuals will demand more medical care than when they were uninsured. And while it takes many years to train a family physician or nurse practitioner, it doesn’t take much time to train the assistants and technicians (and related support staff) who can fill much of this need. In many cases, these are precisely the sort of medium-skill jobs that our economy desperately needs—and that the health care sector has already been providing, even during the recession. More immediately, the increase in economic security for American families will also mean an increase in consumer spending. Many uninsured consumers are forced to set aside money in low interest liquid accounts to make sure they have enough to cover unexpected medical costs. With the security provided by health [insurance](http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/104791/gruber-care-act-job-killing), they can free that money up for consumption that is much more valuable to them. When the federal government expanded Medicaid in the 1990s, my own research has shown, the newly insured significantly increased their spending on consumer goods. More purchases of consumer goods will provide short-run stimulation to the economy and more hiring.

#### Obamacare only viable healthcare option for economy

Harrop 7/3 (bi-weekly syndicated column in about 200, 20th among the top 100 syndicated columnists for total reader reach and 14th based on average circulation, “'Obamacare' good for people, business, economy”, <http://www.poughkeepsiejournal.com/article/20120704/COLUMNISTS03/307040009/-Obamacare-good-people-business-economy>,, 7/03/12, Bhattacharyya)

There was never much doubt that the individual mandate in “Obamacare” was constitutional. As Harvard Law School professor Einer Elhauge had noted, the first Congress in 1790 enacted a law ordering ship owners to buy medical insurance for their seamen. Twenty framers of the U.S. Constitution were members, and President George Washington signed the law. No, the emotional claim that forcing people to buy a commercial product stomps on basic American rights was a cover for a political campaign to kill the reforms. The Supreme Court removed that fig leaf last week, but the naked politicking goes on. The next showdown on the program is less dignified. Conservative governors have latched onto the ruling that states won’t lose their existing Medicaid funding if they don’t expand their coverage as envisioned by the Affordable Care Act. Thus, they won’t. In South Carolina, Gov. Nikki Haley’s spokesman defiantly announced, “We’re not going to shove more South Carolinians into a broken system.” Gosh, wouldn’t bringing coverage to the uninsured make the system less broken? More to the point, exactly who would be “shoved”? Contrary to right-wing mythology, America’s uninsured are not the poor. They already have government-guaranteed health care, as do the elderly, the disabled, government workers and prisoners. Left out are the modest folk who earn too much to qualify under the old Medicaid rules but not enough to afford insurance in the private market (and, by the way, who subsidize others’ coverage). The Medicaid expansion is for them. Nebraska’s Republican Gov. Dave Heineman also opposes letting more struggling workers into Medicaid: “As I have said repeatedly, if this unfunded Medicaid expansion is implemented, state aid to education and funding for the University of Nebraska will be cut or taxes will be increased.” An interesting threat, except for one thing. The Medicaid expansion is funded. The federal government assumes the costs in the early years, then 90 percent after that. Continuing to drive the uninsured to expensive emergency rooms for routine care is itself a major cost. Speaking of affordability, the reforms make health care more affordable for government, as well as for families. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the Affordable Care Act will cut federal deficits. Here’s how: While the federal government will be spending billions to make insurance obtainable to those without, it will save more than that through other parts of the law that curb costs and add revenues, an estimated $525 billion. For example, as Medicare now stands, the program must pay for almost any treatment that works, regardless of whether the same could be done for much less. The law prepares government (and private insurers) for more careful spending by funding research to identify $10,000 treatments that do just as fine a job as the $40,000 variety. Obamacare is also bottom-line good for business and the American economy. It extends tax credits to small companies that cover their workers. Would-be entrepreneurs will be able to leave their corporate jobs, thanks to reasonably priced family coverage.

### Healthcare - AT: Not Effective

#### Healthcare has been effective - millions more have insurance

Kilkarni,’12{Suresh, reporter for Standard Examinar, 7/10/12, <http://www.standard.net/stories/2012/07/10/people-lose-if-obamacare-repealed>]

**Just look at the positives since Obamacare was passed**. Millions do not have to worry about losing coverage or becoming bankrupt because they get sick. We are saving money on preventive care and prescription drugs. Pre-existing conditions are now covered. Even children are covered under their parents’ plan until the age of 26.  
The 30-40 million who are not insured can now get insurance or pay a fine (sorry, tax) if they choose not to. Somehow this fact is being twisted by Republicans as imposed "socialized medicine" or "losing our right to choose."  
Remember that we all pay for those who can afford to get insurance and do not. Only 1 percent or so fall into the category of paying a fine (tax). And Congress has decreed that no one should be denied treatment.  
So, if a free rider gets a hip replacement or a heart bypass, that expense is passed on to the rest of us through increased hospital costs. Quoting Fareed Zakaria of CNN: "A general insurance system can only work if everyone is insured. Otherwise, only the people who are sick will want to buy insurance and the insurance companies will spend most of their time and effort trying to kick sick people out of the system and denying coverage to those who might get sick. This is why the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank, came up with the idea of an individual mandate, requiring that people buy health insurance in exactly the same way that people are required to buy [car insurance](http://www.standard.net/).  
That’s why Romney chose this as a market friendly system for Massachusetts and Newt Gingrich praised the Massachusetts model as the most important step forward in health care in years."  
The benefits of Obamacare are many and this is what we will lose if it is repealed:1. [Insurance companies](http://www.standard.net/) can’t drop us because we got sick or made a mistake on our application or hit an arbitrary cap on coverage. (105 million no longer have caps).2. 86 million get more access to preventive care — from life-saving cancer screenings to regular checkups to immunizations — covered by [Medicare](http://www.standard.net/) or their insurance without a copay or a deductible.3. 3.1 million young adults who would have been uninsured now have coverage through their parent’s plans.4. Over 5 million get discounts on their prescription drugs in their Medicare "doughnut hole" — each saving an average of $600 last year.5. Starting in 2014 insurance companies won’t be allowed to deny coverage or charge more based on health conditions, protecting up to 120 million with preexisting conditions.6. People who cannot afford insurance will get it through Medicaid or generous tax credits to make coverage affordable. A typical middle class family could pay up to 60 percent less for the same coverage — the largest ever health care middle class tax cut.7. By Aug. 1, 12.8 million will have received rebates from their insurance companies because they spent too much on administrative costs or CEO bonuses. Insurance companies now have thousands of VPs on bonus plans.8. Medicare will stay solvent through 2024, eight years longer than without Obamacare.

### Healthcare - Econ Scenario - AT: Hurts Econ

#### Healthcare has no negative effect on the economy - reject their evidence

Cohn 6/13 (Jonathan Cohn, American author and journalist who writes mainly on United States public policy and political issues, Harvard University, “Obamacare, Good for the Economy”, <http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/104035/obamacare-romney-economy-benefit-job-regulation-noam>, 6/13/12, Bhattacharyya)

I think you can argue this either way. The more important issue is the argument that started this whole discussion: Mitt Romney’s claim that the Affordable Care Act itself has slowed the recovery, by introducing new taxes and regulations. Romney keeps citing Noam’s book as proof of this claim, even though Noam keeps pointing out that he said no such thing. But Romney was making this argument even before he read Noam’s book. And Republicans have been calling the Affordable Care Act a “job-killer” since before it became law. That makes the argument ripe for scrutiny. You can certainly find business owners who think as Romney and the Republicans do. Of course, you can also find business owners, particularly self-employed entrepreneurs, who think the law will allow them to start or sustain a company because the law gives people with pre-existing conditions access to comprehensive, affordable medical coverage. And while that’s all anecdotal, the best study I’ve seen on this subject is a new report from the Urban Institute and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, examining the impact of Massachusetts health reform on that state’s job market. Yes, that’s the same law Romney signed as governor. Yes, that’s also the same law whose coverage scheme was a template for Obama’s. The report’s conclusion is unambiguous: “The evidence from Massachusetts would suggest that national health reform does not imply job loss and stymied economic growth.” The study is impressively thorough, too. It breaks down employment numbers by education, income, and part-time versus full-time status. No matter how they analyzed the data, they came up with no evidence that health reform had hurt the job market. “All” the reforms did was get insurance to many more people, providing them with better access to care and more financial security. This is consistent with predictions from the Congressional Budget Office, which determined reform’s only significant employment impact was a reduction in the labor force, primarily because people holding onto jobs just to keep insurance could finally retire. These findings are, or should be, a reminder to all of us: Health care is very much an economic issue, but the likely impact will be the very opposite of what Romney and the Republicans suggest. It’s no accident that the name of the new health care law is the Affordable Care Act. The whole point is to make health care more affordable. It attempts to do that, in part, by making the system more efficient and, in part, by making sure everybody can get comprehensive insurance. Bolstering and expanding insurance coverage is more than a line item in a CBO report. It’s financial security for tens of millions of Americans.

### Iran Strikes Scenario (1NC)

#### 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

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.

#### Extinction

Hirsch 5 - Professor @ UC San Diego (Jorge, “Can a nuclear strike on Iran be averted,” November 21st)

The Bush administration has put together all the elements it needs to justify the impending military action against Iran. [Unlike in the case of Iraq](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html), it will happen without warning, and most of the justifications will be issued after the fact. We will wake up one day to learn that facilities in Iran have been bombed in a joint U.S.-Israeli attack. It may even take another couple of days for the revelation that some of the U.S. bombs were nuclear. Why a Nuclear Attack on Iran Is a Bad Idea Now that we have outlined what is very close to happening, let us discuss briefly why everything possible should be done to prevent it. In a worst-case scenario, the attack will cause a violent reaction from Iran. Millions of "[human wave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_wave_attack)" Iranian militias will storm into Iraq, and just as Saddam [stopped them with chemical weapons](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/n01232003_200301234.html), the U.S. will stop them with nuclear weapons, resulting potentially in hundreds of thousands of casualties. The Middle East will explode, and popular uprisings in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other countries with pro-Western governments could be overtaken by radical regimes. Pakistan already has nuclear weapons, and a nuclear conflict could even lead to Russia's and Israel's involvement using nuclear weapons. In a best-case scenario, the U.S. will destroy all nuclear, chemical, and missile facilities in Iran with conventional and low-yield nuclear weapons in a lightning surprise attack, and Iran will be paralyzed and decide not to retaliate for fear of a vastly more devastating nuclear attack. In the short term, the U.S. will succeed, leaving no Iranian nuclear program, civilian or otherwise. Iran will no longer threaten Israel, a regime change will ensue, and a pro-Western government will emerge. However, even in the best-case scenario, the long-term consequences are dire. The nuclear threshold will have been crossed by a nuclear superpower against a non-nuclear country. Many more countries will rush to get their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. With no taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, they will certainly be used again. Nuclear conflicts will occur within the next 10 to 20 years, and will escalate until much of the world is destroyed. Let us remember that the destructive power of existing nuclear arsenals is approximately [one million times that of the Hiroshima bomb](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/1997/00/00_babst_consequences.htm), enough to erase Earth's population many times over.

