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\*\*\*AFGHANISTAN\*\*\*

Afghanistan – Stable Now

Counternarcotics efforts are solving Afghan opium now

Lee 8 (Matthew, AP Writer, http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2008-10-24-250252244\_x.htm, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Regardless of the difference in opinion over what the drop will mean for opium production, Walters said the decline in cultivation -- particularly that 18 of Afghanistan's 34 provinces are now poppy-free, up from 15 in 2007 and 12 in 2006 -- is "good news" and a sign that counternarcotics efforts are working after years of failure.

"It gives us a clear indication that we can do this, we just need to sustain it," he said, noting that anti-drug campaigns were working especially well in Afghanistan's north and east, where incentive programs aimed at rewarding local officials for declines in poppy cultivation have been most successful.

The Bush administration has spent $2.8 billion on fighting drugs in Afghanistan since 2002 but until this year, it had seen poppy cultivation on the rise with record harvests in both 2006 and 2007.

Means Afghanistan will stabilize – There’s a direct correlation between instability and opium production

IAR 8 (International Affairs Review, http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/39, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Since the 2001 invasion and the lifting of the Taliban opium ban, opium production in Afghanistan has increased from 70 percent of the overall global illicit opium production to 92 percent today. This increase has occurred in tandem with the declining security situation precipitated by the 2001 coalition invasion of the country. The loose relationship between terrorist organizations, violence, decentralized governance, and poverty that existed prior to the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) in Afghanistan, has coalesced into a truly narco-terrorism-driven system. The implications of this are severe to both Afghanistan’s and America’s long-term goals. Corruption, lawlessness, instability, violence, and human suffering all contribute to, and result from, the precipitous increase in opium cultivation and narcotics production and trafficking. Thus, in attempting to subdue the Taliban- and al-Qaeda-led insurgencies, and to forge a stable and effective government in Afghanistan, there must also be effective and socially conscious measures undertaken to eliminate the pervasive narco-economy. As President Karzai has stated, “The question of drugs . . . is one that will determine Afghanistan’s future. . . . [I]f we fail, we will fail as a state eventually, and we will fall back in the hands of terrorism.”

Elections prove stability is high

CNN 10 (CNN World Staff, http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/06/19/afghanistan.un.report/?hpt=T2, AD: 7/8/10) jl

He praised the "state of preparedness" of Afghan election officials for the September vote and the presence of more than 400 women on the preliminary list of candidates.

"Strengthened Afghan electoral institutions in the lead will instil greater public confidence in the electoral process and contribute to improved, more credible elections," he said.

Afghanistan – Stable Now

Jirga will stop terrorism and bring peace

Niazi, 7 [Tarique, Staff Writer, August 17, Asian Times http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South\_Asia/IH17Df03.html] KLS

Finally, from the US standpoint, the jirga was a success for its unequivocal commitment to end terrorism and eliminate al-Qaeda from Pashtun territories. Since September 11, 2001, no such commitment was ever made at such a grand forum of Pashtun leaders. The jirga's call shatters the vogue idiom of "Pashtun terrorists", "tribal badlands", and "lawless tribal areas" that cast Pashtuns in bad light. At the jirga, Pashtuns demonstrated their stake in peace within and between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Yet the jirga was "long on generalities and short on specifics". US and NATO leaders should engage this institution to supply the missing "specifics" to foster peace. It is deceptively simple to dub the Afghan resistance "Taliban militancy" or "al-Qaeda-inspired terrorism

US Seabees are stabilizing the region through reconstruction now

Park 9 (Aaron W, http://edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/theses/2009/Sep/09Sep\_Park.pdf, AD: 6/27/10) jl

The Seabees have a relatively short, sixty-six year history, given the fact that the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps date from 1775. But, the Seabees are unique in that no other military unit of the five services (including the Coast Guard) can provide the full complement of construction and combat capabilities.5 The Seabees are more than a combat support force, however. Their capabilities are utilized in peace-time missions such as disaster relief, construction apprenticeship programs for indigenous populations, reconstruction of core infrastructure, a modest medical outreach component, well drilling, and other dimensions of stability operations that are being conducted in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Seabees’ unique complement of capabilities puts them in a position, with some organizational readjustments, to fulfill the DoD Directive 3000.05, Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations.6 If the Seabees are to play a core role in SSTR missions, what reorganization and additional capabilities will be required? This thesis will argue that the majority of the more difficult elements, such as the training of the construction trades, are already inherent to the Seabee mission. It will demonstrate how, with some joint modifications based on the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) model already operating in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Seabees can launch a Seabee Stability Team within 48 hours of mission notification.

Afghanistan – Stable Now

Seabees are conducting stability and reconstruction missions now

Park 9 (Aaron W, http://edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/theses/2009/Sep/09Sep\_Park.pdf, AD: 6/27/10) jl

If, as this thesis contends, irregular warfare is our future, what force posture should the United States adopt to deal with it? Based on recent experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, we must definitely evolve a capability to carry out stabilization and reconstruction operations, which USN Seabee Stability Teams will play a central role. A Seabee Stability Team can play an important role in shoring up the four pillars of stabilization and reconstruction: the security environment, governance and participation, justice and the rule of law, and social and economic well being.

That Solves stability

Bond and Klinger 7 (Margaret S - Colonel in US Army Reserve, Janeen - Project Adviser, http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/0703bond.pdf, AD: 6/27/10) jl

Underscoring these positions, in July 2004, with bipartisan support in Congress and with the agreement of the National Security Council, the Secretary of State established the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) to lead U.S. efforts at assisting other countries in transition from conflict and helping them reach a sustainable path towards peaceful, democratic, and market-oriented societies.17 The emphasis of the new S/CRS is to strengthen the U.S. government’s institutional capacity to deal with crises in failing states and to reconstruct and stabilize societies recovering from conflict and civil strife.18 The S/CRS’ stated goal is to provide an operational field response to post-conflict situations that emphasizes facilitation of peace implementation processes, coordination with international and local institutions and individuals that are developing transition strategies. In addition S/CRS will help implement transitional governance arrangements; encourage conflicting factions to work together; develop strategies to promote transitional security; coordinate with other US government agencies and the US military; foreign agencies and armed forces; and, if necessary, prepare a diplomatic base on the ground.19 Clearly, the goals and objectives of our national strategy and the S/CRS and the US government agencies and organizations supporting it, are focused in the right direction to address the requirements peculiar to post conflict stability and reconstruction operations. However, the focus of this strategy is primarily on assisting governments in transition, rebuilding stability and national infrastructure and other stabilizing operations after conflict has occurred. Building stability and security in pre-conflict situations and preventing conflict through prophylactic use of elements of national power is not considered. Yet this application of stability and security operations clearly is vital in failed and failing states, where prevention of the establishment of opportunistic terrorist movements is key to maintaining the initiative in the GWOT and protecting US national security interests.

Seabees are stabilizing Afghanistan no

Bacon 9 (Lance M, Staff Writer for the Navy Time, http://www.navytimes.com/news/2009/12/navy\_seabee\_deploy\_122209w/, AD: 6/27/10) jl

The Seabees are a vital enabler for the surge of soldiers and Marines already underway. Additional troops require additional infrastructure such as berthing facilities, roads and airfields.

There already are 3,700 sailors on the ground in Afghanistan. Portions of two Seabee battalions have been there since January. The rest are mainly explosive ordnance disposal and medical personnel. Another 208 sailors are building schools and roads.

“Our Seabee battalions receive extensive training in both construction and defensive skills, so this mission is exactly what we have traditionally trained for. Seabees have a vital role to play as they work to provide the infrastructure necessary to complete our country’s objectives in Afghanistan,” said Rear Adm. Mark Handley, Commander, 1st Naval Construction Division.

Afghanistan – No Escalate

No impact escalation- Afghanistan still protected by extended US security

Phalnikar 5/11 [Sonia 2010, Deutsche Welle http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,5553954,00.html] KLS

In the first of a series of meetings, Afghan President Hamid Karzai on Tuesday met US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton who reassured him that the US would remain committed to providing security in Afghanistan even after US troops have left. "As we look toward a responsible, orderly transition in the international combat mission in Afghanistan, we will not abandon the Afghan people," Clinton said. Karzai, meanwhile, reiterated that his country would stick to its responsibility to further develop Afghanistan's civilian and democratic structures.

Afghanistan – Unstable Now

Afghanistan is highly unstable – increased violence

CNN 10 (CNN World Staff, http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/06/19/afghanistan.un.report/?hpt=T2, AD: 7/8/10) jl

(CNN) -- Security in war-torn Afghanistan has not improved in recent months and violence threatens any strides toward stability, a United Nations report said. "Indiscriminate anti-government element attacks against civilian targets, government representatives and international military forces continued," Secretary General Ban Ki-moon said in his latest report this week to the U.N. Security Council. "The alarming trend of increased improvised explosive device incidents and the occurrence of complex suicide attacks persisted. Military operations also intensified," said Ban, who noted that the country remains unstable despite improvements in the development of Afghan security forces.

Instability now – insurgency is high and resilient

Reid 10 (Robert H, AP chief of bureau in Kabul, 6/18, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hngAYR9UZy8hjYt4l2wwFt3DT3XgD9GDVI2O0, AD: 7/8/10) jl

KABUL, Afghanistan — Rising death tolls, military timetables slowed. Infighting in the partner government. War-weary allies packing up to leave — and others eyeing an exit.

Events this spring — from the battlefields of Helmand and Kandahar to the halls of Congress — have served as a reality check on the Afghan war, a grueling fight in a remote, inhospitable land that once harbored the masterminds of the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States.

The Taliban have proven resilient and won't be easily routed. Good Afghan government won't blossom any faster than flowers in the bleak Afghan deserts. Phrases like "transition to Afghan control" mask the enormous challenge ahead to make those words reality.

The country side is still plagued with instability

Reid 10 (Robert H, AP chief of bureau in Kabul, 6/18, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hngAYR9UZy8hjYt4l2wwFt3DT3XgD9GDVI2O0, AD: 7/8/10) jl

In the countryside, however, where three-quarters of Afghanistan's nearly 30 million people live, the insurgents still wield power, moving freely among the population, operating their own Islamic courts and intimidating those who support the government.

Progress is real but scattered and incremental. All parties here predict a tough summer. July 2011 may be too soon to ensure success — even though the top NATO commander Gen. Stanley McChrystal acknowledges he's under pressure to show progress by the end of the year.

Terrorism and IEDs are bounding back

Reid 10 (Robert H, AP chief of bureau in Kabul, 6/18, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hngAYR9UZy8hjYt4l2wwFt3DT3XgD9GDVI2O0, AD: 7/8/10) jl

NATO and Afghan troops also delivered blows to the militants in the north and west. After Marjah, the alliance shifted attention to Kandahar, promising to ramp up security in the largest city in the south and the former Taliban headquarters. Within weeks, however, the Taliban were back in Marjah, threatening and assassinating those who cooperated with the Americans and their Afghan partners. The security effort in Kandahar slowed to a crawl, in large part because of public opposition to the campaign for fear it would lead to more bloodshed. The Taliban responded by planting more of their signature weapon — roadside bombs that the military calls improvised explosive devices, or IEDs. Those hidden bombs not only account for most of the deaths among international troops but they reduce their effectiveness in controlling territory where the Taliban operate. With so many bombs along roads and footpaths, troops on patrol can cover only a limited area since they must move slowly searching for hidden IEDs.