### Iran Strikes - XT Romney Attacks Iran

#### Ousting of Obama leads to Iran strikes - causes destabilization of the Middle East, economic collapse, and war

Curiel 11 (Jonathan, staff writer for True Slant, “What just might happen if Obama loses in 2012”, 7/28/10, AD: 12/8/11,http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:AIlWa6eGDQcJ:trueslant.com/jonathancuriel/2010/07/28/what-just-might-happen-if-obama-loses-in-2012/+If+Obama+losses+2012&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a  | Kushal)

 Less than four months from now, the mid-term elections will determine if the Democrats lose control of the Senate and their ability to set the national agenda. The November balloting will also lay the foundation for President Obama’s next two years in office – and his re-election campaign. Any number of scenarios  could undermine Obama in 2012. If (God forbid) a 9/11-style attack hits the United States that summer, or, say, the economy goes into a deep tailspin, then Obama will become the first one-term president since George H.W. Bush. In Obama’s wake, the Republican Piranha who’ve been circling the White House since 2008 (Palin, Romney, et al.) will feast on the Democrats’ political carcass. Here are three scenarios: \*\* President Whitman: After narrowly beating Jerry Brown for the California governorship in 2010, former eBay CEO Meg Whitman gets drafted for the 2012 presidential campaign and reluctantly accepts – then steamrolls her way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Whitman’s appeal – the first woman Republican to head the ticket; her success in Silicon Valley; her (anti-Palinesque) ability to speak coherently about the economy, foreign affairs, and her vision for America – makes her the surprising choice for independents and conservative liberals who helped springboard Obama in 2008. Whitman’s running mate, Newt Gingrich, secures her standing among Conservatives, especially in the South, and – like Joe Biden in 2008 with Obama – he reassures a potentially jittery public that his ticket has the necessary experience. \*\* War in Iran: The Republicans’  ascension marks the return of chickenhawk diplomacy. Instead of the Obama administration’s reasoned approach to Iran, the new administration relies on all-or-nothing antagonism, leading to the third Gulf War in two decades. What ensues are thousands of new military deaths, a dangerously destabilized Middle East, and an oil crisis that shocks Western economies for years. As in Afghanistan and Iraq, the U.S. tries to shepherd in a friendlier government, but now all three countries – connected geographically, religiously and historically – become the world’s leading front for insurgency against the United States. \*\* Hillary Re-Emerges: Free from her role in Team Obama, Hillary Clinton writes her second memoir and takes a teaching position at Columbia University. In both her class and new book, she talks of the irony that her groundbreaking 2008 campaign paved the way for U.S. voters to accept . . . a Meg Whitman presidency. Mulling a run in 2016, Clinton starts a bipartisan think-tank, which launches her into a new phase of political respectability. Eventually, she and Bill get their own CNN talk-show, which becomes the highest-rated political talk show on cable. As for Obama, he walks away with his head held high, his historic presidency less than his supporters wanted but more than his detractors thought possible. For the most part, America survived and thrived under Obama’s watch, but it still wasn’t enough to keep him in high office

#### Romney explicitly has endorsed striking Iran

Romney 12, (Mitt Romney, Presidential Candidate, “How I would check Iran’s nuclear ambition”. 3/5/12 AD. 7/10/12. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/mitt-romney-how-i-would-check-irans-nuclear-ambition/2012/03/05/gIQAneYItR_print.html>|Ashwin)

America and the world face a strikingly similar situation today; only even more is at stake. The same Islamic fanatics who took our diplomats hostage are racing to build a nuclear bomb. Barack Obama, America’s most feckless president since Carter, has declared such an outcome unacceptable, but his rhetoric has not been matched by an effective policy. While Obama frets in the White House, the Iranians are making rapid progress toward obtaining the most destructive weapons in the history of the world.¶ The gravity of this development cannot be overstated. For three decades now, the ayatollahs running Iran have sponsored terrorism around the world. If we’ve learned anything from Sept. 11, 2001, it is that terrorism in the nuclear age holds nightmarish possibilities for horror on a mass scale.¶ What’s more, Iran’s leaders openly call for the annihilation of the state of Israel. Should they acquire the means to carry out this inhuman objective, the Middle East will become a nuclear tinderbox overnight. The perils for Israel, for our other allies and for our own forces in the region will become unthinkable.¶ The United States cannot afford to let Iran acquire nuclear weapons. Yet under Barack Obama, that is the course we are on.¶ As president, I would move America in a different direction.¶ The overall rubric of my foreign policy will be the same as Ronald Reagan’s: namely, “peace through strength.” Like Reagan, I have put forward a comprehensive plan to rebuild American might and equip our soldiers with the weapons they need to prevail in any conflict. By increasing our annual naval shipbuilding rate from nine to 15, I intend to restore our position so that our Navy is an unchallengeable power on the high seas. Just as Reagan sought to defend the United States from Soviet weapons with his Strategic Defense Initiative, I will press forward with ballistic missile defense systems to ensure that Iranian and North Korean missiles cannot threaten us or our allies.¶ As for Iran in particular, I will take every measure necessary to check the evil regime of the ayatollahs. Until Iran ceases its nuclear-bomb program, I will press for ever-tightening sanctions, acting with other countries if we can but alone if we must. I will speak out on behalf of the cause of democracy in Iran and support Iranian dissidents who are fighting for their freedom. I will make clear that America’s commitment to Israel’s security and survival is absolute. I will demonstrate our commitment to the world by making Jerusalem the destination of my first foreign trip.¶ Most important, I will buttress my diplomacy with a military option that will persuade the ayatollahs to abandon their nuclear ambitions. Only when they understand that at the end of that road lies not nuclear weapons but ruin will there be a real chance for a peaceful resolution.¶ My plan includes restoring the regular presence of aircraft carrier groups in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf region simultaneously. It also includes increasing military assistance to Israel and improved coordination with all of our allies in the area.¶ We can’t afford to wait much longer, and we certainly can’t afford to wait through four more years of an Obama administration. By then it will be far too late. If the Iranians are permitted to get the bomb, the consequences will be as uncontrollable as they are horrendous. My foreign policy plan to avert this catastrophe is plain: Either the ayatollahs will get the message, or they will learn some very painful lessons about the meaning of American resolve.

### Iran Strikes - XT Causes War

#### Iran strike would escalate to all-out war- several warrants

Kahl, 1-17-12, Colin H., From February 2009 to December 2011, Prof. Kahl was the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East at the Pentagon. In this capacity, he served as the senior policy advisor to the Secretary of Defense for Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel and the Palestinian territories, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, and six other countries in the Levant and Persian Gulf. He was responsible for strategy development and policy oversight of the responsible drawdown of U.S. forces from Iraq, the Department's efforts to counter Iran's destabilizing activities, security enhancements to support Israeli security and facilitate the Middle East Peace Process, and efforts to build an integrated regional security architecture in the Gulf. In June 2011, he was awarded the Secretary of Defense Medal for Outstanding Public Service by Secretary Robert Gates. From 2000-2004 and 2006-2007, he was an assistant professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. In 2005-2006, Prof. Kahl was a Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellow in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, where he worked on issues related to counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and responses to failed states. In 1997-1998, he was a National Security Fellow at the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University. Associate professor in the Security Studies Program in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, where he teaches courses on international relations, international security, the geopolitics of the Middle East, American foreign policy, and civil and ethnic conflict. Current research projects include a study of the evolution of U.S. counterinsurgency practices in Iraq and a separate study on the emerging U.S. regional security architecture to counter Iran. He has published articles on U.S. policy and military conduct in the Middle East in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, International Security, the Los Angeles Times, Middle East Policy, the National Interest, and the New York Times, and has published several reports for the Center for a New American Security, a Washington-based think tank. He is a regular consultant for the Department of Defense and the Intelligence community. “Not Time to Attack Iran,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show>

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 inter-national 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. 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 success-fully 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. 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 counter-attacks. 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 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. 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.

#### Regional states will escalate the strike

Kahl, 1-17-12, Colin H., From February 2009 to December 2011, Prof. Kahl was the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East at the Pentagon. In this capacity, he served as the senior policy advisor to the Secretary of Defense for Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel and the Palestinian territories, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, and six other countries in the Levant and Persian Gulf. He was responsible for strategy development and policy oversight of the responsible drawdown of U.S. forces from Iraq, the Department's efforts to counter Iran's destabilizing activities, security enhancements to support Israeli security and facilitate the Middle East Peace Process, and efforts to build an integrated regional security architecture in the Gulf. In June 2011, he was awarded the Secretary of Defense Medal for Outstanding Public Service by Secretary Robert Gates. From 2000-2004 and 2006-2007, he was an assistant professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. In 2005-2006, Prof. Kahl was a Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellow in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, where he worked on issues related to counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and responses to failed states. In 1997-1998, he was a National Security Fellow at the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University. Associate professor in the Security Studies Program in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, where he teaches courses on international relations, international security, the geopolitics of the Middle East, American foreign policy, and civil and ethnic conflict. Current research projects include a study of the evolution of U.S. counterinsurgency practices in Iraq and a separate study on the emerging U.S. regional security architecture to counter Iran. He has published articles on U.S. policy and military conduct in the Middle East in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, International Security, the Los Angeles Times, Middle East Policy, the National Interest, and the New York Times, and has published several reports for the Center for a New American Security, a Washington-based think tank. He is a regular consultant for the Department of Defense and the Intelligence community. “Not Time to Attack Iran,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show>

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. 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 - AT: Successful

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

Melman, 7-5-11, Yossi, Haaertz (Israel newspaper), cites Meir Dagan, former Israel Defense Forces officer and former Director of the Mossad, “Former Mossad chief: Israel air strike on Iran 'stupidest thing I have ever heard',” <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/former-mossad-chief-israel-air-strike-on-iran-stupidest-thing-i-have-ever-heard-1.360367>

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

### Iran Strikes - AT: Israel Strike I/E

#### Israel will never strike Iran absent US approval

Uri, 2010, The Palestine Chronicle, “Hold Me Back! – But Will Israel Attack Iran,” April 4, <http://palestinechronicle.com/view\_article\_details.php?id=15863> http://palestinechronicle.com/view\_article\_details.php?id=15863, last accessed 1.21.11

It is dangerous to prophesy in such matters, especially when we are dealing with people not all of whom are wise and not all of whom are sane. Yet I am ready to maintain: **there is no possibility whatsoever** that the governmentof **Israel will** send the air force to **attack Iran.** I am not going to enter into military matters. Is our air force really capable of executing such an operation? Are circumstances similar to those that prevailed 28 years ago, when the Iraqi reactor was successfully destroyed? Is it at all possible for us to eliminate the Iranian nuclear effort, whose installations are dispersed throughout the large country and buried far below the surface? I want to focus on another aspect: is it politically feasible? What would be the consequences? First of all, a basic rule of Israeli reality: the State of **Israel cannot start any large-scale military operation without American consent**. Israel depends on the US in almost every respect, but in no sphere is it more dependent than in the military one. The aircraft that must execute the mission were supplied to us by the US. Their efficacy depends on a steady flow of American spare parts. At that range, refueling from US-built tanker aircraft would be necessary. The same is true for almost all other war material of our army, as well as for the money needed for their acquisition. Everything comes from America. In 1956, Israel went to war without American consent. Ben-Gurion thought that his collusion with the UK and France was enough. He was vastly mistaken. One hundred hours after telling us that the “Third Kingdom of Israel” had come into being, he announced with a broken voice that he was going to evacuate all the territories just conquered. President Dwight Eisenhower, together with his Soviet colleague, had submitted an ultimatum, and that was the end of the adventure. **Since then, Israel has not started a single war without securing the agreement of Washington**. On the eve of the Six-day War, a special emissary was sent to the US to make sure that there was indeed American agreement. When he returned with an affirmative answer, the order for the attack was issued. On the eve of Lebanon War I, Defense Minister Ariel Sharon rushed to Washington to obtain American consent. He met with Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who agreed – but only on condition that there would be a clear provocation. A few days later there just happened to be an attempt on the life of the Israeli ambassador in London, and the war was on. The Israeli army’s offensives against Hezbollah (“Lebanon War II”) and Hamas (“Cast Lead”) were possible because they were cast as part of the American campaign against “Radical Islam”. Ostensibly, that is also true for an attack on Iran. But no. Because an Israeli attack on Iran would cause a military, political and economic disaster for the United States of America. Since the Iranians, too, realize that Israel could not attack without American consent, they would react accordingly. As I have written here before, a cursory glance at the map suffices to indicate what would be the immediate reaction. The narrow Hormuz Strait at the entrance of the Persian (or Arabian) Gulf, through which a huge part of the world’s oil flows, would be sealed at once. The results would shake the international economy, from the US and Europe to China and Japan. Prices would soar to the skies. The countries that had just begun to recover from the world economic crisis would sink to the depths of misery and unemployment, riots and bankruptcies. The Strait could be opened only by a military operation on the ground. The US simply has no troops to spare for this – even if the American public were ready for another war, one much more difficult than even those of Iraq and Afghanistan. It is even doubtful whether the US could help Israel to defend itself against the inevitable counter-stroke by Iranian missiles. T**he Israeli attack on a central Islamic country would unite the entire Islamic world**, including the entire Arab world. The US, which has spent the last few years laboring mightily to form a coalition of “moderate” Arab states (meaning: countries governed by dictators kept by the US) against the “radical” states. This pack would immediately become unstuck. No Arab leader would be able to stand aside while the masses of his people were gathering in tumultuous demonstrations in the squares. All this is clear to any knowledgeable person, and even more so to the American military and civilian leaders. Secretaries, generals and admirals have been sent to Israel to make this clear to our leaders in a language that even kindergarten kids can understand: No! Lo! La! Nyet!

### Iran Strikes - Kills Econ

#### Iran war crushes the economy- greatest and most probable risk of collapse- current sanctions don’t trigger the spikes

Hargreaves, 4-11-12, Steve, CNN, “Iran-fueled oil price spike biggest threat to economy,” <http://money.cnn.com/2012/04/11/news/economy/oil-price-economy/index.htm>

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- An oil price spike caused by a confrontation with Iran is now seen as **the biggest threat to the U.S. economy.** That's according to nine out of 18 economists surveyed recently by CNNMoney. They say rising oil prices now outweigh the risks posed by the European debt crisis, ongoing gridlock over the budget in Washington and fears of a slowdown in China. "An Iranian disruption of oil supplies could send oil prices to $200 a barrel," said Lynn Reaser, chief economist at the Fermanian Business & Economic Institute. "It's something we're really concerned about," said Chris Lafakis, an economist at Moody's Analytics. "A military confrontation could push prices to $180 a barrel, which would precipitate a *recession*." The economy, it appears, can handle oil around $100 a barrel and gas prices near $4 a gallon. While these prices are relatively high, consumer spending continues to rise. President Obama seems keenly aware of this, and has been working to strike the right balance in sanctioning Iran over its nuclear program. The sanctions, phased in gradually, are designed to crimp Iran's oil industry just enough to get the country to the negotiating table, but not so much that they cause oil prices to spike or trigger an armed conflict. So far it appears to be working. Iran recently agreed to new talks, although whether they will be successful in getting the country to curtail its nuclear program is an open question. Iran says its nuclear ambitions are for peaceful purposes, although many suspect they are intended to produce a bomb. To be clear, most economists don't think a confrontation with Iran and the resulting oil price spike is likely. They just think it's more likely than the other scenarios. "Out of all the things that could derail the economy, **that has the highest probability** of actually occurring," said Lafakis. By comparison, only five economists in the CNNMoney poll cited the a meltdown in financial markets due to sovereign debt crisis in Europe as the biggest risk to the U.S. economy.

#### US-Iran War causes Economic Recession, disaster for U.S. Economy

Yglesias 2012, (Matthew Yglesias, Slate Politics, “War for No Oil 3/7/12 AD. 7/10/12. <http://www.slate.com/articles/business/moneybox/2012/03/oil_speculators_are_right_a_war_with_iran_would_devastate_the_economy_.html>|Ashwin)

Under the circumstances, it’s ironic that the Obama administration is often attacked politically for its alleged softness on Iran. In the grand scheme of things, if the Iranian nuclear program really is a dire threat to American security, maybe something as petty as the fate of the economy doesn’t matter. But make no mistake, a war with Iran would have enormous consequences on the global price of oil, and it’s perfectly reasonable for speculators to take to the futures markets to try to bet on it.¶ How big of an impact on oil prices are we talking about? In January, UC-San Diego energy economist James Hamilton looked at four previous supply disruptions: the 1973 OPEC embargo, the Iranian Revolution of 1978, the 1980 Iran-Iraq War, and the 1990 Persian Gulf War. Hamilton found that at peak “these events took out 4-7 percent of net world productions and were associated with oil price increases of 25-70 percent” Iran, in case you were wondering, is currently responsible for 4.9 percent of world oil production.¶ So that’s big. Of course, an American or Israeli bombing of Iranian nuclear facilities wouldn’t mean that all of Iran’s oil would come off world markets. But then again, it might. This hard-to-assess probability is catnip for speculators. While it’s completely plausible to suggest that speculation is a factor in driving current prices, the speculators here are clearly the symptom, not the cause. This is what happens when there’s underlying uncertainty about whether or not 4.9 percent of global oil production is going to vanish.¶ But it gets worse.¶ Off the coast of Iran is the 21-mile-wide Strait of Hormuz between the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman. About 20 percent of the world’s total global production—oil from Kuwait, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia—passes through the strait on a daily basis and could easily be disrupted by a war with Iran. If the Strait of Hormuz gets attacked by missile fire or irregular naval warfare, the effect on global oil prices would be apocalyptic.¶ I’m generally sanguine about the trend toward higher oil prices, but this kind of supply shock would be disastrous for the world economy. The fundamental issue is that the short-term price elasticity is low. Over the long term, people react to changes in gasoline prices by purchasing more fuel-efficient vehicles or by living someplace where they drive less. But the existing stock of cars gets replaced on a slow schedule and the existing stock of buildings on an even slower one. So in the short term, people’s natural inclination is to respond to a small increase in the price of gasoline by consuming roughly the same amount of gas and cutting back on other things. It’s simpler to save money by switching from beef to chicken than to reduce fuel consumption. But when prices rise because of a disruption in supply, consumption has to fall. There simply isn’t enough oil to go around.¶ That means enormous price spikes. These work in two ways. One is that a sufficiently drastic shift in prices will lead people to undertake disruptive changes in their personal behavior. The other is that unemployment is a major fuel economizer. When households cut back on restaurant meals because all their income is going to gasoline, waitresses get laid off. When you don’t have a job, suddenly you’re not commuting, and energy consumption falls. Similarly, a collapse in factory orders means fewer and lighter trucks are on the road delivering goods. A severe recession and a major decline in the per capita level of economic activity, in other words, is the only way for the world economy to adapt to a sudden reduction in fuel quantity.¶ These are probabilities worth speculating over. It’s true that, absent speculation, the mere possibility of a future war wouldn’t cause oil prices to fluctuate wildly. But blaming speculators rather than the underlying geopolitics is a perverse form of shooting the messenger. The moral for politicians ought to be that in addition to the major national-security issues, the ongoing confrontation with Iran has important economic implications. As the speculators are telling us, disruptions in the availability of Iranian oil to world markets would be costly for the American economy, and broader disruptions in the Persian Gulf would be disastrous.