Afghanistan – Unstable Now

Massive instability now – nothing has changed in the past 8 years

Reid 10 (Robert H, AP chief of bureau in Kabul, 6/18, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hngAYR9UZy8hjYt4l2wwFt3DT3XgD9GDVI2O0, AD: 7/8/10) jl

"They should leave Afghanistan because they didn't come to protect this country," Maulvi Sarajuddin, a leading cleric in Baghlan province, said of the international troops. "They came here and insecurity continues. Nothing has changed. In the past eight years, the country is more unstable and corruption has seized the throats of the Afghan people."

Securing a reliable local partner turned the tide of the Iraq war when Sunni insurgents abandoned al-Qaida and joined with the Americans just as the U.S. troop surge of 2006 and 2007 was under way.

U.S. allies gained little reassurance about the reliability of the Afghan government when Karzai — a key pillar of Obama's war strategy — this month let go two respected members of his national security team, one of whom had questioned overtures to the Taliban.

The lack of solid local allies lies at the heart of the delays in Kandahar. The local government is weak and underfunded, held hostage to tribal leaders and politically connected businessmen whose wheeling and dealing have undercut support for the central government.

Afghanistan – Alt Causality – US

lgTerrorism is inevitable – plan only draws the US back in and causes worse violence

Hedges 9 (Chris, senior fellow at The Nation Institute, http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/20090720\_war\_without\_purpose/, AD: 7/8/10) jl

The offensive by NATO forces in Helmand province will follow the usual scenario laid out by military commanders, who know much about weapons systems and conventional armies and little about the nuances of irregular warfare. The Taliban will withdraw, probably to sanctuaries in Pakistan. We will declare the operation a success. Our force presence will be reduced. And the Taliban will creep back into the zones we will have “cleansed.” The roadside bombs will continue to exact their deadly toll. Soldiers and Marines, frustrated at trying to fight an elusive and often invisible enemy, will lash out with greater fury at phantoms and continue to increase the numbers of civilian dead. It is a game as old as insurgency itself, and yet each generation of warriors thinks it has finally found the magic key to victory.

Afghanistan – Alt Causality – Non-US

Can’t solve instability – terrorism will continually exist

Hedges 9 (Chris, senior fellow at The Nation Institute, http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/20090720\_war\_without\_purpose/, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Al-Qaida could not care less what we do in Afghanistan. We can bomb Afghan villages, hunt the Taliban in Helmand province, build a 100,000-strong client Afghan army, stand by passively as Afghan warlords execute hundreds, maybe thousands, of Taliban prisoners, build huge, elaborate military bases and send drones to drop bombs on Pakistan. It will make no difference. The war will not halt the attacks of Islamic radicals.  Terrorist and insurgent groups are not conventional forces. They do not play by the rules of warfare our commanders have drilled into them in war colleges and service academies. And these underground groups are protean, changing shape and color as they drift from one failed state to the next, plan a terrorist attack and then fade back into the shadows. We are fighting with the wrong tools. We are fighting the wrong people. We are on the wrong side of history. And we will be defeated in Afghanistan as we will be in Iraq.

Can’t solve root cause of instability – civil war

Hedges 9 (Chris, senior fellow at The Nation Institute, http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/20090720\_war\_without\_purpose/, AD: 7/8/10) jl

We have stumbled into a confusing mix of armed groups that include criminal gangs, drug traffickers, Pashtun and Tajik militias, kidnapping rings, death squads and mercenaries. We are embroiled in a civil war. The [Pashtuns](http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Afghanistan-to-Bosnia-Herzegovina/Pashtun.html), who make up most of the Taliban and are the traditional rulers of Afghanistan, are battling the [Tajiks](http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Tajikistan-to-Zimbabwe/Tajiks.html) and [Uzbeks](http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Tajikistan-to-Zimbabwe/Uzbeks.html), who make up the Northern Alliance, which, with foreign help, won the civil war in 2001. The old Northern Alliance now dominates the corrupt and incompetent government. It is deeply hated. And it will fall with us.

Can’t solve Central Asia – spills over into Afghanistan

Cutler 1 (Robert, research fellow at the Institute of European and Russian Studies at Carleton University, http://www.mafhoum.com/press2/67E12.htm, AD: 7/8/10) jl

CONCLUSIONS: The Western search for active assistance against Kabul in Central Asia seeks being seen by authoritarian regimes in the region as a carte blanche to intensify their repression of political and social dissidence. Even without events in Afghanistan, Central Asia suffers from scarce resources and volatile ethnic tensions. It would be useful if the present focus on Afghanistan were to lead international institutions to increase their attention to whole of Central Asia, where economic and political reform have generally lagged over the last decade or, indeed, been entirely retrograde. A Western-sponsored reconstruction package not only for Afghanistan but that also includes Central Asia may be advisable to avoid longer-term instability.  Since the United Nations has lately given attention, in its economic commissions, to Central Asian problems, such a package becomes more likely if Washington decides to hand off post-Taliban Afghanistan to the U.N. In such an instance the country could become a sort of U.N. protectorate on the model of Cambodia, with which the current situation shares some similarities – a lengthy civil war, decimation of intellectuals, and omnipresence of landmines, to name but three.

Iran will continually destabilize Afghanistan

AFP 8 (http://rawstory.com/news/afp/Iran\_seeking\_to\_keep\_Afghanistan\_un\_05062008.html, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Iran is seeking to keep Afghanistan weak and unstable, delivering arms to the Taliban whilst ostensibly supporting Kabul's government, a senior US state department official said in Paris Tuesday. "They (Iran) interfere in a variety of different ways, perhaps not as violently as they do sometimes in Iraq," Richard Boucher, assistant secretary of state for south and central Asia, told reporters at a press conference. "But what we see is Iranian interference politically, Iranian interference in terms of the money that they channel into the political process, Iranian interference in terms of playing off local officials against central government, trying to undermine the state in that way."

Afghanistan – Alt Causality – Non-US

Pakistan spills over – causes instability

Kjaernet and Torjesen 7 (Heidi and Stina, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, http://www.nupi.no/content/download/3781/57112/version/2/file/Report-Kj%25C3%25A6rnet-Torjesen.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Official Pakistani–Afghan bilateral relations have remained highly strained over recent years, although the Afghanistan–Pakistan ‘peace jirga’ in August 2007 represented a welcome diplomatic step forward.8 Nevertheless, with the profound political crisis that faced Pakistan in Winter 2007/07, efforts to follow up and develop bilateral relations were put on hold.9 With the election results of February 18 2008, there is increased hope that Pakistan- Afghanistan bilateral relations may improve further. Still, domestic political struggles and developments in Pakistan will persist in having a profound bearing on Afghanistan. In this way, Pakistan will most likely continue to be the source of Afghanistan’s most serious regional challenge for years to come.

Indo-Pakistan conflict prevents stable development of Afghanistan

Kjaernet and Torjesen 7 (Heidi and Stina, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, http://www.nupi.no/content/download/3781/57112/version/2/file/Report-Kj%25C3%25A6rnet-Torjesen.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

The second cluster of geopolitical rivalry concerns the long-running dispute between India and Pakistan, where the two countries’ conflicting claims on Kashmir lie at the centre of bilateral tensions. Pakistan’s insecurity towards India has historically constituted a key rationale behind Pakistan’s intense involvement in Afghanistan’s internal affairs. Facing the prospect of a new war with India, Pakistan has identified a need for ‘strategic depth’ beyond its western and northern borders. In practical terms, this has entailed a quest for ensuring that Afghanistan and its leadership will remain friendly, supportive allies of Pakistan.17 The Pakistan–India dispute prevents the two countries from developing a complex joint approach to facilitating Afghan recovery, and it is not unlikely that the two countries are also undermining each other’s efforts towards Afghanistan. One manifestation of these tensions and detrimental affects can be seen in trade arrangements. While Pakistan allows Afghan exports to transit Pakistan to India, it does not allow Indian exports to transit Pakistan to Afghanistan. This hinders the full development of Afghanistan–India trade, even as India has taken significant steps to enhance Afghanistan’s export potential to India. Afghanistan has been granted exemption from Indian import duties and the country is set to join the India-led South Asian Free Trade Agreement (SAFTA) in February 2008.

Afghanistan – Presence High

Presence is high – Surge going into effect

Kruzel 10 (John J, American Forces Press Service, 3/24, http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=58461, AD: 7/9/10) jl

WASHINGTON, March 24, 2010 – This summer will mark the first time since 2003 that the number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan will overshadow the American presence in Iraq, the top U.S. military officer told Congress today.

Driving the eclipse is the 30,000-troop surge President Barack Obama announced for Afghanistan in December, roughly a third of which is in place, and with 18,000 of the additional forces expected to be in Afghanistan by late spring as troop levels in Iraq continue to drop.

Troop levels are increasing now

Kruzel 10 (John J, American Forces Press Service, 3/24, http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=58461, AD: 7/9/10) jl

“Indeed, by the middle of this year, Afghanistan will surpass Iraq, for the first time since 2003, as the location with the most deployed American forces,” said Navy Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.   
Mullen told members of the House Appropriations Committee the remainder of the 30,000 will arrive as rapidly as possible over the summer and early fall, making a major contribution to reversing Taliban momentum in 2010.

Troops are here to stay – withdrawal will be delated

Alberts 10 (Sheldon, Canwest News Service, 6/30, http://www.nationalpost.com/news/world/here+while+Petraeus/3218449/story.html, AD: 7/9/10) jl

General David Petraeus warned Americans yesterday to prepare for several more years of war in Afghanistan and cast the Obama administration's July 2011 timeline to begin withdrawing troops as highly flexible.

Appearing before the U.S. Senate's armed services committee, the General said troop drawdowns would "be determined by conditions" on the ground -- which, he bluntly said, would get worse before they got better.

"July 2011 will mark the beginning of a process, not the date when the U.S. heads for the exits and turns out the lights," added Gen. Petraeus, who has been tapped by President Barack Obama to take command of U.S. and allied forces in Afghanistan.

Troop levels will increase to 100,000

Alberts 10 (Sheldon, Canwest News Service, 6/30, http://www.nationalpost.com/news/world/here+while+Petraeus/3218449/story.html, AD: 7/9/10) jl

"It is going to be a number of years before Afghan forces can truly handle the security tasks in Afghanistan on their own. [Combat] may get more intense in the next few months" as U.S. forces intensify their campaign against the Taliban in Kandahar province.

"As we take away the enemy's safe havens and reduce the enemy's freedom of action, the insurgents will fight back."

U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan will reach 100,000 by the end of August, he said.

Afghanistan – Presence Low

Even if they win troop levels will remain high, there is a perception of decreasing presence which is more important

Rubin 10 (Michael, Journalist, http://www.michaelrubin.org/7033/afghanistan-withdrawal-deadline, AD: 7/9/10) jl

It is true, as Schlesinger points out, that Obama did not set a date for the completion of the withdrawal, but he signaled its finite nature. And herein lays the problem. The reason Obama spoke of a deadline was not to pressure Afghanistan President Hamid Karzai but rather to assuage constituencies in the United States increasingly wary of open-ended U.S. involvement in the country. But in the Middle East and South Asia, perception matters far more than reality.

Withdrawal deadline means perception of low Afghan presence

Ide 6/4 (4 July William Washington US lawmakers criticize deadline for Afghan withdrawal http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/asia/US-Lawmakers-Criticize-Deadline-for-Afghan-Withdrawal-97777524.html) TBC 7/9/10

On ABC television's "This Week" program, McCain said he was concerned about the message that a time line sends. "I'm more concerned about the perception of our friends and our enemies as well as the people in Afghanistan as to the depth of our commitment. Our commitment must be, 'We will succeed and then we will withdraw,'" he said. McCain, a senior lawmaker and former prisoner of war during the Vietnam War, said the United States should not leave Afghanistan until it is stable enough to maintain a strong government. "I'm all for dates of withdrawal, but that's after the strategy succeeds, not before. That's a dramatic difference," he said. Senator Joseph Lieberman, who was in Afghanistan with McCain agreed. He told the "Fox News Sunday" program that setting a deadline sends a message to the Afghan people, the Taliban insurgents and neighboring countries that the United States will leave regardless of the security situation. "America has a vital national security interest on the line here and we've got to win it. And therefore, you don't put that on a time line," he said. Republican Senator Lindsey Graham said President Obama's date to begin a U.S. military pullout from Afghanistan has created confusion. "This confusion has hurt. It has hurt our friends and emboldened our enemies. We need to get it right and get it clarified. Leaving Afghanistan is about America being safe," he said.

Afghanistan – No Escalation

No great powers would get drawn into a conflict

Weitz 6 (Richard, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Future Security Strategies at Hudson Institute, Washington Quarterly 29.3, Muse) jl

Central Asian security affairs have become much more complex than during the original nineteenth-century great game between czarist Russia and the United Kingdom. At that time, these two governments could largely dominate local affairs, but today a variety of influential actors are involved in the region. The early 1990s witnessed a vigorous competition between Turkey and Iran for influence in Central Asia. More recently, India and Pakistan have pursued a mixture of cooperative and competitive policies in the region that have influenced and been affected by their broader relationship. The now independent Central Asian countries also invariably affect the region's international relations as they seek to maneuver among the major powers without compromising their newfound autonomy. Although Russia, [End Page 155] China, and the United States substantially affect regional security issues, they cannot dictate outcomes the way imperial governments frequently did a century ago.

Concerns about a renewed great game are thus exaggerated. The contest for influence in the region does not directly challenge the vital national interests of China, Russia, or the United States, the most important extraregional countries in Central Asian security affairs. Unless restrained, however, competitive pressures risk impeding opportunities for beneficial cooperation among these countries. The three external great powers have incentives to compete for local allies, energy resources, and military advantage, but they also share substantial interests, especially in reducing terrorism and drug trafficking. If properly aligned, the major multilateral security organizations active in Central Asia could provide opportunities for cooperative diplomacy in a region where bilateral ties traditionally have predominated.

Afghanistan – Impact Helpers

Terrorism in Afghanistan spills over globally

Voa News 10 (News Organization, http://www1.voanews.com/a-41-2009-03-16-voa6-84650682.html, AD: 7/8/10) jl

"The deteriorating situation in the region poses a security threat, from our perspective, not just to the United States, but to every single nation around this table. It was from that remote area of the world that al Qaeda plotted 9/11. It was from that very same area that extremists planned virtually every major terrorist attack in Europe since 9/11, including the attacks on London and Madrid."  
The Taliban have increased their attacks on Afghan government troops as well as western military forces, and a widening area of Afghanistan is increasingly insecure.  The mountainous border between Afghanistan and Pakistan are beyond the control of either government, and offer sanctuary to both Taliban and al-Qaida militants.   
"We need to look at Afghanistan and Pakistan together, because success in one requires progress in the other," said Vice President Biden, and went on to stress the necessity of a comprehensive approach with strong civilian and diplomatic components. NATO members play a critical role, said Mr. Biden.  
"Together, I am absolutely confident we can handle not only Afghanistan, but many other crises we'll face in the 21st century," said Vice President Biden in closing.   "I'm also equally as confident that absent that kind of cohesion, it will be incredibly more difficult for us to meet the common threats we're going to face."

Instability in Afghanistan spills over globally

RTT News 9 (Global Financial Newswires, http://www.rttnews.com/ArticleView.aspx?Id=1144493, AD: 7/8/10) jl

(RTTNews) - Ahead of President Barack Obama's announcement concerning new troop levels in [Afghanistan[mag-glass_10x10](http://www.rttnews.com/ArticleView.aspx?Id=1144493)](http://www.rttnews.com/ArticleView.aspx?Id=1144493) Tuesday night, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton spoke Monday night at Gotham Hall in New York City, where she argued that instability in regions like Afghanistan still represent a threat to U.S. security.

"We have seen in recent weeks that the stability of countries far away like Afghanistan and Pakistan is directly connected to our own national security," Clinton said.

She added, "As long as countries like that struggle to control their borders, extend their sovereignty, the door is open to the bad actors who today are more empowered because of the tools of globalization, the instant communication, the weapons of such greater force and magnitude than what came before."

Clinton called it "imperative" to look at the "syndicate of terrorism that operates out of the border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan."

Specifically, she noted al-Qaida as "being the head of the table of this syndicate of terrorism" and argued that if they and a group like the Taliban can maintain a safe haven in the region, "then terrorists will continue to use that territory to plan future attacks on us."

Afghanistan – Impact Helpers

Afghanistan instability causes cascading instability all over Eurasia

Oliker and Szayna 3 (Olga and Thomas S, Fellows at RAND, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/2005/RAND\_MR1598.sum.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

The situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan, as well as the troop presence of U.S., Russian, and other forces in the region may serve to catalyze state failure in a number of ways, perhaps making significant conflict more proximate than it might otherwise have been. Refugee flows into the region could strain the treasuries and stretch the capacities of states to deal with the influx. They can also potentially be a mechanism for countergovernment forces to acquire new recruits and assistance. This is of particular concern given the history of Al Qaeda and Taliban support to insurgent groups in Central Asia, as well as the ethnic links and overlaps between Afghanistan and the Central Asian states. To date, the rise of insurgencies linked to radical Islam has either caused or provided an excuse for the leadership in several states to become increasingly authoritarian, in many ways aggravating rather than alleviating the risk of social unrest, and it is entirely plausible that this trend will continue. Moreover, if the U.S.-Russian relationship improves, Russian officials may take advantage of the opportunity, combined with U.S. preoccupation with its counterterror campaign, to take actions in Georgia and Azerbaijan that these states will perceive as aggressive. Meanwhile, U.S. forces in the region may be viewed as targets by combatants in the Afghanistan war and by insurgent efforts against the Central Asian governments. The situation in Afghanistan will almost certainly have an impact on the faultlines in Central Asia and possibly those in the South Caucasus. While it remains too early to predict just what that impact might be, regardless of the situation in Afghanistan, there remains excellent reason to believe that over the next 15 years separatists will continue to strive to attain independence (as in Georgia) and insurgency forces to take power (as in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan). This could spread from the countries where we see it currently to possibly affect Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Azerbaijan. It could also result in responses by states that see a neighboring insurgency as a threat, and by others that pursue insurgents beyond their own borders. Insofar as U.S. forces stay involved in the region, it could draw the United States into these Central Asian and South Caucasus conflicts.

Afghanistan – Impact Helpers

Instability in Afghanistan spills over and causes several scenarios for extinction

Morgan 7 (Stephen J, former member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, http://www.electricarticles.com/display.aspx?id=639, AD: 7/7/10) jl

They are low on adequate resources and relegated in importance. The former British Commander of NATO forces admitted that last year they came close to losing Kandahar, the second city. It is not ruled out that much of the south and east could fall into Taliban hands this year, paving the way for the fall of Kabul, the year after. The Taliban are ferocious fighters, with a messianic fervour to fight to the death. They bring with them the experience of veterans of the brutal Soviet war and the civil war which followed. Now regrouped, rearmed, their forces are prepared both for unfavourable open combat of almost suicidal proportions. Furthermore they are opportunistically changing tactics, both in order to create maximum urban destabilization and to win local support in the countryside. Boasting of more than 1,000 suicide volunteer bombers, they have also renounced their former policy against heroin cultivation, thus allowing them to win support among the rural population and gain support from local tribes, warlords and criminal gangs, who have been alienated by NATO policies of poppy field destruction. Although disliked and despised in many quarters, the Taliban could not advance without the support or acquiescence of parts of the population, especially in the south. In particular, the Taliban is drawing on backing from the Pashtun tribes from whom they originate. The southern and eastern areas have been totally out of government control since 2001. Moreover, not only have they not benefited at all from the Allied occupation, but it is increasingly clear that with a few small centres of exception, all of the country outside Kabul has seen little improvement in its circumstances. The conditions for unrest are ripe and the Taliban is filling the vacuum. The Break-Up of Afghanistan? However, the Taliban is unlikely to win much support outside of the powerful Pashtun tribes. Although they make up a majority of the nation, they are concentrated in the south and east. Among the other key minorities, such as Tajiks and Uzbeks, who control the north they have no chance of making new inroads. They will fight the Taliban and fight hard, but their loyalty to the NATO and US forces is tenuous to say the least. The Northern Alliance originally liberated Kabul from the Taliban without Allied ground support. The Northern Alliance are fierce fighters, veterans of the war of liberation against the Soviets and the Afghanistan civil war. Mobilized they count for a much stronger adversary than the NATO and US forces. It is possible that, while they won’t fight for the current government or coalition forces, they will certainly resist any new Taliban rule. They may decide to withdraw to their areas in the north and west of the country. This would leave the Allied forces with few social reserves, excepting a frightened and unstable urban population in Kabul, much like what happened to the Soviets. Squeezed by facing fierce fighting in Helmund and other provinces, and, at the same time, harried by a complementary tactic of Al Qaeda-style urban terrorism in Kabul, sooner or later, a “Saigon-style” evacuation of US and Allied forces could be on the cards. The net result could be the break-up and partition of Afghanistan into a northern and western area and a southern and eastern area, which would include the two key cities of Kandahar and, the capital Kabul. Pastunistan? The Taliban themselves, however may decide not to take on the Northern Alliance and fighting may concentrate on creating a border between the two areas, about which the two sides may reach an agreement regardless of US and Allied plans or preferences. The Taliban may claim the name Afghanistan or might opt for “Pashtunistan” – a long-standing, though intermittent demand of the Pashtuns, within Afghanistan and especially along the ungovernable border regions inside Pakistan. It could not be ruled out that the Taliban could be aiming to lead a break away of the Pakistani Pashtuns to form a 30 million strong greater Pashtun state, encompassing some 18 million Pakistani Pashtuns and 12 Afghan Pashtuns. Although the Pashtuns are more closely linked to tribal and clan loyalty, there exists a strong latent embryo of a Pashtun national consciousness and the idea of an independent Pashtunistan state has been raised regularly in the past with regard to the disputed territories common to Afghanistan and Pakistan. The area was cut in two by the “Durand Line”, a totally artificial border between created by British Imperialism in the 19th century. It has been a question bedevilling relations between the Afghanistan and Pakistan throughout their history, and with India before Partition. It has been an untreated, festering wound which has lead to sporadic wars and border clashes between the two countries and occasional upsurges in movements for Pashtun independence. In fact, is this what lies behind the current policy of appeasement President Musharraf of Pakistan towards the Pashtun tribes in along the Frontiers and his armistice with North Waziristan last year? Is he attempting to avoid further alienating Pashtun tribes there and head–off a potential separatist movement in Pakistan, which could develop from the Taliban’s offensive across the border in Afghanistan? Trying to subdue the frontier lands has proven costly and unpopular for Musharraf. In effect, he faces exactly the same problems as the US and Allies in Afghanistan or Iraq. Indeed, fighting Pashtun tribes has cost him double the number of troops as the US has lost in Iraq. Evidently, he could not win and has settled instead for an attempted political solution. When he agreed the policy of appeasement and virtual self-rule for North Waziristan last year, President Musharraf stated clearly that he is acting first and foremost to protect the interests of Pakistan. While there was outrageous in Kabul, his deal with the Pashtuns is essentially an effort to firewall his country against civil war and disintegration. In his own words, what he fears most is, the « Talibanistation » of the whole Pashtun people, which he warns could inflame the already fierce fundamentalist and other separatist movement across his entire country. He does not want to open the door for any backdraft from the Afghan war to engulf Pakistan. Musharraf faces the nationalist struggle in Kashmir, an insurgency in Balochistan, unrest in the Sindh, and growing terrorist bombings in the main cities. There is also a large Shiite population and clashes between Sunnis and Shias are regular. Moreover, fundamentalist support in his own Armed Forces and Intelligence Services is extremely strong. So much so that analyst consider it likely that the Army and Secret Service is protecting, not only top Taliban leaders, but Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda central leadership thought to be entrenched in the same Pakistani borderlands. For the same reasons, he has not captured or killed Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda leadership. Returning from the frontier provinces with Bin Laden’s severed head would be a trophy that would cost him his own head in Pakistan. At best he takes the occasional risk of giving a nod and a wink to a US incursion, but even then at the peril of the chagrin of the people and his own military and secret service. The Break-Up of Pakistan? Musharraf probably hopes that by giving de facto autonomy to the Taliban and Pashtun leaders now with a virtual free hand for cross border operations into Afghanistan, he will undercut any future upsurge in support for a break-away independent Pashtunistan state or a “Peoples’ War” of the Pashtun populace as a whole, as he himself described it. However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the
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current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