### Warming Scenario (1NC)

#### Obama is key to solve climate – the impact is extinction.

Buffalo News, “Stakes are high in race for president,” 4/22/2012, http://www.buffalonews.com/editorial-page/viewpoints/article822432.ece

Despite what you hear from Fox News, Rush Limbaugh and other fossil- fuel industry apologists, climate change is real, already occurring and principally caused by human activity —releasing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere by burning coal, oil and natural gas and, to a lesser extent, by destroying forests. **If we don’t act soon, we’ll be cooked** — figuratively and literally. Our current “business as usual” trajectory is leading to a hostile and unsustainable world. The Earth’s surface temperature could be an average 10 degrees warmer by the end of the century. We can spare our children and grandchildren this hellish hothouse future by rapidly shifting from fossil fuels to clean, renewable energy resources like wind, solar, biomass and geothermal — coupled with much greater energy conservation and efficiency. This is not a hoax, a conspiracy or mere speculation. These conclusions are scientifically established and endorsed by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, representing thousands of scientists in 195 countries; U.S. Academy of Sciences and academies in more than 30 other countries; American Association for the Advancement of Science; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and American Meteorological Society. In fact, **virtually every scientific organization with credible climate expertise** acknowledges the reality of human- caused climate change and the need to quickly transition away from fossil fuels. Many other experts have concluded that the costs of addressing climate change would be far less than those associated with coping with its devastating aftermath. Furthermore, a serious effort would significantly reduce respiratory illness and provide a bonanza of green jobs. Imagine the jobs created by super-insulating and solarizing every house in Western New York! While Obama’s environmental record is not perfect, he is committed to environmental progress. He understands and respects the international scientific consensus on climate change and the increasingly urgent calls for action from expert scientists. A look at Obama’s record The positive impact of a generally pro-environment Obama presidency is evident in Western New York. EPA Region 2 Administrator Judith Enck has strongly supported local efforts, led by the Clean Air Coalition of Western New York, to curtail toxic industrial pollution from Tonawanda Coke. Nationally, the Obama administration has: • Incorporated clean energy projects into “stimulus” spending. • Helped double renewable energy production. • Established EPA greenhouse gas emissions reduction rules for large stationery sources, vehicles and new power plants. • Raised fuel economy standards to 54.5 mpg by 2025. • Reduced water pollution in the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay and elsewhere. • Set strict rules against mercury and other toxic emissions from coal-fired power plants. • Restricted new mountaintop removal coal mining. • Reinstated the Roadless Area Rule protecting 58.5 million acres of wilderness. • Sought to end $4 billion in annual taxpayer subsidies to the oil industry. These and other actions constitute a solid record of environmental achievement. But his record is not without disappointments. Obama’s handling of the 2010 BP oil spill received mixed grades. The Sierra Club praised Obama’s mercury rule and fuel economy achievements, but wished for more. Grass-roots groups want more protection for endangered species. Greenpeace called Obama’s environmental performance “mediocre at best.” And highly respected physicist and climate blogger Joe Romm (thinkprogress.org/romm) gave Obama an “F” grade because he hasn’t done enough to address the climate emergency. The Obama administration’s “all of the above” energy policy fails to consistently address environmental concerns. In the aftermath of the largest oil spill in U.S. history, Obama accelerated oil and gas drilling — even allowing Shell to drill in the Arctic Ocean where spills can’t be cleaned up. The administration announced new EPA rules that will prevent most new U.S. coal plant construction, yet opened vast new areas of Wyoming to coal mining. Then there’s the Keystone XL pipeline. After 8,000 people were arrested in front of the White House last fall protesting the pipeline, Obama won environmental praise for postponing the decision on it until 2013. But last month, during all-time record-breaking March temperatures, he approved the pipeline’s southern portion. In further irony, he made the announcement in Cushing, Okla., the site of recent severe drought, tornadoes, ice storms and wildfires. Climate protection failure However, Obama’s greatest environmental lapse was his failure to provide adequate leadership and support for national climate protection legislation in 2009. The result was a disastrously compromised House bill that no one liked and that could not pass the Senate. As a result, the United States still doesn’t have a comprehensive and coherent climate action policy. Defeats like this are inevitable unless the American public is better educated, false propaganda is countered and political will is instilled. But Obama’s bully pulpit was MIA. Writing in Rolling Stone magazine, Nobel Prizewinner and former Vice President Al Gore faulted Obama for never having “presented to the American people the magnitude of the climate crisis. He has simply not made the case for action.” In the president’s defense, one could say he was busy dealing with an inherited severe recession and two wars not of his making. Moreover, he was thwarted by coal-state Democrats and a climate change-denying, filibuster- wielding Republican Party singularly bent on denying Obama a second term. These are mitigating circumstances, but they don’t excuse. Scientists say we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions between 80 percent and 90 percent by 2050 to avoid runaway catastrophic climate change. Enacting laws to accomplish that will now be even more difficult because of the Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision, which opened the floodgates of corporate money into politics. Let’s not reverse progress While Obama has not yet delivered on some environmental priorities, his environmental record is solid in many areas. He appears to be committed to addressing environmental problems in a meaningful way within the constraints of what he views as politically possible. **Obama’s re-election offers the promise of continuing his pro-environment programs and the hope he will do more in his second term**. Cleaner air, water and energy mean tens of thousands of green jobs with improved public health outcomes that reduce health care costs. The president understands this win-win. Additionally, Obama is likely to do more on climate change in a second term if re-elected with a Democratic Congress and an increasingly informed public demanding action on this life-and-death issue.

### Warming - XT Obama Solves

#### Obama win is key to environmental protection and solving climate change

Matthews 11 Chris Matthews American news anchor and political commentator 'Hardball with Chris Matthews' for Monday, OCtober 3rd, 2011, 7 pm show www.msnbc.msn.com/id/44772720/ns/msnbc\_tv-hardball\_with\_chris\_matthews/t/hardball-chris-matthews-monday-october-rd-pm-show/#.TvZrldR8Dgc

Think of the stakes. If he gets it right, and the Democrats get four more years to get the economy finally back on track with full employment again the norm, the country heading forward to greener pastures and bluer skies, continuing the long, good march toward a cleaner environment, a protected climate, a more human, more tolerant, fully employed society.

If he blows it, the Tea Partiers and neocons come roaring back into Washington, emptying out the Heritage Foundation and American Enterprise Institute, erecting statues to Dick Cheney, celebrating the death penalty, elevating torture, ending environmental protection as we know it, breaking unions, punishing gays, starting more wars, enacting one more giant tax cut for the rich -- or worse.

#### Obama win key to cap and trade

Politico 11 <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 reelection is critical to a global climate deal

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

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

#### It's his top priority

IBD 6/12 Investor Business Daily. "Obama’s Hope ... And Climate Change," 2012, http://news.investors.com/article/614608/201206121844/obama-makes-climate-change-his-top-priority-for-his-second-term.htm

'Obama has an ambitious second-term agenda," wrote Ryan Lizza in this week's New Yorker. "The President has said that the most important policy he could address in his second term is climate change," supposedly to "improve the world."

### Warming - XT Causes Extinction

#### Warming is real and anthropogenic - extinction

Flournoy, PhD and MA from the University of Texas, Former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, Former Associate Dean @ State University of New York and Case Institute of Technology, Project Manager for University/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, Currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications @ Ohio University, 12 (Don, "Solar Power Satellites," January, Springer Briefs in Space Development, Book, EMM)

In the Online Journal of Space Communication , Dr. Feng Hsu, a NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth, writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010 ) . Hsu and his NASA colleagues were engaged in monitoring and analyzing climate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have no doubt global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and (b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do nothing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010 ) . As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confidence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction of human species, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010 ) . It was this NASA scientist’s conclusion that humankind must now embark on the next era of “sustainable energy consumption and re-supply, the most obvious source of which is the mighty energy resource of our Sun” (Hsu 2010 ) (Fig . 2.1 ).

### Warming - XT Real/Anthropogenic

#### The most recent scientific evidence and consensus conclude warming is real and anthropogenic

Somerville, Professor of Oceanography @ UC San Diego, 11 (Richard, Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor @ Scripps Institution of Oceanography @ UC San Diego, Coordinating Lead Author in Working Group I @ the 2007 Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations,” CQ Congressional Testimony, 3/8, Lexis)

In early 2007, at the time of the publication of WG1 of AR4, the mainstream global community of climate scientists already understood from the most recent research that the latest observations of climate change were disquieting. In the words of a research paper published at the same time as the release of AR4 WG1, a paper for which I am a co-author, "observational data underscore the concerns about global climate change. Previous projections, as summarized by IPCC, have not exaggerated but may in some respects even have underestimated the change" (Rahmstorf et al. 2007). Now, in 2011, more recent research and newer observations have demonstrated that climate change continues to occur, and in several aspects the magnitude and rapidity of observed changes frequently exceed the estimates of earlier projections, including those of AR4. In addition, the case for attributing much observed recent climate change to human activities is even stronger now than at the time of AR4. Several recent examples, drawn from many aspects of climate science, but especially emphasizing atmospheric phenomena, support this conclusion. These include temperature, atmospheric moisture content, precipitation, and other aspects of the hydrological cycle. Motivated by the rapid progress in research, a recent scientific synthesis, The Copenhagen Diagnosis (Allison et al. 2009), has assessed recent climate research findings, including: -- Measurements show that the Greenland and Antarctic ice-sheets are losing mass and contributing to sea level rise. -- Arctic sea-ice has melted far beyond the expectations of climate models. -- Global sea level rise may attain or exceed 1 meter by 2100, with a rise of up to 2 meters considered possible. -- In 2008, global carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels were about 40% higher than those in 1990. -- At today's global emissions rates, if these rates were to be sustained unchanged, after only about 20 more years, the world will no longer have a reasonable chance of limiting warming to less than 2 degrees Celsius, or 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, above 19th-century pre-industrial temperature levels, This is a much- discussed goal for a maximum allowable degree of climate change, and this aspirational target has now been formally adopted by the European Union and is supported by many other countries, as expressed, for example, in statements by both the G-8 and G-20 groups of nations. The Copenhagen Diagnosis also cites research supporting the position that, in order to have a reasonable likelihood of avoiding the risk of dangerous climate disruption, defined by this 2 degree Celsius (or 3.6 degree Fahrenheit) limit, global emissions of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide must peak and then start to decline rapidly within the next five to ten years, reaching near zero well within this century.