\*\*\*IRAQ\*\*\*

Iraq – Stable Now

Business survey bets on stability - even with drawdown

Rafique 7/4 (Mahmood, Arab News Correspondent, http://arabnews.com/economy/article78686.ece, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Almost two-third or 64 percent said it is still too dangerous to do business in Iraq at the present time. But more than half of those surveyed said their view of Iraq has become more positive over the past two years .  
Moreover, most respondents expect the security situation for foreign executives and employees to improve over the next two years, with 46 percent saying it would improve somewhat and 9 percent saying it would improve significantly, despite the drawdown of Western troops. Just 10 percent expected it to worsen.

Prefer our evidence – Economic forecasts are the most accurate form of predictions

McCain 98 (Roger A, Department of Economics and International Business at Drexel, http://faculty.lebow.drexel.edu/McCainR//top/Prin/txt/controv1/RE1.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Most macroeconomists had agreed that expectations play a key role in major role in economic events. Certainly Keynes did: he made a simplifying assumption, for example, that the "state of long-term expectation" (about the profitability of investment) is given. He certainly didn't assume those expectations would be "rational," claiming instead that they must be irrationally optimistic, motivated by "animal spirits."

But most macroeconomists since Keynes have tried to allow for the fact that expectations do change and people learn. In the last few chapters we have made passing reference to two views on this. One, "Adaptive Expectations," holds that, on the average, people learn by experience, slowly and predictably. The other view, "Rational Expectations," holds that people learn very quickly and, by learning the patterns of economic activity, can often anticipate experience and adapt to changes in economic circumstances as they happen -- rather than after.

Of course, there is a little more to it than just that. The idea behind Rational Expectations is that if people can decide "rationally" how to divide their income between saving and consumption, and how to divide their consumption between coffee and donuts and beemers and other products, then people can determine with the same "rationality" what they expect will happen in the economic system. Thus, the basic assumption of Rational Expectations is that people make efficient use of all the information available to them.

Of course, it's a fact of life that people may not have all the information they need, in order to make the best decisions. But more information can be obtained, bought or produced. In effect, everybody acts as an economic forecaster, gathering information to judge what kinds of economic events are likely. These forecasts are the person's Rational Expectations. On the other hand, information, like other products, has costs as well as benefits. It won't be "rational" or "efficient" to use all the information that might be out there -- some of it will be too costly to pay off. So expectations may be "rational," but still quite inaccurate.

Elections prove stability is coming

Kruzel 10 (John J, American Forces Press Service, 3/24, http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=58461, AD: 7/9/10) jl

In Iraq, meanwhile, officials continue tallying the results of a parliamentary election that took place earlier this month. Despite a relatively mild incidence of violence, no polling stations were forced to close.   
An estimated 12 million Iraqis, about 62 percent of the electorate, cast votes in the March 7 election that will appoint parliamentary seats and possibly a new prime minister, pending results. Gates told Congress today that the turnout was a cause for optimism, noting a video teleconference he had with Army Gen. Raymond T. Odierno, commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, before the election. “He said if we get 50 to 55 percent turnout, that will be great,” the secretary said. “If we get 55 to 60 percent -- that would be exceptional.   
“We ended up with 62 percent turnout,” Gates continued. “The Iraqis are trying to solve their problems politically instead of shooting at each other. And frankly, I think we're modestly optimistic that this thing is going to go forward without any need for changing the plans.”

Iraq – Stable Now

Iraq is stabilizing – multiple factors

Rushing 7/4 (J Taylor, Writer for The Hill, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/107141-biden-says-stability-near-in-iraq?page=2#comments, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Vice President Joe Biden on Sunday said the U.S. goal for withdrawing its forces from Iraq remains on schedule and that the country is approaching stability. Speaking at a naturalization ceremony for U.S. service members in Baghdad, the vice president said by the end of August, U.S. troops will have been reduced from 140,000 troops in January 2009 to 50,000. Biden took heat last year for a similar statement that predicted stability in the country, but on Sunday he said events have proven him correct. Biden's son Beau has served in the U.S. forces in Iraq. "Last year at this ceremony, I made what I was criticized for saying a bit of a bold statement. But I was confident then as I am now about other things that are going to happen," Biden said. "I said last August of this year that we will have achieved two goals. We will have helped Iraq’s leaders set the conditions for a sovereign, stable and self-reliant nation for future generations of Iraqis within a year, and we will have ended our combat mission here after more than seven years.

Stability now – Key enemies eliminated

VOA News 10 (Voice of America News Organization, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Odierno-Iraq-Moves-Toward-Stability-US-Drawdown-on-Track-95646044.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

The top U.S. commander in Iraq says his forces and Iraqi troops have captured or killed 34 of the top 42 leaders of al-Qaida in the country, significantly hurting the organizations ability to conduct attacks.  General Ray Odierno also says Iran is taking a less violent but still destructive approach in its involvement in Iraq.

Violent attacks are at an all time low

VOA News 10 (Voice of America News Organization, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Odierno-Iraq-Moves-Toward-Stability-US-Drawdown-on-Track-95646044.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

General Odierno says the number of violent incidents, the number of casualties and the number of high-profile attacks in Iraq are all at their lowest levels since the conflict started.  He attributes the change to increased competence by the Iraqi security forces and a joint operation in the town of Mosul about three months ago that broke a key al-Qaida cell and led to a series of attacks on some of the group's leaders and the arrests of several more.

Stability now – low recruitment for insurgency

VOA News 10 (Voice of America News Organization, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Odierno-Iraq-Moves-Toward-Stability-US-Drawdown-on-Track-95646044.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Odierno says al-Qaida will try to overcome the setback, and he says it is still capable of carrying out attacks, particularly against undefended civilian targets.  But he says the group is having more trouble recruiting fighters and leaders, and is finding it more and more difficult to destabilize the Iraqi government.

Elections prove stability – prevents backsliding into insurgency

VOA News 10 (Voice of America News Organization, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Odierno-Iraq-Moves-Toward-Stability-US-Drawdown-on-Track-95646044.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

General Odierno says in addition to security, the other key to long-term stability in Iraq is politics.  He called the certification of the election results a very important step, and also said he is pleased with talk of forming a government that includes all political factions. "Most of the security issues will come from what spawns out of the political realm," said Odierno. "That's why it's important to have a unity government.  We don't want to see any group that feels it's been disenfranchised and even contemplates moving back to an insurgency."

Iraq – Stable Now

Stability now – Iran is backing off of violent attacks

VOA News 10 (Voice of America News Organization, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Odierno-Iraq-Moves-Toward-Stability-US-Drawdown-on-Track-95646044.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

General Odierno also says Iran appears to have changed its strategy in Iraq in a way that contributes to the reduction in violence, but still seeks to gain influence.  
"They clearly moved away from a heavy lethal strategy to one that involves some lethal, and then some non-lethal, trying to almost gain monopolies in some economic areas as well as through heavy diplomatic and security collection influence inside of Iraq," he said. "So they're still doing it, but at a lower level."

Iraq – Unstable Now

Instability is mounting – Politics and US withdrawal

Henne 10 (Peter, Security Fellow, Truman National Security Project, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-henne/supporting-allawi-and-sta\_b\_548222.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Reports are beginning to emerge about increasing sectarian tension in Iraq, as trust degrades between Sunnis and Shia and fears of returning to the full-blown insurgency of a few years ago spread. This possibly deteriorating situation is connected to two concurrent developments in that country. Iraqi politicians are currently struggling to form a government following contentious parliamentary elections, with numerous sectarian undertones. Meanwhile, the United States is gradually withdrawing its troops from the country. Although the US drawdown of forces is a good move, the increasingly downgraded importance of Iraq among the US public and its leaders indicates a dangerous complacency.

Massive unrest now – election controversy

Henne 10 (Peter, Security Fellow, Truman National Security Project, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-henne/supporting-allawi-and-sta\_b\_548222.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

While Americans want out of Iraq, the stability of the country is far from assured, and reignited ethnic violence in that country can harm both US interests and the American conscience. The best course for the United States to take may be to fully support the outcome of the parliamentary elections, including its winner, Iyad Allawi.

As I [argued recently](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-henne/channeling-identity-polit_b_517574.html), the recent parliamentary elections represented a significant milestone in Iraq's democratic development. Former Prime Minister Iyad Allawi's secular coalition -- which many Sunnis supported -- won a plurality of votes, claiming victory. He beat out incumbent Nouri al-Maliki's coalition of Shia groups, and the more radical Shia bloc of Moqtada al-Sadr. Because no side gained a clear majority, difficult negotiations among the factions are needed before a new government is formed.

Yet, al-Maliki has hesitated in accepting Allawi's victory. Al-Maliki ominously pointed out that he remains the commander of Iraq's military, and accused Allawi of fraud. Also, he convinced Iraq's Supreme Court to allow him -- instead of Allawi -- to set up the next government. And there have been continuing moves to disqualify some candidates in Allawi's bloc for reputed Baathist ties, which could erase his lead. In addition to this, al-Maliki has been negotiating with al-Sadr to [merge](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/14/AR2010041402004.html) their blocs, which would yield a majority.

If al-Maliki succeeds in holding on to power, the results could be disastrous. If he does so through extra-democratic means -- such as a coup (even a soft one) or disqualifying members of Allawi's coalition -- it could undermine the viability of Iraqi democracy and set the stage for a return to dictatorship. Even if he wins through an alliance with al-Sadr, ignoring the outcome of an election could degrade voters' confidence in the system.

Election results will erupt into violence – no checks on escalation

Henne 10 (Peter, Security Fellow, Truman National Security Project, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-henne/supporting-allawi-and-sta\_b\_548222.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

More troublesome, though, would be the possibility of ethnic strife. Allawi's Sunni supporters hoped to balance the perceived Shia favoritism of al-Maliki through their votes. If Allawi were to be passed over for Prime Minister in favor of al-Maliki, this would -- at best -- lead to greater cynicism among Sunnis concerning the electoral process, with decreased participation. At worst it could lead to renewed Sunni-Shia violence.

Despite this possibly explosive situation, the United States has taken only [minimal steps](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/14/AR2010041404070.html) to shore up the political system following the election. This is far from the hands-on diplomacy that may be needed to help set up a new government. US aloofness is in part to be expected; Americans are tired of the war in Iraq, and are wary of being perceived as dictating political outcomes. Also, President Obama's agenda is rather full. Health care, financial reform, Supreme Court nominees and other domestic issues have high priority, and even his foreign policy attention is occupied with significant initiatives on nuclear weapons.

Iraq – Unstable Now

Instability now - Elections

Henne 10 (Peter, Security Fellow, Truman National Security Project, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-henne/supporting-allawi-and-sta\_b\_548222.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

The United States cannot stay in Iraq forever, and Obama's plans for troop withdrawal should effectively transfer responsibility for Iraqi security to its government. But this does not mean we can ignore Iraq, or our obligation to stabilize the country we invaded. President Obama should throw his support behind Allawi as the democratically-elected leader, and make it clear that any attempt to reverse the electoral outcome will be met with US disapproval.

If al-Maliki regains control and the Sunnis lose faith in the system, the United States will be forced to decide between abandoning Iraq as it explodes or re-committing a significant number of troops to the country. If, instead, the US supports Allawi now, this would represent not an expanded US presence, but rather insurance that we can withdraw responsibly from Iraq.

Iraq – Alt Causality – Non-US

Iran fuels Iraqi instability

Khonsari 6 (Mehrdad - Iran Press Service, http://www.iran-press-service.com/ips/articles-2006/august2006/hezbollah\_iran\_25806.shtml, AD: 7/9/10) jl

By providing substantial assistance of all kinds to their hard-line Shi’ite and Sunni allies, in unison with Syria through unchecked borders, Teheran has been able to enhance its own position in Iraq by promoting insecurity and mayhem to the detriment of most Iraqi citizens.

While Iranian officials have often shed crocodile tears for the suffering people of Iraq and spoken of the need for constructive progress, those cries have hardly been matched by the actions of the Revolutionary Guards or their local mercenaries who have pursued an opposite agenda in fuelling the current insurgency.

Ethnic Conflicts produce massive instability

NIE 7 (National Intelligence Estimates, http://www.dni.gov/press\_releases/20070202\_release.pdf, AD: 7/9/10) jl

For key Sunni regimes, intense communal warfare, Shia gains in Iraq, and Iran’s assertive role have heightened fears of regional instability and unrest and contributed to a growing polarization between Iran and Syria on the one hand and other Middle East governments on the other. But traditional regional rivalries, deepening ethnic and sectarian violence in Iraq over the past year, persistent anti-Americanism in the region, anti-Shia prejudice among Arab states, and fears of being perceived by their publics as abandoning their Sunni co-religionists in Iraq have constrained Arab states’ willingness to engage politically and economically with the Shia-dominated government in Baghdad and led them to consider unilateral support to Sunni groups.

Ethnic conflicts cause rapid deterioration of Iraq

NIE 7 (National Intelligence Estimates, http://www.dni.gov/press\_releases/20070202\_release.pdf, AD: 7/9/10) jl

A number of identifiable internal security and political triggering events, including sustained mass sectarian killings, assassination of major religious and political leaders, and a complete Sunni defection from the government have the potential to convulse severely Iraq’s security environment. Should these events take place, they could spark an abrupt increase in communal and insurgent violence and shift Iraq’s trajectory from gradual decline to rapid deterioration with grave humanitarian, political, and security consequences. Three prospective security paths might then emerge:

Water shortages fuel instability

Gustin 9 (Hadley, MNDaily Writer, http://www.mndaily.com/2009/12/06/water-evaporates-stability-middle-east, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Fortunately, today, this is not an issue for most Americans, but for those in the Middle East it is a different story. Regrettably, Middle Eastern nations are currently experiencing many problems with water paucity; as the global population continues to grow exponentially, these crises will only worsen. In April of 2006, an article in The Middle East magazine stated that “in 1990, 20 countries were listed as water-scarce by CNIE, an organization which monitors water supplies.” With eight of these nations being Middle Eastern, it is a wonder that immediate resolutions were not enacted to stem further escalation of this problem, the root of tensions in the region. The projections for 2025 are even worse with an additional “10 to 15 water-scare nations globally.” Of these newcomers, “Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Oman and Syria” are from the Middle East.

If this predicament does not improve, we will see less regional stability. However, at present, the most notable conflicts in the Middle East are between the Israelis and Palestinians and between the Sunnis, Shi’ites and Kurds in Iraq. While both disputes are distinct, they also share the critical dilemma of water shortage.

Iraq – Alt Causality – Non-US

Water shortages cause migration that destabilize the region and produce conflict

Gustin 9 (Hadley, MNDaily Writer, http://www.mndaily.com/2009/12/06/water-evaporates-stability-middle-east, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Iraq has a similar situation with water dearth. Though, conversely, it has more to do with the deterioration of antique aqueducts than a majority peoples’ domination of the country’s freshwater supply. Particularly, in the areas closest to Iran, people are migrating away from their homes and ancestral lands in search of useable water sources. Dale Lightfoot, a professor of geography at Oklahoma State University, noted that “migrations [will affect] the relative stability of the Kurdish-controlled region that largely escaped violence in southern Iraq following the United States’ 2003 invasion.” Because Iraq’s Sunni and Shi’a Arabs have access to the majority of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, the Kurds are at the greatest disadvantage. However, much of the Shi’ite population resides along the central and southern parts of the border with Iran. Therefore, migration from this area could potentially rise in the future which will no doubt further tensions with the Sunnis.

Iraq – No Escalation

Spill over is empirically denied

Cook, Takeyh and Maloney 7 (Steven A, Ray, and Suzanne – Fellows at Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.iht.com/articles/2007/06/28/opinion/edtakeyh.php, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight.

Escalation is impossible—weak armies

Yglesias 7 (Matthew, The Atlantic, http://matthewyglesias.theatlantic.com/archives/2007/09/containing\_iraq.php, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Kevin Drum tries to throw some water on the "Middle East in Flames" theory holding that American withdrawal from Iraq will lead not only to a short-term intensification of fighting in Iraq, but also to some kind of broader regional conflagration. Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, as usual sensible but several clicks to my right, also make this point briefly in Democracy: "Talk that Iraq’s troubles will trigger a regional war is overblown; none of the half-dozen civil wars the Middle East has witnessed over the past half-century led to a regional conflagration." Also worth mentioning in this context is the basic point that the Iranian and Syrian militaries just aren't able to conduct meaningful offensive military operations. The Saudi, Kuwait, and Jordanian militaries are even worse. The IDF has plenty of Arabs to fight closer to home. What you're looking at, realistically, is that our allies in Kurdistan might provide safe harbor to PKK guerillas, thus prompting our allies in Turkey to mount some cross-border military strikes against the PKK or possibly retaliatory ones against other Kurdish targets. This is a real problem, but it's obviously not a problem that's mitigated by having the US Army try to act as the Baghdad Police Department or sending US Marines to wander around the desert hunting a possibly mythical terrorist organization.

No regional escalation—empirically denied

Drum 7 (Kevin, Washington Monthly Writer, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/archives/individual/2007\_09/012029.php, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Having admitted, however, that the odds of a military success in Iraq are almost impossibly long, Chaos Hawks nonetheless insist that the U.S. military needs to stay in Iraq for the foreseeable future. Why? Because if we leave the entire Middle East will become a bloodbath. Sunni and Shiite will engage in mutual genocide, oil fields will go up in flames, fundamentalist parties will take over, and al-Qaeda will have a safe haven bigger than the entire continent of Europe. Needless to say, this is nonsense. Israel has fought war after war in the Middle East. Result: no regional conflagration. Iran and Iraq fought one of the bloodiest wars of the second half the 20th century. Result: no regional conflagration. The Soviets fought in Afghanistan and then withdrew. No regional conflagration. The U.S. fought the Gulf War and then left. No regional conflagration. Algeria fought an internal civil war for a decade. No regional conflagration.

Iraq – Impact Helpers

Instability in Iraq spills over into the entire region

Pollack 4 (Kenneth M, Sr. Fellow & Director of Research @ Saban Center for Middle East Policy, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2004/01iraq\_pollack/20040107.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Various political, military, and economic factors make it unlikely that Washington will simply maintain its current economic and military commitments to Iraq indefinitely, however. The key question is whether the Bush Administration adapts its policy to the needs of reconstruction or instead opts to phase out its engagement in Iraq. There is enough good in Iraq and enough positive developments there that if the United States and its Coalition allies are willing to address the challenges listed above, there is every reason to believe that Iraq could be a stable, prosperous, and pluralist society within a period of 5–15 years. In contrast, there is great danger for the United States in disengaging from Iraq. Without a strong American role, at least behind the scenes, the negative forces in the country would almost certainly produce Lebanon-like chaos and civil war that would quickly spill across Iraq’s borders and destabilize politically and economically fragile neighbors such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iran, and Syria, and possibly Turkey and Kuwait as well.

Iraqi instability spills over globally

Ferguson 6 (Niall, Professor of History at Harvard University, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html, AD: 7/8/10) jl

What makes the escalating civil war in Iraq so disturbing is that it has the potential to spill over into neighboring countries. The Iranian government is already taking more than a casual interest in the politics of post-Saddam Iraq. And yet Iran, with its Sunni and Kurdish minorities, is no more homogeneous than Iraq. Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Syria cannot be expected to look on insouciantly if the Sunni minority in central Iraq begins to lose out to what may seem to be an Iranian-backed tyranny of the majority. The recent history of Lebanon offers a reminder that in the Middle East there is no such thing as a contained civil war. Neighbors are always likely to take an unhealthy interest in any country with fissiparous tendencies.

The obvious conclusion is that a new "war of the world" may already be brewing in a region that, incredible though it may seem, has yet to sate its appetite for violence. And the ramifications of such a Middle Eastern conflagration would be truly global. Economically, the world would have to contend with oil at above $100 a barrel. Politically, those countries in western Europe with substantial Muslim populations might also find themselves affected as sectarian tensions radiated outward. Meanwhile, the ethnic war between Jews and Arabs in Israel, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank shows no sign of abating. Is it credible that the United States will remain unscathed if the Middle East erupts?

Iraq – Presence High

US presence will remain high – election violence

Alaaldin 10 (Ranj, Guardian Journalist, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/may/01/iraq-elections-allawi-maliki, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Iraq continues to be embroiled in its messy post-election coalition-building process. It has become so messy that the US may well be rethinking its withdrawal plans, and particularly its withdrawal of all combat troops at the end of August. In the past few weeks, amid a number of terror attacks, two key developments have taken place: an order by an electoral panel to have all the votes cast in Baghdad manually recounted; and a ruling that paves the way for [banning some elected candidates](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/apr/26/iraq-election-candidates-disqualified) because of their sympathies for the outlawed Ba'ath party. Reports suggest [at least two of these candidates](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/8644097.stm) won seats in the 325-member Iraqi parliament; both belong to the winning bloc of the Iraqi National Movement (INM), led by Ayad Allawi who won 91 seats, ahead of Nouri al-Maliki and his State of Law coalition's 89 seats. The banning of other INM elected members is also possible within the next couple of weeks. Together, the recount and the ban, may give Maliki little more than three or four additional seats, making him the overall electoral winner. But many will question what difference it will make, since Iraq's supreme court has already ruled that it is the largest post-election parliamentary alliance, rather than the largest vote winner, that can form the next government. Any changes in Maliki's favour strengthen his hand in his push to retain the premiership and have his State of Law coalition lead the next government. State of Law (and indeed, Maliki) will redeem the prestige lost when INM was declared the largest single bloc after the elections. In such a position, Maliki could also be more willing to negotiate with INM since he would rather Allawi and INM played second-fiddle to him (as runners-up) than the other way around. Maliki has also reportedly encountered internal problems within his Islamic Dawa party, with some factions in the group opposing another tenure for him. Any changes in his favour would constitute a political boost and help to silence his critics. The decisions on the recount and the bans may be perceived on the Iraqi street as yet another set of attempts to sideline the Sunni voice in post-2003 Iraqi politics. But it is too easy to assume that they mark the beginning of the return to Iraq's violent past. Although there is cause for concern, [as argued this week by Simon Tisdall](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/apr/27/us-iraq-unfinished-business), the recount itself was expected since both Allawi and Maliki complained of irregularities in the voting process and count. Also, he decision to ban the candidates was made on election day itself, meaning all the political entities had ample warning of what was to come; significant in this context is that the ban will not dramatically alter the allocation of seats. The extent to which both rulings will adversely impact on Iraq's political process and, indeed, US withdrawal plans will, of course, depend on Allawi and the INM's own reactions to them – whether, that is, their reactions will go beyond rhetoric. Allawi's coalition, it should be noted, contains fierce ultra-nationalists all too capable of igniting damaging and destructive violence, but there is a feeling that Iraq's political actors, some of them former insurgency members, have matured and given up their futile and costly ways of violence. INM would certainly be concerned about the possibility of the recount justifying State of Law's calls for a manual recount in other provinces, particularly if it provides for any significant changes. As a result of all this, a government is unlikely to be formed until August or perhaps even September, creating a vacuum that terrorists are all too happy to try to fill, and leaving the US with sufficient justification to alter its withdrawal plans.