#### There's near unanimous believe in climate change among qualified scientists

Rice 10, (Doyle Rice, USA Today, “Report: 97 percent of scientists say man-made climate change is real”. 6/22/10 AD. 7/11/12. http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/06/scientists-overwhelmingly-believe-in-man-made-climate-change/1|Ashwin)

Forget the four out of five dentists who recommend Trident…. Try the 97 out of 100 scientists that believe in man-made climate change.¶ This data comes from a new survey out this week in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.¶ The study found that 97 percent of scientific experts agree that climate change is "very likely" caused mainly by human activity.¶ The report is based on questions posed to 1,372 scientists. Nearly all the experts agreed that it is "very likely that anthropogenic greenhouse gases have been responsible for most of the unequivocal warming of the Earth's average global temperature in the second half of the twentieth century."¶ As for the 3 percent of scientists who remain unconvinced, the study found their average expertise is far below that of their colleagues, as measured by publication and citation rates.¶ In the study, the authors wrote: "This extensive analysis of the mainstream versus skeptical/contrarian researchers suggests a strong role for considering expert credibility in the relative weight of and attention to these groups of researchers in future discussions in media, policy, and public forums regarding anthropogenic climate change."¶ The study authors were William R.L. Anderegg, James W. Prall, Jacob Harold and Stephen H. Schneider.¶ The report comes as the Earth continues to sizzle in 2010. So far, through May, 2010 is the warmest year ever recorded, according to the National Climatic Data Center.

#### Our evidence represents scientific consensus

Alley, Professor of Geoscience @ Penn State, 10 (Richard, Authored Over 200 Refereed Scientific Papers, “CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE; COMMITTEE: HOUSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY; SUBCOMMITTEE: ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT,” CQ Congressional Testimony, 11/17, Lexis)

Background on Climate Change and Global Warming. Scientific assessments such as those of the [NAS] National Academy of Sciences of the United States (e.g., National Research Council, 1975; 1979; 2001; 2006; 2008; 2010a; 2010b), the U.S. [CCSP] Climate Change Science Program, and the [IPCC] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have for decades consistently found with increasingly high scientific confidence that human activities are raising the concentration of CO2 and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, that this has a warming effect on the climate, that the climate is warming as expected, and that the changes so far are small compared to those projected if humans burn much of the fossil fuel on the planet**.** The basis for expecting and understanding warming from CO2 is the fundamental physics of how energy interacts with gases in the atmosphere. This knowledge has been available for over a century, was greatly refined by military research after World War II, and is directly confirmed by satellite measurements and other data (e.g., American Institute of Physics, 2008; Harries et al., 2001; Griggs and Harries, 2007). Although a great range of ideas can be found in scientific papers and in statements by individual scientists, the scientific assessments by bodies such as the National Academy of Sciences consider the full range of available information. The major results brought forward are based on multiple lines of evidence provided by different research groups with different funding sources, and have repeatedly been tested and confirmed. Removing the work of any scientist or small group of scientists would still leave a strong scientific basis for the main conclusions.

### Russia Relations Scenario (1NC)

#### Romney kills US-Russia relations

Larison 6/27 (Daniel Larison, contributing editor at The American Conservative and writes a column for The Weekonline, Ph.D. graduate from the University of Chicago, “U.S.-Russian Relations Would Get Much Worse Under Romney”, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/u-s-russian-relations-would-get-much-worse-under-romney/>, 6/27/12, Bhattacharyya)

Putin might share some of that same distrust of liberal partners and be more apt to deal with a hard-line conservative in the White House. Yet, there would almost certainly be tradeoffs. A conservative president would likely engage in more assertive policies toward Moscow. A more active U.S. policy toward the Middle East, the South Caucasus, or Central Europe would risk clashing more openly with Russia’s positions. Why would Putin want this, given the fragility of Russian power today? Threats have been a key driver of Russian power politics throughout the history of the Empire. Putin’s calculations could take many forms. A more active U.S. policy on disputed issues might demonstrate not only American power but also reveal American weaknesses. A more assertive U.S. presence in the spheres of Russian interest might also provoke more active opposition by China, and Russia may benefit from greater competition between Beijing and Washington. Or Putin might prefer an immediate, open rivalry with what he perceives to be a weakened United States across a range of issues. The easier (and more accurate) answer is that Putin doesn’t actually want a “hard-line conservative in the White House.” Putin distrusts the U.S. because he believes that the Bush administration behaved in an ungrateful and untrustworthy fashion in the previous decade, and U.S.-Russian relations improved as much as they did because the current administration seemed to be more reliable. U.S.-Russian relations reached their lowest point in the last twenty years in no small part because of a “more active U.S. policy” toward the Middle East, the South Caucasus, and central Europe. Putin might be willing to deal with a more hard-line American President, but only so long as it this translated into tangible gains for Russia. Provided that the hard-liner was willing to live up to his end of the bargain, there could be some room for agreement, but there isn’t any. Since Romney’s Russia policy is essentially to never make any deals with the current Russian government, Putin doesn’t have much of an incentive to cooperate. That will guarantee that U.S.-Russian relations will deteriorate much more than they have in the last year.

#### Extinction

Allison 11 (Graham, 10/30, Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

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

### Russia Relations - XT Romney Kills Russia Relats

#### Romney's empirically hostile to Russia - makes relations impossible

Oppel 5/11 (RICHARD A. OPPEL Jr, staff writer at the New York Times“Romney’s Adversarial View of Russia Stirs Debate”, May 11, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/12/us/politics/romneys-view-of-russia-sparks-debate.html?\_r=1&pagewanted=all)

WASHINGTON — Mitt Romney’s recent declaration that Russia is America’s top geopolitical adversary drew raised eyebrows and worse from many Democrats, some Republicans and the Russians themselves, all of whom suggested that Mr. Romney was misguidedly stuck in a cold war mind-set. But his statement was not off the cuff — and it was not the first time Mr. Romney had stirred debate over his hawkish views on Russia. Interviews with Republican foreign policy experts close to his campaign and his writings on the subject show that his stance toward Russia reflects a broader foreign policy view that gives great weight to economic power and control of natural resources. It also exhibits Mr. Romney’s confidence that his private-sector experience would make him a better negotiator on national security issues than President Obama has been. Mr. Romney’s views on Russia have set off disagreements among some of his foreign policy advisers. They put him in sync with the more conservative members of his party in Congress, who have similarly criticized Mr. Obama as being too accommodating to Russia, and generally reflect the posture of some neoconservatives. But they have frequently put him at odds with members of the Republican foreign policy establishment, like Senator Richard G. Lugar of Indiana, who was defeated in a primary this week, and the party’s shrinking band of foreign policy “realists” — those who advocate a less ideological and more pragmatic view of relations with rival powers. The Romney campaign has been critical of Mr. Obama’s record and positions on a variety of national security issues, including containing Iran’s nuclear ambitions and confronting China’s rise. But many of the positions taken by Mr. Romney, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, have either been vague or not fundamentally different from those of the administration. Russia, however, is an exception, one where Mr. Romney, the former Massachusetts governor, has carved out a clear contrast to Mr. Obama, who came to office promising to “reset” relations with Moscow, only to find that Russia can be a difficult partner. Just this week, President Vladimir V. Putin abruptly canceled his plans to visit the United States next week for the Group of 8 summit meeting and for talks with Mr. Obama at Camp David. Mr. Romney was a leading opponent of the most recent arms-reduction treaty with Russia, ratified by the Senate and signed last year by Mr. Obama. Russia figures prominently in Mr. Romney’s book, where he calls it one of four competitors for world leadership, along with the United States, China and “violent jihadism” embraced by Iran and terrorist groups. Some advisers close to Mr. Romney, who declined to be quoted or identified by name, say Russia is a good illustration of his belief that national security threats are closely tied to economic power — in this case stemming from Russia’s oil and gas reserves, which it has used to muscle European countries dependent on energy imports.

### Russia Relations - US/Russia War Outweighs

#### US/Russia war outweighs on magnitude, probability, and timeframe

Helfand and Pastore 9 | Presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility (Ira and John, MD's and Past Presidents of the Physicians for Social Responsbility, "US-Russia nuclear war still a threat," 3/31)

Since the end of the Cold War, many have acted as though the danger of nuclear war has ended. It has not. There remain in the world more than 20,000 nuclear weapons. Alarmingly, more than 2,000 of these weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals remain on ready-alert status, commonly known as hair-trigger alert. They can be fired within five minutes and reach targets in the other country 30 minutes later. Just one of these weapons can destroy a city. A war involving a substantial number would cause devastation on a scale unprecedented in human history. A study conducted by Physicians for Social Responsibility in 2002 showed that if only 500 of the Russian weapons on high alert exploded over our cities, 100 million Americans would die in the first 30 minutes. An attack of this magnitude also would destroy the entire economic, communications and transportation infrastructure on which we all depend. Those who survived the initial attack would inhabit a nightmare landscape with huge swaths of the country blanketed with radioactive fallout and epidemic diseases rampant. They would have no food, no fuel, no electricity, no medicine, and certainly no organized health care. In the following months it is likely the vast majority of the U.S. population would die. Recent studies by the eminent climatologists Toon and Robock have shown that such a war would have a huge and immediate impact on climate world wide. If all of the warheads in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals were drawn into the conflict, the firestorms they caused would loft 180 million tons of soot and debris into the upper atmosphere — blotting out the sun. Temperatures across the globe would fall an average of 18 degrees Fahrenheit to levels not seen on earth since the depth of the last ice age, 18,000 years ago. Agriculture would stop, eco-systems would collapse, and many species, including perhaps our own, would become extinct. It is common to discuss nuclear war as a low-probabillity event. But is this true? We know of five occcasions during the last 30 years when either the U.S. or Russia believed it was under attack and prepared a counter-attack. The most recent of these near misses occurred after the end of the Cold War on Jan. 25, 1995, when the Russians mistook a U.S. weather rocket launched from Norway for a possible attack. Jan. 25, 1995, was an ordinary day with no major crisis involving the U.S. and Russia. But, unknown to almost every inhabitant on the planet, a misunderstanding led to the potential for a nuclear war. The ready alert status of nuclear weapons that existed in 1995 remains in place today. The nuclear danger will not pass until the U.S. and Russia lead the other nuclear states to a Nuclear Weapons Convention that seeks to abolish these weapons forever. As a critical first step the U.S. and Russia must take their weapons off ready-alert status. Presidents Obama and Medvedev can do this on their own by executive order.

### Russia Relations - Solves Laundrylist

#### Relations solve: proliferation, terrorism, economy, energy security, hegemony, Iran prolif, Afghanistan

Commission on US Policy Toward Russia 9 (US Senate, “THE RIGHT DIRECTION FOR U.S. POLICY TOWARD RUSSIA,” March)

Securing America’s vital national interests in the complex, interconnected, and interdependent world of the twenty-first century requires deep and meaningful cooperation with other governments. The challenges—stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, defeating terrorist networks, rebuilding the global economy, and ensuring energy security for the United States and others—are enormous. And few nations could make more of a difference to our success than Russia, with its vast arsenal of nuclear weapons, its strategic location spanning Europe and Asia, its considerable energy resources, and its status as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. Rapid and effective action to strengthen U.S.-Russian relations is critically important to advancing U.S. national interests An American commitment to improving U.S.-Russian relations is neither a reward to be offered for good international behavior by Moscow nor an endorsement of the Russian government’s domestic conduct. Rather, it is an acknowledgement of the importance of Russian cooperation in achieving essential American goals, whether preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, dismantling al- Qaeda and stabilizing Afghanistan, or guaranteeing security and prosperity in Europe. Success in creating a new and cooperative relationship with Russia can contribute to each of these objectives and many others. Failure could impose significant costs.

#### Relations solve: hegemony, Afghanistan, Central Asia, warming, terrorism, Iran, Korea, proliferation, economy, nuclear war

Rojansky and Collins 10 (Matthew, Deputy Director @ Russia and Eurasia Program @ Carnegie, and James, Director @ Russia and Eurasia Program @ Carnegie, “Why Russia Matters,” 8/18, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=41409>, EMM)

A year and a half after Barack Obama hit the "reset" button with Russia, the reconciliation is still fragile, incomplete, and politically divisive. Sure, Russia is no easy ally for the United States. Authoritarian yet insecure, economically mighty yet technologically backward, the country has proven a challenge for U.S. presidents since the end of the Cold War. Recent news hasn't helped: The arrest in July of a former deputy prime minister and leader of the Solidarity opposition movement, Boris Nemtsov, provoked some of the harshest criticism of Russia yet from the Obama administration. Then last Wednesday, Russia announced that it had moved anti-aircraft missiles into Abkhazia, the region that broke off from Georgia during the August 2008 war. The announcement was hardly welcome news for the United States, which has tried to defuse tensions there for the last 24 months. Yet however challenging this partnership may be, Washington can't afford not to work with Moscow. Ronald Reagan popularized the phrase, "Trust, but verify" -- a good guiding principle for Cold War arms negotiators, and still apt for today. Engagement is the only way forward. Here are 10 reasons why: 1. Russia's nukes are still an existential threat. Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons in stockpile and hundreds still on hair-trigger alert aimed at U.S. cities. This threat will not go away on its own; cutting down the arsenal will require direct, bilateral arms control talks between Russia and the United States. New START, the strategic nuclear weapons treaty now up for debate in the Senate, is the latest in a long line of bilateral arms control agreements between the countries dating back to the height of the Cold War. To this day, it remains the only mechanism granting U.S. inspectors access to secret Russian nuclear sites. The original START agreement was essential for reining in the runaway Cold War nuclear buildup, and New START promises to cut deployed strategic arsenals by a further 30 percent from a current limit of 2,200 to 1,550 on each side. Even more, President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, have agreed to a long-term goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. But they can only do that by working together. 2. Russia is a swing vote on the international stage. As one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, Moscow holds veto power over any resolution that the body might seek to pass -- including recent efforts to levy tougher sanctions on Iran or, in 2009, against North Korea following that country's second nuclear test. Russian support for such resolutions can also help persuade China and others not to block them. The post-reset relationship between Moscow and Washington works like a force multiplier for U.S. diplomacy. Russia plays an equally crucial role in the G-8 and G-20 economic groups, helping to formulate a coordinated approach in response to economic threats. In 2008, for example, Russia supported a G-20 resolution promising to refrain from protectionism and avoid new barriers to investment or trade. 3. Russia is big. The country's borders span across Europe, Central and East Asia, and the Arctic -- all regions where the United States has important interests and where it cannot afford destructive competition. With an ongoing counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan, the United States has a strong interest in Central Asian stability and relies on Russia not only for direct assistance with logistics and information sharing, but [and] to help manage threats like the recent political upheaval and sectarian violence in Kyrgyzstan. In the former Soviet space, Moscow's historical ties to newly independent states are still fresh and powerful. Moscow is the linchpin to resolving "frozen conflicts" that prevent countries like Moldova, Georgia, and Azerbaijan from prospering economically and moving toward European Union membership. Recently, for example, Moscow signaled renewed interest in resolving frozen conflicts in Nagorno-Karabakh and Transnistria. And despite recent troop movements into Abkhazia, a negotiated settlement is still very possible, one that returns some territory to Georgia but preserves its autonomous status, along with that of its fellow breakaway republic, South Ossetia. 4. Russia's environment matters. As the catastrophic fires across Western Russia have dramatically illustrated, Russia is both a victim of global climate change and a steward of natural resources -- including many of the forests now badly burned -- needed to reverse the global warming trend. With more than one-tenth of the world's total landmass, vast freshwater and ocean resources, plus deposits of nearly every element on the periodic table, Russia is an indispensable partner in the responsible stewardship of the global environment. On climate change, there is work to be done, but progress is evident. Russia today is the world's fourth-largest carbon emitter, but as a signatory to the Copenhagen Accord, it has pledged to reduce emissions to 20 to 25 percent below 1990 levels. Another black spot is Russia's use of "flaring" -- a technique that burns natural gas into the open atmosphere during oil extraction, but Medvedev agreed to capture 95 percent of the gas currently released through flaring. Last year he also signed Russia's first law on energy efficiency, which takes such steps as requiring goods to be marked according to their energy efficiency and banning incandescent light bulbs after 2014. True, most of Russia's other commitments are short on deadlines and concrete deliverables. But like China's cleanup for the Beijing Olympics, Moscow could transform resolve into reality with surprising speed, given the right amount of international engagement. And in the meantime, Russia's natural climate-cleaning properties are vast; the Siberian provinces alone contain more clean oxygen-producing forests and reserves of freshwater than continental Europe. 5. Russia is rich. As the "R" in the famous BRIC grouping of emerging economies, Russia is the 12th-largest market in world, with the third-largest foreign currency reserves. And the country's role in world markets is only growing. Russia is a big player in commodity trading, the country boasts a volatile but increasingly attractive stock exchange, and it is open to foreign investment -- even in state-owned industries. Russian businesses are increasingly looking abroad to form strategic partnerships, acquire assets, and sell their products. And as a country that felt the global financial crisis viscerally -- economic growth fell by almost 8 percent in 2009 -- Russia has a strong interest in making sure there is no repeat. Despite occasional retrenchments, such as the ban on grain exports after the summer fires, Russia is committed to becoming a free-trading World Trade Organization member, and wants more access to U.S. and European technology and management know-how to drive its modernization. Excessive bureaucracy and widespread corruption are the biggest challenges to Russia's further economic growth, but these are already top talking points in Medvedev's modernization drive, and engagement with more transparent Western countries such as the United States can only help. 6. One word: energy. The American way of life depends on stable and predictable commodity prices -- gasoline, natural gas, and coal in particular -- and Russia plays a large role in the global production and pricing of these fossil fuels. Russia alone possesses roughly one-quarter of the world's known gas reserves, and it is currently responsible for over a fifth of global exports. It is the second largest oil-producing state after Saudi Arabia and has the second-largest coal reserves after the United States. The even better news for Washington is that Russia is not a member of OPEC, the cartel of oil-producing countries. This gives the country far more freedom to focus on increasing exports rather than reducing them to keep prices down. When it comes to bringing supply to market, many will no doubt remember the so-called gas wars between Russia and Ukraine and Russia and Belarus that left Eastern Europe in the cold several times in recent years. Much of the trouble is attributable to the legacy of Soviet energy infrastructure in Russia's western neighbors, which put a choke-hold on Russia's gas pipelines. Moscow is currently working with the United States, China, and Western Europe to find a way around this problem, which will entail building new pipelines through the Baltic Sea, Black Sea and Siberia. 7. Russia is a staunch ally in the war on terror (and other scourges). Even during the dark days after the 2008 Russia-Georgia war, Moscow and Washington cooperated effectively on counterterrorism, counternarcotics, infectious disease prevention and response, and other shared security priorities. Recently, the two have worked together under the auspices of the Bilateral Presidential Commission to coordinate relief strategies for catastrophes such as the Haiti earthquake and the violence in Kyrgyzstan. Both Washington and Moscow recognize that swift, well-organized responses to such crises are key to preventing weaknesses from being exploited -- for example by extremist groups who are happy to fill the vacuum of government authority. Russia is also a critical partner in U.S. law enforcement efforts to defeat organized crime and terrorism financing. The two countries are currently working to map smuggling routes in Central Asia. And Russia has shared information with the United States on the informal financial networks used to fund Taliban and Afghan warlords. 8. The roads to Tehran and Pyongyang go through Moscow. Russia maintains unique relationships with Iran and North Korea -- both top concerns on Washington's nuclear nonproliferation radar. In the past, the Kremlin has used its leverage to keep the path open for negotiations, sending senior diplomats to Tehran and offering carrots such as civilian nuclear assistance and weapons sales (though it has deferred the sale of advanced S-300 ground-to-air missiles that could be used to blunt a U.S. or Israeli air strike). Now more than ever, Washington needs allies with that kind of leverage to help punish violators and discourage cascading nuclear proliferation worldwide. Leading by example on nonproliferation is also a must; as the world's biggest nuclear powers, the United States and Russia are looked to as the standard-setters. If they fail to ratify their latest modest step forward on bilateral nuclear arms control, it will be difficult to push other countries to take similar counter-proliferation measures. 9. Russia can be a peacemaker. Moscow has the potential to play a role in the settlement of key regional conflicts -- or if it chooses, to obstruct progress. Russia is a member of the Middle East "Quartet," the six-party talks dealing with North Korean denuclearization, and each of the working groups addressing conflicts in the post-Soviet space, such as the OSCE Minsk group on Nagorno-Karabakh, and the 5+2 group on Transnistria. In such post-Soviet regions in particular, Russia has a unique capacity to contribute to peaceful resolution of territorial disputes by facilitating trade and economic engagement with and between former adversaries, and acting as a peacekeeper once a final settlement is reached. In the Middle East, Russia still controls a network of commercial and intelligence assets and has substantial influence with the Syrians, who should be pushed to play a more productive role in the Arab-Israeli peace process. 10. Russians buy U.S. goods. As the U.S. economy stops and starts its way out of recession, most everyone agrees that boosting exports is a key component in the recovery. And Russia is a big market. U.S. companies such as Boeing, International Paper, and John Deere have invested billions in Russian subsidiaries and joint ventures. In all, there are more than 1,000 U.S. companies doing business there today. They are in Russia not only to take advantage of the country's vast natural resources and highly skilled workers but also to meet the demand for American-branded goods. The Russian middle class wants consumer goods and the country's firms increasingly seek advanced U.S. equipment and machinery. Between 2004 and 2008, before the financial crisis hit, U.S.-Russia trade grew by more than 100 percent to over $36 billion annually, and although that figure dropped by a third in 2009, there is potential for an even better, more balanced trade relationship in the coming decade. In short, Russia is indispensible. As long as the United States participates in the global economy and has interests beyond its own borders, it will have no choice but to maintain relations with Russia. And good relations would be even better.