Iraq – Presence Low

US presence in Iraq is declining

Kruzel 10 (John J, American Forces Press Service, 3/24, http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=58461, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Meanwhile, the number of U.S. forces in Iraq is set to fall to 50,000 by Sept. 1, in accordance with an agreement between Washington and Baghdad. Some 97,000 U.S. troops are in Iraq now, compared to 83,000 American and 45,000 allied forces in Afghanistan, defense officials said.

Troop levels are decreasing

Jakes 10 (Lara, USA Today Staff Writer, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2010-02-16-iraq-troops\_N.htm, AD: 7/9/10) jl

BAGHDAD (AP) — The number of American troops in [Iraq](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Places,+Geography/Countries/Iraq) has dropped below 100,000 for the first time since the [2003 U.S.-led invasion](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Events+and+Awards/War/Iraq+War), the U.S. military said Tuesday.

The U.S. military plans on maintaining its current 98,000 troops on the ground in Iraq through the March 7 elections, said 1st Lt. Elizabeth Feste, an army spokeswoman in [Baghdad](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Places,+Geography/Towns,+Cities,+Counties/Baghdad).

Withdrawal is steadily occurring and will be done by the end of next year

Jakes 10 (Lara, USA Today Staff Writer, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2010-02-16-iraq-troops\_N.htm, AD: 7/9/10) jl

That's in line with what Gen. [Ray Odierno](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/People/Military/Ray+Odierno), the top U.S. commander in Iraq, has said would remain in place until at least 60 days after the election — a period during which he has said Iraq's new government will be at its most vulnerable.

President Obama has ordered all but 50,000 troops to leave Iraq by Aug. 31. The remainder will pull out by the end of next year under an Iraqi-American security agreement.

"The withdrawal pace remains on target for about 50,000 at the end of August 2010," Feste said.

\*\*\*JAPAN\*\*\*

US-Japan Relations High

US-Japan relations high – Hosono restored confidence

Rogin 10 (Josh, Foreign Policy, http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/06/21/hosono\_washington\_can\_trust\_japan\_again, AD: 7/8/10) jl

The new acting secretary general of Japan's ruling party took time out of a heated campaign to visit Washington briefly Friday night, to deliver the message that the Obama administration no longer has to worry about the Japanese government's commitment to the U.S.-Japan alliance.

In what several observers called his "reassurance tour," rising star Goshi Hosono spoke to a group of experts and officials at a dinner hosted by the Center for a New American Security, the culminating event of the think tank's two-day conference on U.S.-Japan relations. Hosono took over the position when former Secretary General Ichiro Ozawa stepped down along with Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama last month.

Hosono was forceful, even aggressive, in describing the importance of the security relationship between the world's top two economies and the need for Japan to take a larger and more active role in regional security operations.

US-Japan Relations Low

Relations low – Futenma Incident

Clemons 10 (Steve, Director of American Strategy Program, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-clemons/will-okinawas-voice-be-he\_b\_611713.html, AD: 7/8/10) jl

People there will try to convince themselves that the U.S. did not push too hard for Futenma, did not help collapse a government, and that there is nothing too serious lurking beneath the political surface among regular Japanese about the Futenma incident. All will be well. All will be well.

After having spent some time in Tokyo and Okinawa this past week with journalist [James Fallows](http://www.theatlantic.com/james-fallows) and other leading political writers and thinkers in Japan, I don't believe that this confidence in the "status quo" is very wise. Many Japanese feel throttled by their American ally and feel that they have less and less choice in the security relationship -- constrained both by regional realities and an American overlord that doesn't understand how serious the strain of Futenma is on those Japanese who live near it -- and how serious a psychological issue Futenma remains to many Japanese on other islands who used to never give a moment's thought to the downside costs of the US-Japan security relationship and are now vividly aware given the palace intrigue of late in US-Japan relations.

Relations low – Futenma and Okinawa base

Talmadge 10 (Eric, AP Writer, 6/22, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5islkPj\_84APsquFWNdqr2kuTwDQw69GG68080, AD: 7/8/10) jl

But while the alliance is one of the strongest Washington has anywhere in the world, it has come under intense pressure lately over a plan to make sweeping reforms that would pull back roughly 8,600 Marines from Okinawa to the U.S. Pacific territory of Guam.

The move was conceived in response to opposition on Okinawa to the large U.S. military presence there — more than half of the U.S. troops in Japan are on Okinawa, which was one of the bloodiest battlefields of World War II.

Though welcomed by many at first, the relocation plan has led to renewed Okinawan protests over the U.S. insistence it cannot be carried out unless a new base is built on Okinawa to replace one that has been set for closing for more than a decade.

A widening rift between Washington and Tokyo over the future of the Futenma Marine Corps Air Station was a major factor in the resignation of Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama earlier this month. It could well plague Kan as well.

Japan – No Rearm – General

Japan won’t rearm – Taboo, nuclear umbrella, and no will

Chanlett-Avery and Nikitin 9 (Emma - Specialist in Asian Affairs, Mary - Analys in Nonproliferation, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34487.pdf, AD: 6/22/10) jl

The notion of Japan developing nuclear weapons has long been considered far-fetched and even taboo, particularly within Japan. Hailed as an example of the success of the international nonproliferation regime, Japan has consistently taken principled stands on non-proliferation and disarmament issues. Domestically, the largely pacifist Japanese public, with lingering memories of the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by atomic bombs in the closing days of World War II, has widely rejected any nuclear capacity as morally unacceptable. The inclusion of Japan under the U.S. nuclear “umbrella,” with regular reiterations from U.S. officials, provides a guarantor to Japanese security. Successive Japanese administrations and commissions have concluded that Japan has little to gain and much to lose in terms of its own security if it pursues a nuclear weapons capability.

Japan – No Rearm – Taboo

No impact – Nuclear Taboo

Suto 7 (Takaya, Center for the Promotion of Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, http://www.cpdnp.jp/pdf/Iran.pdf, AD: 6/22/10) jl

As the only victim of nuclear bombs dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japanese people have strong sentiment against nuclear weapons (nuclear taboo or nuclear allergy). Japan is strictly observing the “Three Non-nuclear Principles”; not possessing, not producing, and not permitting the introduction of nuclear weapons to Japan. Japan is also refraining from exporting weapons to foreign countries. Also the use of nuclear energy is strictly limited to peaceful purpose by national legislation and under the IAEA safeguards.

Japan – No Rearm – No Public Will

No impact – Public will block rearm

Chanlett-Avery and Nikitin 9 (Emma - Specialist in Asian Affairs, Mary - Analys in Nonproliferation, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34487.pdf, AD: 6/22/10) jl

In general, public opinion on defense issues in Japan appears to be shifting somewhat, but pacifist sentiment remains significant. In the past, Japanese public opinion strongly supported the limitations placed on the Japanese military, but this opposition has softened considerably since the late 1990s. Despite this overall shifting tide, the “nuclear allergy” among the general public remains strong. The devastation of the atomic bombings led Japanese society to recoil from any military use of nuclear energy. Observers say that the Japanese public remains overwhelmingly opposed to nuclearization, pointing to factors like an educational system that promotes pacifism and the few surviving victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki who serve as powerful reminders of the bombs’ effects.

Japan – No Rearm – NPT

NPT agreements prevent Japanese Rearm

Chanlett-Avery and Nikitin 9 (Emma - Specialist in Asian Affairs, Mary - Analys in Nonproliferation, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34487.pdf, AD: 6/22/10) jl

Japan is obligated under Article 2 of the NPT not to “receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.” Under Article 3 of the NPT, Japan is required to accept IAEA full-scope safeguards on its civilian nuclear program. Japan signed an Additional Protocol in 1998 under which the IAEA can use an expanded range of measures to verify that civilian facilities and materials have not been diverted to a military program.

Japan – No Rearm – Political Pressure

Outside political pressures make flip flop on nuclear weapons impossible

Chanlett-Avery and Nikitin 9 (Emma - Specialist in Asian Affairs, Mary - Analys in Nonproliferation, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34487.pdf, AD: 6/22/10) jl

Diplomatically, the policy turn-about would have profound implications. Japan has built a reputation as a leader in non-proliferation and as a promoter of nuclear disarmament. It has consistently called for a “safe world free of nuclear weapons on the earliest possible date.” Japan submits a resolution to the General Assembly’s First Committee each year on a nuclear-free world and submits working papers to the NPT review conferences and preparatory committees on disarmament. It has been a vocal advocate for IAEA verification and compliance and was the first to respond with sanctions to nuclear tests in South Asia and North Korea. It has been a constant voice in support of nuclear disarmament in international fora. An about-face on its non-nuclear weapon state status would dramatically change the global view of Japan, or might dramatically change the perception of nuclear weapons possession in the world. This move could have profound implications for nuclear proliferation elsewhere, perhaps leading to additional NPT withdrawals. Acquiring nuclear weapons could also hurt Japan’s long-term goal of permanent membership on the U.N. Security Council.

\*\*\*KUWAIT\*\*\*

Kuwait – Stable Now

Kuwait is stabilizing now

Kuwait Times 10 (6/27, http://www.kuwaittimes.net/read\_news.php?newsid=MTAwMjUxMDcwMA==, AD: 7/9/10) jl

According to the index, Kuwait has witnessed the biggest positive changes in the area of political indicators. The country moved up from 6.5 to 6.0 in the indicator of 'Criminalization and/or Delegitimization of the State,' from 3.5 to 3.1 in "Progressive Deterioration of Public Services, and Suspension or Arbitrary Application of the Rule of Law,' and lastly from 6.9 to 6.5 in the indicator 'Widespread Violation of Human Rights.'

Kuwait is stable – investor confidence

Thompson 8 (Richard - ME Business Intelligence, http://www.meed.com/sectors/economy/political-stability-must-be-first-step-in-kuwait/1017982.article, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Kuwait is trying to improve its investment environment, taking action that is needed if it is to make a success of the $265bn worth of projects the country has planned. It also needs to create jobs in the coming years for the 40 per cent of the population that are under 20 years old.

Reducing the tax for non-Kuwaiti firms to a flat rate of 15 per cent from the previous maximum of 55 per cent is a welcome move for foreign investors. Kuwait is also considering the establishment of a new capital markets authority, which would help to bring in even more foreign capital.