### Russia Relations - AT: No Accidental War

#### The threat of accidental nuclear war is still high - relations are key to solve

Rojansky and Collins 10 (Matthew, Deputy Director @ Russia and Eurasia Program @ Carnegie, and James, Director @ Russia and Eurasia Program @ Carnegie, “Why Russia Matters,” 8/18, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=41409>, EMM)

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

### India Relations Scenario (1NC)

#### Romney kills US-India relations

Larison 6/6 (Daniel Larison, contributing editor at The American Conservative and writes a column for The Weekonline, Ph.D. graduate from the University of Chicago, “Romney and U.S.-Indian Relations”, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/romney-and-u-s-indian-relations/>, 6/06/12, Bhattacharyya)

Of course, this raises the question of what Romney would have done or will do differently on these and other issues related to India. As far as I can tell, Romney would be less flexible in granting waivers to countries that import oil from Iran. That means that U.S.-Indian relations would likely be worse under Romney because Romney would be more hawkish towards Iran and even less concerned about India’s interests in maintaining its economic ties with Iran. Romney would not be more willing to accommodate India on the nuclear deal, so it’s not clear how Romney would be able to salvage the deal from its current limbo. Would Romney be able to persuade India that the U.S. will be a reliable supplier of military equipment? Unless he intends to alter U.S. ties to Pakistan in radical fashion, I don’t see how he could, so India isn’t likely to start buying American jets from a Romney administration. If Obama’s handling of relations with India has been unsatisfactory, how would Romney improve on it when he is even less accommodating to the interests of other major and rising powers? Dan Drezner suggested this morning that Romney add India as a stop on his upcoming trip: First, India. That’s another country where bilateral relations have cooled off a bit during the Obama years. It’s also one of the BRIC economies, which would allow Romney to disprove Laura Rozen’s charge of being out-of-touch with current geopolitical realities. All right, but what would be the point of his going there? What is he going to say that Indians would be interested in hearing? Romney has stated repeatedly that he rejects the idea of a multipolar world, so what does he have to offer India? Romney’s starkly hegemonist worldview is exactly what makes many Indians wary of aligning their country too closely with ours.

#### US-India relations solve every major impact

Burns et al 10 (Armitage, Richard, Burns, Nicholas, & Fontaine, Richard. "Natural Allies: A Blueprint for the Future of U.S.-India Relations." Paper, Center for a New American Security, October 20, 2010. <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/20446/natural_allies.html?breadcrumb=/>)

The emergence of India as a new major global power is transforming the world’s geopolitical landscape, with profound implications for the future trajectory of our century and for America’s own global interests. A strengthened U.S.-India strategic partnership is thus imperative in this new era. The transformation of U.S. ties with New Delhi over the past 10 years, led by Presidents Clinton and Bush, stands as one of the most significant triumphs of recent American foreign policy. It has also been a bipartisan success. In the last several years alone, the United States and India have completed a landmark civil nuclear cooperation agreement, enhanced military ties, expanded defense trade, increased bilateral trade and investment and deepened their global political cooperation. Many prominent Indians and Americans, however, now fear this rapid expansion of ties has stalled. Past projects remain incomplete, few new ideas have been embraced by both sides, and the forward momentum that characterized recent cooperation has subsided. The Obama administration has taken significant steps to break through this inertia, including with its Strategic Dialogue this spring and President Obama’s planned state visit to India in November 2010. Yet there remains a sense among observers in both countries that this critical relationship is falling short of its promise. We believe it is critical to rejuvenate the U.S.- India partnership and put U.S. relations with India on a more solid foundation. The relationship requires a bold leap forward. The United States should establish a vision for what it seeks in the relationship and give concrete meaning to the phrase “strategic partnership.” A nonpartisan working group of experts met at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS) over the past eight months to review the main pillars of the U.S.-India relationship and we articulate here a specific agenda of action. In order to chart a more ambitious U.S.-India strategic partnership, we believe that the United States should commit, publicly and explicitly, to work with India in support of its permanent membership in an enlarged U.N. Security Council; seek a broad expansion of bilateral trade and investment, beginning with a Bilateral Investment Treaty; greatly expand the security relationship and boost defense trade; support Indian membership in key export control organizations, a step toward integrating India into global nonproliferation efforts; and liberalize U.S. export controls, including the removal of Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) subsidiaries from the U.S. Entity List. These and the other actions outlined in this report will require India to make a number of commitments and policy changes, including taking rapid action to fully implement the Civil Nuclear Agreement; raising its caps on foreign investment; reducing barriers to defense and other forms of trade; enhancing its rules for protecting patents and other intellectual property; further harmonizing its export control lists with multilateral regimes; and seeking closer cooperation with the United States and like-minded partners in international organizations, including the United Nations. The U.S. relationship with India should be rooted in shared interests and values and should not be simply transactional or limited to occasional collaboration. India’s rise to global power is, we believe, in America’s strategic interest. As a result, the United States should not only seek a closer relationship with India, but actively assist its further emergence as a great power. U.S. interests in a closer relationship with India include: • Ensuring a stable Asian and global balance of power. • Strengthening an open global trading system. • Protecting and preserving access to the global commons (air, sea, space, and cyber realms). • Countering terrorism and violent extremism. • Ensuring access to secure global energy resources. • Bolstering the international nonproliferation regime. • Promoting democracy and human rights. • Fostering greater stability, security and economic prosperity in South Asia, including in Pakistan, [and] Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. A strong U.S.-India strategic partnership will prove indispensable to the region’s continued peace and prosperity. Both India and the United States have a vital interest in maintaining a stable balance of power in Asia. Neither seeks containment of China, but the likelihood of a peaceful Chinese rise increases if it ascends in a region where the great democratic powers are also strong. Growing U.S.-India strategic ties will ensure that Asia will not have a vacuum of power and will make it easier for both Washington and New Delhi to have productive relations with Beijing. In addition, a strengthened relationship with India, a natural democratic partner, will signal that the United States remains committed to a strong and enduring presence in Asia. The need for closer U.S.-India cooperation goes well beyond regional concerns. In light of its rise, India will play an increasingly vital role in addressing virtually all major global challenges. In order to chart a more ambitious U.S.-India strategic partnership, we believe that the United States should commit, publicly and explicitly, to work with India in support of its permanent membership in an enlarged U.N. Security Council; seek a broad expansion of bilateral trade and investment, beginning with a Bilateral Investment Treaty; greatly expand the security relationship and boost defense trade; support Indian membership in key export control organizations, a step toward integrating India into global nonproliferation efforts; and liberalize U.S. export controls, including the removal of Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) subsidiaries from the U.S. Entity List. Our recommendations are based on the belief that a stronger and more prosperous India will allow for a more vibrant U.S.-India relationship and that the United States should encourage and facilitate India’s rise as a full stakeholder in the international community.

### CTBT Scenario (1NC)

#### Obama’s pushing to ratify CTBT – his defeat crushes the initiative

Schneidmiller 11 Chris, "Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty," Global Security Newswire, 7/18/11, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20110714\_9351.php

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

#### US Ratification Is Key To Prevent Global Prolif and Nuke War.

Davis 7 Dr. Ian, Co-Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council, “Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track” Huffington Post -- April 11

This can't happen too soon. North Korea has marched through the open door with its first underground test of an atomic device. There is widespread agreement that the test has escalated tension in the region and raised the stakes in the stand-off with the United States. It could also destroy the prospects for the CTBT and open the floodgates to more nuclear-armed states. While we welcome the current agreement with Pyonyang which may ultimately eliminate the North Korean nuclear program, and lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, the details of implementation have yet to be worked out, and already, strong conservative opposition to the agreement is beginning to appear. The door to an alternative way forward is also still open, and the United States could seize the moral high ground by leading the world through it. If President Bush were to press the Senate to reconsider and support ratification of the treaty, it could be part of a far-reaching strategy for shoring up the North Korean agreement, peacefully tackling the Iranian nuclear program and for preventing a world with 40 or more nuclear powers. The North Korean and Iranian nuclear crises exemplify an increasing number of damaging developments that make it clear that the non-proliferation system needs to be strengthened and updated, not neglected or discarded. The international community must not only work together to develop more effective diplomatic approaches towards North Korea and Iran, but it must also apply stricter international safeguards on all nuclear programs, prevent the spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, secure a global halt to the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, take new steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons and achieve the entry into force of the CTBT. If, in 1963, at the height of the Cold War, the US, UK, and USSR could negotiate a limited test ban treaty. Why can't we ratify a comprehensive treaty now? Were we less threatened then? Are Iran and North Korea greater threats to the United States than was the USSR? The CTBT is vital to a system of security that does not rely on nuclear weapons. Its entry into force would put a cap on the nuclear age. Posturing for domestic politics and insisting on a macho attitude in international relations has dangerous long-term implications, both for America and the rest of the world. Since the Bush administration has come to power, global non-proliferation has gone into a holding pattern at best, a tailspin at worst. That can only lead to a world overpopulated with nuclear weapons and a nuclear war sooner or later. The consequences do not bear thinking about. So it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the American and European political agenda and move to secure ratification by other key states.