The revision of the build-operate-transfer law is another sign that conditions for investors are improving. The law extends the concession period for a construction project to up to 40 years. Previously, private developers had to transfer projects back to the public sector after 20 years, barely enough time to break even, let alone make a profit.

Kuwait is stable – Functional government

BTI 10 (Bertelsmann Stiftung - Nonprofit Organization aiming at reforms and democracy, http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/1397.0.html, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Kuwait is a relatively stable state. There are no major open conflicts within the ruling family, although the al-Salem branch of the al-Sabah family has recently been sidelined. Procedures for choosing the emir, crown prince, prime minister and the cabinet are clearly defined. Conflicts between the government and the parliament occur regularly, and the emir has dissolved parliament five times since 1976. In the last three cases (1999, 2006, 2008), he heeded the constitutional requirement to call new elections afterwards.

Kuwait is comparatively much more stable than other states in the region

BTI 10 (Bertelsmann Stiftung - Nonprofit Organization aiming at reforms and democracy, http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/1397.0.html, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Compared with those in other Gulf states, civil society in Kuwait is well-developed. There are numerous trade unions, women’s organizations, cultural clubs and some professional associations for journalists and lawyers. On occasion, all of these interest groups make their voices heard and present their demands to the government. At the same time, informal networks of tribal and family members remain very strong throughout Kuwaiti society and are generally able to successfully mediate between their respective groups and the political system.

Most people seem to have a positive view of democracy and a relatively large segment of the population participates in elections. In the last parliamentary elections of May 2008, the turnout of registered voters was 69%.

Kuwait – Unstable Now

Instability now – massive corruption

Kuwait Times 9 (http://www.zawya.com/Story.cfm/sidZAWYA20090604042143/Kuwait%20Corruption%20Levels%20On%20The%20Rise, AD: 7/9/10) jl

KUWAIT: Corruption and bribery is perceived to be increasing in Kuwait, according to the 2009 Global Corruption Barometer, a new study that was conducted by Transparency International (TI), an international anti-corruption watchdog. The results of the survey were released yesterday. Some 20 percent of the respondents in Kuwait claimed to have paid a bribe themselves or knew someone in their household who did in the past year. "Kuwait's average (perceived corruption) was higher this year than the previous year and was higher when compared globally," explained Tamara Kamhawi, TI program coordinator for Middle East and Africa.  
In a telephone interview with the Kuwait Times yesterday, Kamhawi said, "When surveyed, results showed that Kuwait was most unhappy with its civil servants and public officials." She also noted that the survey results on Kuwait indicated the majority of the 801 polled were satisfied with the judicial system.

Prefer our evidence – expert opinions are more accurate

Kuwait Times 9 (http://www.zawya.com/Story.cfm/sidZAWYA20090604042143/Kuwait%20Corruption%20Levels%20On%20The%20Rise, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Generally, figures show a correlation between the public perception of corruption and that of the experts. However, this is not the case for Kuwait, where it was found that people believed that corruption was less prevalent than what experts viewed it to be.

Instability in Iraq will spill over into Kuwait

Reuters 10 (1/17, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE60G03C, AD: 7/9/10) jl

KUWAIT Jan 17 (Reuters) - Kuwait fears a rise in militant attacks and sectarian tensions in Iraq could cause a new security threat for the Gulf Arab oil producer, a minister said in remarks published on Sunday.  
The sectarian bloodshed unleashed by the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq has largely abated but U.S. and Shi'ite-dominated Iraqi authorities expect attacks by Sunni militants to increase ahead of key parliamentary elections in March.   
Large-scale bombings killed dozens this month across Iraq, which Baghdad blamed on al Qaeda militants and elements of former leader Saddam Hussein's outlawed Baath party.  
"I'm worried about the collapse of the security system in Iraq, which could drive many Iraqis to seek refuge in Kuwait," Foreign Minister Sheikh Mohammad al-Salem al-Sabah told al-Qabas daily.

Violence is spilling over into Iraq – Terrorism is on the rise

Reuters 10 (1/17, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE60G03C, AD: 7/9/10) jl

"I am worried about ... a sectarian conflict that would spread to Kuwait ... I'm worried that conflicts, terrorism and al Qaeda groups could spread to Kuwait," he said.   
Kuwait, which is almost one-third Shi'ite, waged a largely successful campaign to stamp out violence by Islamist militants after the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on U.S. cities and Iraq war.  
Last year, Kuwait said it had foiled an al Qaeda-linked plan to bomb a U.S. army camp and an oil refinery in the OPEC oil exporting state.

Kuwait – Alt Causality – Iran

Kuwait is unstable because of Iranian supported terrorism.

Badran 10 (“The shape of things to come with Iran” Tony, research fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, May 11, http://www.nowlebanon.com/Sub.aspx?ID=125478)KM

Just as Egypt’s judiciary handed down convictions in the case of a Hezbollah cell that it uncovered, reports surfaced that an Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps cell had also been broken up in Kuwait.   This type of Iranian action, while hardly new, is a harbinger of what’s to come once Tehran, which is seeking hegemony over the Middle East and senses an American retreat from the region, crosses the nuclear threshold. It also highlights the precariousness of any containment policy against Iran and its regional proxies.    The Kuwaiti daily Al-Qabas first broke the story almost two weeks ago, and Kuwaiti and Saudi officials have since confirmed the existence of the cell. While officials have remained publicly tight-lipped about the specifics of the story, and an official order has been handed down forbidding the publication of any further information, several of the details in the newspaper reports are of interest.     The members of the cell apparently included two stateless citizens (known as al-bidoun), a Lebanese citizen who acted as the cell’s liaison with the Iranians, as well as several military officers. One report in Al-Qabas, quoting informed sources, claimed the spy network extended to Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates – which was roundly denied by Saudi Interior Minister Prince Nayef Bin Abdul Aziz. The Kuwaitis, however, are demanding an overhaul of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) security agreement (which Kuwait had previously refrained from signing) in light of “new challenges,” likely meaning the threat of Iranian security breaches.    Kuwait has had something of a history with Iran and Hezbollah. In the 1980s, Kuwait suffered attacks and two infamous airliner hijackings at the hands of Hezbollah (in cooperation with the Iraqi Al-Daawa Party) and Imad Mugniyah, the man who would head the party’s external operations network until his assassination in 2008.     After Mugniyah’s assassination, a commemoration rally was held for him in Kuwait, praising his legacy and absolving him of any wrongdoing against the state. Shia parliamentarians involved in the rally were expelled from their parliamentary bloc and placed in custody on suspicion of belonging to the Kuwaiti Hezbollah. The Kuwaiti authorities deported foreigners who had participated in the rally, which reportedly included Bahrainis, Lebanese and Iranians.     The episode led to an intimidation campaign against Kuwait in Lebanon. Its embassy in Beirut came under bomb threat (followed by a telephone call from a Hezbollah official assuring the diplomats that they would be safe!). This led to a Kuwaiti government travel advisory warning its nationals to avoid Lebanon. And just to make sure the Kuwaitis showed respect to Mugniyah, a massive portrait of him was placed on the embassy’s wall by Hezbollah supporters.

Kuwait – Alt Causality – Government

Kuwait’s government makes it a destabilizing force – neighbors are uneasy and Kuwait suspends democracy at will.

Terrill 7 (KUWAITI NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE U.S.-KUWAITI STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP AFTER SADDAM” W. Andrew the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) September, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub788.pdf)KM

This division has sometimes had regional implications as the often confrontational Kuwaiti style of politics has occasionally scandalized neighboring states with more powerful and traditional monarchies. Such states occasionally view Kuwait as a worrisome example for their own population. 20 The Kuwaiti parliament and the democratic process in Kuwait have also experienced serious setbacks. The royal government suspended parliament from 1976 until 1981 and then again from 1986 until 1992. According to the Constitution, such suspensions are legal if they are followed by new elections within 60 days, a provision which was ignored in each of these cases. The parliament was briefly suspended again in 1999 over problems resulting from misprints in free copies of the Koran published by the state. 21 Another brief suspension occurred in 2006. Both of these later suspensions were constitutional since they were followed by elections in the allotted time frame.

\*\*\*SOUTH KOREA\*\*\*

US-ROK Relations High

Relations are at an all time high – strategic cooperation

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

In this dynamic context, the Obama administration used its first year in office to strengthen the U.S.-South Korean alliance. Presidents Obama and Lee Myung-bak established an effective working relationship and their two administrations consulted closely, especially on North Korea policy. The two presidents declared that bilateral relations have “never been stronger.” Building on President Bush’s efforts in 2008 with the new South Korean administration, President Obama and President Lee issued a major “Joint Vision” statement on pursuing “a comprehensive strategic alliance.” President Obama supported President Lee’s efforts for South Korea to play a global role, including South Korea’s hosting of the November 2010 G20 summit and the 2012 Nuclear Security Summit. In response to North Korean actions, President Obama underlined the U.S. security commitment to South Korea, and the United States and South Korea continued effectively to implement the important alliance and military basing reforms initiated by previous administrations.

Relations are high – they’re prioritized over other issues

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

The New Beginnings policy study group of U.S. experts on Northeast Asia was formed in January 2008 in anticipation that the impending changes of administration in both the United States and the Republic of Korea (ROK, or South Korea) would offer the two countries “a major opportunity to strengthen their alliance and to transform it into a global partnership.”1 We are pleased that the governments of the United States and South Korea have indeed used the opportunity to make important progress toward those goals. South Korean President Lee Myung-bak, inaugurated in February 2008, made clear from the outset of his administration that he attached top priority to his country’s alliance with the United States. He worked closely with President George W. Bush in the latter’s final year in office to set a new tone in bilateral relations, laying the basis for further progress during President Barack Obama’s first year in office in 2009. The two countries’ leaders now say, with considerable justification, that bilateral relations have “never been stronger.”2

Relations high – partnership on a range of issues

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Alliance management is of course a continuing process, and, as President Lee said during President Obama’s visit to Seoul in November 2009, the relationship “can become even stronger.” Major challenges and issues remain, including North Korea, ongoing updates to U.S.-South Korean security arrangements, and regional and global concerns that range from the economic crisis to international aid and peacekeeping. Fortunately, Presidents Obama and Lee share similar visions for alliance cooperation, and they have developed an excellent personal relationship. With President Lee having just entered the third year of his single five-year term in office, President Obama has the opportunity of three more years of joint efforts to build on their accomplishments. This report briefly reviews U.S.-ROK relations and offers recommendations to the Obama administration to strengthen the alliance and partnership between our two countries.

US-ROK Relations High

Relations high now – close consultation

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Presidents Obama and Lee deserve praise for their attention to the alliance and the progress that they have made in strengthening it during their first year of working together. Like President Lee, President Obama entered office convinced of the importance of the alliance and determined to strengthen it. As a result, consultation between the leaders of the two countries has never been closer or more cooperative. The two leaders held several summits, as well as a number of meetings at international events, supplemented by frequent telephone conversations. Following up on the work of President Bush, President Obama issued a “Joint Vision” statement with President Lee on June 16, 2009, in which the two leaders pledged to build “a comprehensive strategic alliance of bilateral, regional, and global scope.”3 They instructed their foreign and defense ministers to meet as a group in 2010, and Secretary of State Clinton and Foreign Minister Yu plan also to reinvigorate the bilateral “Strategic Consultation for Allied Partnership” (SCAP), a foreign ministerial-level strategic consultative process launched in 2006.