### Interventionism Scenario (1NC)

#### GOP win destroys American interventionism

Lobe 11

[Jim Lobe, Foreign Policy Analyst, “NeoCons Losing hold over Republican Foreign Policy” 6/16/11, <http://original.antiwar.com/lobe/2011/06/15/neocons-losing-hold-over-republican-foreign-policy%C2%A0/>]

WASHINGTON, Jun 15, 2011 (IPS) - Nearly ten years after seizing control of Republican foreign policy, neo- conservatives and other hawks appear to be losing it. That is at least the tentative conclusion of a number of political analysts following Monday’s first nationally televised debate of the party’s declared Republican candidates - none of whom defended the current U.S. engagement in Libya, while several suggested it was time to pare down Washington’s global military engagements, including in Afghanistan. "This sure isn’t the Republican Party of George Bush, [former Vice President] Dick Cheney, and [former Pentagon chief] Donald Rumsfeld," exulted one liberal commentator, Michael Tomasky, in the ‘Daily Beast’. "The neo-cons are gone." "Is the Republican party turning isolationist for 2012?" asked ‘Washington Post’ columnist Jackson Diehl, a liberal interventionist who has often allied himself with neoconservatives in support of "regime change" against authoritarian governments hostile to the U.S. or Israel. "All in all, this first Republican debate offered a striking change of tone for a party that a decade ago was dominated, in foreign policy, by the neoconservative movement, which favoured [and still does favour] aggressive American intervention abroad," Diehl wrote on his blog. Of particular note during the debate was a comment about Afghanistan by former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, who is widely acknowledged to be the current front-runner in the Republican field. "It’s time for us to bring our troops home as soon as we possibly can, consistent with the word that comes to our generals that we can hand the country over to the [Afghan] military in a way that they’re able to defend themselves," Romney said, adding, perhaps fatefully, "I also think we’ve learned that our troops shouldn’t go off and try and fight a war of independence for another nation." What precisely he meant by the latter sentence was left unclear, but it was sufficiently negative for one prominent neoconservative, Danielle Pletka, to tell ‘Politico’ that her inbox had been flooded Tuesday morning with emails calling Romney’s remarks a "disaster". "I’d thought of Romney as a mainstream Republican - supporting American strength and American leadership, but this doesn’t reflect that," Pletka, who heads the foreign policy and defence division of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), told ‘Politico’, adding that perhaps the front-runner was "a little bit of a weathervane". Whatever Romney meant, Monday’s debate - and the candidates’ apparent lack of enthusiasm for the military adventures of the near-decade that followed the 9/11 attacks - marked at least an "incremental… shift", as the ‘New York Times’ put it, in the party’s foreign-policy stance from "the aggressive use of American power around the world" to a "new debate over the costs and benefits" of deploying that power, particularly in a time of "extreme fiscal pressure". Since the mid-1970’s, Republicans have been divided between aggressive nationalists, like Cheney, and Israel-centred neoconservatives - who also enjoyed the support of the Christian Right - on the one hand, and isolationists and foreign-policy realists on the other. The balance of power between the two groups has shifted more than once in the nearly four decades since. Under most of President Ronald Reagan’s tenure, for example, the nationalists and neoconservatives largely prevailed until they were overcome by the combination of the Iran-Contra scandal, Secretary of State George Shultz, and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. Under President George H.W. Bush, the realists gained virtually total control. The two factions spent much of President Bill Clinton’s eight years fighting each other. Indeed, it was during that period that the nationalists, neoconservatives, and Christian Rightists formed the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) - initially to counteract what they saw as growing isolationism and anti-interventionism among Republican lawmakers in Congress. PNAC’s founders, neoconservatives Robert Kagan and Bill Kristol, backed John McCain in the 2000 Republican primaries, against George W. Bush - whose calls for a "more humble" and "modest" foreign policy conjured bad memories of his father. Once in office, however, President George W. Bush chose leaders of both factions as his main advisers - most importantly Cheney and Rumsfeld, both nationalists surrounded by neoconservatives; and Colin Powell, a classic realist, as his secretary of state. For the first eight months, the two sides locked horns on virtually every major foreign-policy issue. But the 9/11 attacks changed the balance of power decisively in favour of the hawks who, even as they gradually lost influence to the realists within the administration during Bush’s second term, retained the solid support of Republicans in Congress for all eight years. The fact that McCain, whose foreign-policy views were distinctly neoconservative, won the party’s presidential nomination in 2008 testified to the hawks’ enduring strength. But the Sep 2008 financial crisis - and the economic distress it caused - laid the groundwork for the resurgence of the party’s realist-isolationist wing, according to political analysts. "The economic duress is undermining the national greatness project of Bill Kristol and the neo-cons," according to Steve Clemons, a national-security expert at the New America Foundation (NAF), whose washingtonnote.com blog is widely read here. "What we are seeing evolve among Republicans is a hybrid realism with some isolationist strains that believes the costs of American intervention in the world at the rate of the last decade simply can’t be sustained," wrote Clemons. That evolution has gained momentum in the past few months, particularly since President Barack Obama yielded to pressure from a coalition of neoconservatives, liberal interventionists, and nationalists like McCain, to intervene in Libya, and, more importantly since the May 2 killing by U.S. Special Forces of the Al-Qaeda chief in Pakistan. The killing of Osama bin Laden, according to Charles Kupchan of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), "symbolised a closure in some ways to the wars that began after the 9/11 attacks." Indeed, in just the last month, 26 Republican congressmen deserted their leadership and joined a strong majority of Democrats in calling for an accelerated withdrawal from Afghanistan, while last week, in an action that drew charges of "isolationism" from the neoconservative ‘Wall Street Journal’, 87 Republicans voted for a resolution that would require Obama to end military action in Libya within 15 days. And each new day seems to offer a story about yet another Republican insisting that the defence budget should not be exempt from major cuts to reduce the yawning federal deficit. "The party was moving in this direction quite decidedly before 9/11, and then 9/11 silenced the voices of restraint and neo-isolationism," Kupchan told IPS. "And now, they are finally coming back with a vengeance." "That emergence may make for some interesting alliances across partisan lines where you have left- leaning Democrats uncomfortable with the use of force lining up with Republicans interested in bringing down the deficit," Kupchan noted. Tomasky observed, Republican candidates might now be changing their tune not so much out of conviction as out of the desire to win elections. Just last week, the Pew Research Center released its latest poll on U.S. foreign policy attitudes which found that "the current measure of isolationist sentiment is among the highest recorded" in more than 50 years. While, for much of the Bush administration, only one in four Republicans said the U.S. should "mind its own business" internationally, that percentage has nearly doubled since Bush left office. The Pew survey also found a 50 percent increase in Republican support for "reducing [U.S.] military commitments overseas" - from 29 percent in 2008, to 44 percent in May, 2011. Moreover, 56 percent of Republicans said they support reducing those commitments as a way to cut the budget deficit. Similarly, Republicans appear to have lost virtually all interest in promoting Bush’s and the neoconservatives’ "Freedom Agenda" abroad. According to the Pew poll, only one in ten Republicans said they believe democracy-promotion should be a long-term U.S. priority.

#### That's key to solve nuclear war

Kagan 7 (senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Robert, "End of Dreams, Return of History", 7/19, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/07/end_of_dreams_return_of_histor.html>)

Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying -- its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic.It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War ii would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe 's stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war

### Obama Turns Case (Trans. Investment)

#### Obama solves the case - he'll invest in transportation infrastructure in his second term

Dolan, Karen; February 14, 2012 (Karen Dolan is a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies and director of the [Cities for Progress](http://citiesforprogress.org/) and [Cities for Peace](http://citiesforpeace.org/)projects based there. She holds an M.A. With Highest Distinction in Philosophy and Social Policy from the American University in Washington D.C.  Karen joined IPS in 1996;  Karen’s public [scholarship](http://www.ips-dc.org/staff/karen) and activism at IPS have included organizing the Cities for Peace movement and the Cities for Progress project) <<http://www.ips-dc.org/blog/populism_and_pain_in_obamas_2013_budget_proposal>>[Shah]

Both want to appeal to a hurting middle-class electorate. Only one has a populist message with appeal and effect. He most likely will win re-election in 2012.President Obama wants to align himself as a champion of the Middle Class*. Photo by Chrysler Group.*Obama's $3.8 trillion 2013 [budget](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Overview) proposal, with its 10-year outlook, is by design a populist campaign tool. Though not politically viable now, his newly released budget is critically important in this election year both for the values it reflects, the vision it promotes and the potential it promises.   
Obama's budget has a populist tone, appeals to the middle class, and has some good proposals, both on investment and revenue-raising. But it also reflects the strict spending caps mandated this past summer by the Budget Control Act and hits some struggling families hard. It doesn't go nearly far enough in revenue-raising. For instance, it does't propose a tax on financial transactions that would curb Wall Street's worst speculation or proKaren Dolan is a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies and director of the [Cities for Progress](http://citiesforprogress.org/) and [Cities for Peace](http://citiesforpeace.org/)projects based there. She holds an M.A. With Highest Distinction in Philosophy and Social Policy from the American University in Washington D.C.  Karen joined IPS in 1996;  Karen’s public [scholarship](http://www.ips-dc.org/staff/karen) and activism at IPS have included organizing the Cities for Peace movement and the Cities for Progress projectpose significant corporate tax reform that would actually raise needed funds. And, by reducing non-security discretionary spending from its current 3.1 percent of GDP to a 50-year low of 1.7 percent over the next decade, a lot of pain will set in when the populism starts to wears off. **Let's start with the good. Among the good proposals on investment side:**The extension of the [payroll](http://www.ips-dc.org/blog/populism_and_pain_in_obamas_2013_budget_proposal) tax cut and unemployment benefits through the end of 2012.School modernization and plans to retain teachers and first responders.Project Rebuild which helps to match unemployed in distressed communities with those communities'  infrastructure needs.A [small business](http://www.ips-dc.org/blog/populism_and_pain_in_obamas_2013_budget_proposal) tax credit that incentivizes new hiring.Increased child care funding.Improvements in [Earned Income Tax Credit](http://www.irs.gov/individuals/article/0,,id=96406,00.html) and [Child Tax Credit](http://www.irs.gov/newsroom/article/0,,id=106182,00.html).Tax incentives for manufacturers that keep and create jobs here in the United States. National Infrastructure Bank that would fund projects that increase sustainable transportation and infrastructure investment.A total of $850 million in Race to the Top education proposals intended to improve the quality of education from [early childhood](http://www.ips-dc.org/blog/populism_and_pain_in_obamas_2013_budget_proposal) through higher education.Efforts to make college more affordable through sustaining Pell grant funding, keeping interest on student [loans](http://www.ips-dc.org/blog/populism_and_pain_in_obamas_2013_budget_proposal) from increasing, and reining in tuition hikes.A 7 percent increasing in new biomedical research [grants](http://www.ips-dc.org/blog/populism_and_pain_in_obamas_2013_budget_proposal).Support for a more sustainable economy through goals of increasing electric car production, doubling the share of "clean energy" electricity sources, and reducing the energy consumed by buildings by 20 percent by 2020.