Relations are high – public popularity

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Given his personal popularity in South Korea, President Obama could effectively help to strengthen the long-term basis of the alliance by taking time to reach out to the South Korean public. We recommend that he consider engaging the younger generation in South Korea during future visits, such as the November 2010 G20 summit in Seoul. Korea’s inclusion in the Visa Waiver Program (VWP) has proven successful in increasing South Korean tourism to the United States and in making South Koreans regard the bilateral relationship as a partnership. The Work, English Study and Travel (WEST) program for student exchanges is also potentially very helpful. It encountered start-up problems, some of which have been resolved. We recommend robust support for the program and the early initiation of U.S. student exchanges to Korea along similar lines.

Conflict has de-escalated – Cheonan controversy is being resolved

Kim 7/9 (Hyung-Jin, AP Correspondent, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5j\_3iCnaJgfjAXReTvUJNdZ224FnQD9GRJ1CO0, AD: 7/9/10) jl

SEOUL, South Korea — North Korea on Friday proposed military talks with the United States next week to discuss the sinking of a South Korean warship which Washington blames on the North.

The proposal was made ahead of the U.N. Security Council's approval Friday of a statement that condemned the sinking of the warship Cheonan, without directly blaming the North.

An international investigation concluded in May that North Korea torpedoed the vessel near the tense Korean sea border, killing 46 sailors. The North vehemently denies the accusations and has warned any punishment would trigger war.

Late last month, the American-led U.N. Command, which oversees an armistice that ended the Korean War in 1953, proposed general-level talks with North Korea to discuss the warship sinking. The North, however, rejected the offer, urging Washington not to interfere in inter-Korean affairs under the name of the U.N.

On Friday, however, the North reversed its position and proposed a working-level contact between colonels with the U.S. next Tuesday at the border village of Panmunjom to prepare for the general-grade talks.

US-ROK Relations Low

Relations are low – Free Trade Agreements

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Presidents Obama and Lee have nearly three more years of overlap in office to deal with pending and future alliance issues. Unfortunately, the Obama administration has so far failed to bring the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA) before Congress for approval. Continued failure to do so will not only hurt the American economy and cost American jobs, but will also reduce U.S. credibility and influence with South Korea and all of East Asia.

Relations low – KORUS FTA

Ahn and Noerper 10 (Heath - Korean Studies Program Coordinator @ Stanford, Stephen - VP Korean Society, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/6219/New\_Beginnings\_FINAL\_May\_2010.pdf, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Failure to ratify the KORUS FTA hurts American credibility and influence, both with the ROK and within Northeast Asia as a whole. Economically, the United States’ share of trade with South Korea has been steadily declining in recent years compared to China, the EU, and Japan. As President Lee has frankly stated, the ROK, with a view to the strategic situation in Northeast Asia, has specifically sought to make its ally, the United States, its first major FTA partner.6 If the United States does not soon ratify the KORUS FTA, the ROK will probably proceed to finalize its pending FTA with the EU, and eventually negotiate FTAs with China and a number of other countries. The result will be relatively weaker American ties with the ROK and reduced American stature in the region.

No – North Korea War

Conflict won’t escalate – It’s all hype, China deters, and economic sanctions all prevent war

Mottram 5/25 (Linda, Austrailian Broadcasting Corporation Reporter, "North is bluffing says South Korea's ambassador to Australia," http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/asiapac/stories/201005/s2909210.htm, 6/5/10) jl

South Korea's ambassador to Australia Woosang Kim says North Korea is bluffing and that current tensions on the peninsula won't escalate to military action.  
The Ambassador also says he's confident North Korea's main international backer, China, will play it's part to calm the crisis. As he spoke in Canberra, Beijing's special representative for Korean affairs was meeting South Korea's foreign minister as part of Seoul's diplomatic push to secure international support. The push comes after the South announced it was cutting trade and other contacts and barring the North's merchant ships from using it's sea lanes over the finding that a North Korean submarine torpedoed and sank a South Korean ship in March, killing 46. Seoul is also referring the issue to the United Nations Security Council -- and that's where China's veto could either make or break a push for new sanctions against the North.

No impact to Korean war

Meyer 3 (Carlton, former marine and editor of G2mil.com, http://www.g2mil.com/korea.htm, AD: 7/8/10) jl

When Pentagon officials talk about the need to maintain a “two-war” capability, they often refer to Korea. This is absurd since South Korea can crush North Korea without American help. North Korea’s million-man army may look impressive on paper, but remember that Iraq had a million-man army, which also had modern equipment, combat experience, and plenty of fuel. In contrast, North Korean soldiers suffer from malnutrition and rarely train due to a scarcity of fuel and ammo. Most North Korean soldiers could not attack because they are needed to defend the entire DMZ and coastal approaches (they remember the 1950 landing at Inchon) while entire divisions must remain throughout North Korea to fend off heliborne offensives, food riots, and probable coups.

There won’t be a war over North Korea and even if there is it won’t escalate

Adamson 2 (Deborah, CBS Market Watch, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/south-koreas-sudden-market-jitters, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Arjun Divecha, who manages the $1 billion GMO Emerging Markets fund said, ''I don't think it's that serious, actually. The probability of war is very low. Nobody wants war. It's about muscle flexing.''Umbarger said North Korea has done the same thing before. ''It's really not new news. This is not terribly different from how they have negotiated with the U.S. and U.N. in the past.''The threat today is similar to the situation faced in 1994, said John Chambers, chairman of the Sovereign Rating Committee at Standard & Poor's. ''We don't think there will be war and we don't think North Korea will collapse,'' Chambers said. ''North Korea will be a nuclear power and its neighbors will have to live with it. Just as it is with Pakistan.''Umbarger compared the current situation to political tensions before the Brazilian elections in October last year, but said T. Rowe Price will wait for the situation to subside before considering more investments. Meanwhile, foreign brokerage houses in Seoul also believed the nuclear situation will not escalate to an all-out war with North Korea.

No – North Korea War

No war – Nuclear Deterrence

Wahab 10 (Zakaria Abdul, Writer for Bernama, "South Korea, Us, To Act Further Over North Korea's Sinking Of Warship," 6/5, http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v5/newsgeneral.php?id=503722, AD: 6/5/10) jl

"North Korea must cease its belligerent behaviour and demonstrate clearly and decisively that it wants to pursue a different path," he said.  
The US defence secretary said the nations of this region shared the task of addressing these dangerous provocations as any inaction would amount to an abdication of their collective responsibility to protect the peace and reinforce stability in Asia.

Gates said that though it was a Pacific nation, the US believed that its security interests and economic well-being were integrally tied to Asia's, and it was increasing its deterrent capabilities in a number of ways to protect the region.  
Gates said the US would enhance its missile defences with the intent to develop capabilities in Asia that were flexible and deployable, tailored to the unique needs of its allies and partners and able to counter the clear and growing ballistic missile threats in the region.  
He said the US was also renewing its commitment to a strong and effective extended deterrence that would guarantee the safety of the American people and the defence of its allies and partners.  
He said the US was committed to reducing the role of nuclear weapons as it worked toward a world without such armaments, but, as long as these weapons existed, it would maintain a safe, secure, and effective nuclear arsenal.  
Gates also said that the US would continue to maintain its substantial forces in the region as a show of strength of US commitment and as a deterrent power.

The US would instantly win a war with North Korea – no escalation

Woolsey and McInerney 3 (General R. James – former CIA director and Thomas – retired Air Force Lieutenant, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/the-next-korean-war/236772.html, AD: 7/8/10) jl

U.S. and South Korean forces have spent nearly half a century preparing to fight and win such a war. We should not be intimidated by North Korea's much-discussed artillery. Around half of North Korea's 11,000-plus artillery pieces, some of them in caves, are in position to fire on Seoul. But all are vulnerable to stealth and precision weapons -- e.g., caves can be sealed by accurate munitions. Massive air power is the key to being able both to destroy Yongbyon and to protect South Korea from attack by missile or artillery. There is a significant number of hardened air bases available in South Korea and the South Koreans have an excellent air force of approximately 550 modern tactical aircraft. The United States should begin planning immediately to deploy the Patriot tactical ballistic missile defense system plus Aegis ships to South Korea and Japan, and also to reinforce our tactical air forces by moving in several air wings and aircraft carrier battle groups, together with the all-important surveillance aircraft and drones. The goal of the planning should be to be prepared on short notice both to destroy the nuclear capabilities at Yongbyon and other key North Korean facilities and to protect South Korea against attack by destroying North Korean artillery and missile sites. Our stealth aircraft, equipped with precision bombs, and cruise missiles will be crucial -- these weapons can be tailored to incinerate the WMD and minimize radiation leakage. The key point is that the base infrastructure available in the region and the accessibility of North Korea from the sea should make it possible to generate around 4,000 sorties a day compared to the 800 a day that were so effective in Iraq. When one contemplates that the vast majority of these sorties would use precision munitions, and that surveillance aircraft would permit immediate targeting of artillery pieces and ballistic missile launch sites, we believe the use of air power would be swifter and more devastating than it was in Iraq. North Korea's geriatric air defenses, both fighter aircraft and missiles, would not last long. As the Iraqis understood when facing U.S. air power, if you fly, you die. Marine forces deployed off both coasts of North Korea could put both Pyongyang and Wonson at risk of rapid seizure, particularly given the fact that most of North Korea's armed forces are situated along the DMZ. With more than 20 of the Army's 33 combat brigades now committed it would be necessary to call up additional Reserve and National Guard units. However, the U.S. forces that would have the greatest immediate effect are Expeditionary Air Forces and Carrier Battle Groups, most of which have now been removed from Iraq. The South Korean Army is well equipped to handle a counteroffensive into North Korea with help from perhaps two additional U.S. Army divisions, together with the above-mentioned Marine Expeditionary Force and dominant air power. We judge that the United States and South Korea could defeat North Korea decisively in 30 to 60 days with such a strategy. Importantly, there is "no doubt on the outcome" as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Meyers, said to the Senate at his reconfirmation hearing on July 26.

\*\*\*TURKEY\*\*\*

US-Turkey Relations High

**Relations high now—cooperation over the PKK, Iraq, and rising economic relations**

Karabat 6/24 (Ayse, Today’s Zaman, http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/news-214071-102-turkey-us-intel-sharing-against-pkk-working-fine-says-armitage.html

Intelligence sharing in northern Iraq, where the terrorist Kurdistan Workers’ Party’s (PKK) main camps are based, is working smoothly, according to the chairman of the American-Turkish Council (ATC), Ambassador Richard Armitage. Armitage, who is leading a delegation of visiting ATC members in Turkey, expressed his condolences to the Turkish nation for the victims of the recent terrorist attacks. Speaking about the level of cooperation between Turkey and the US against terrorist activity, he said, “When an ally is in trouble, we are troubled,” and added that intelligence sharing between the US and Turkey against the PKK is working, the cooperation between the two countries regarding Iraq and Afghanistan is going well and economic relations are improving, too. In related developments, US Assistant Secretary of State Philip J. Crowley also made a statement in a press conference yesterday on a PKK attack on Tuesday that killed five people in İstanbul and another PKK attack over the weekend that left 11 soldiers dead. He offered condolences to the families and friends of the victims, and said: “There has been no change in the level of US-Turkey cooperation in confronting the PKK. The PKK, as you know, is a Foreign Terrorist Organization and presents a joint common threat to Turkey, to Iraq and to the United States. They are a threat to the stability of the region and we support efforts by our Turkish allies and our Iraqi allies to deal with the challenge posed by the PKK.” However, during his statement Armitage also hinted that nowadays they have some difficulties in explaining some aspects of Turkish foreign policy back in the US, but they believe that talking more can overcome these difficulties.

Relations are strong—flotilla and sanctions incidents don’t harm relations

Rozen 6/21 (Politico, national security correspondent, Laura, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0610/38806.html,

But Tan insisted there has been no breach in the U.S.-Turkey relationship in the wake of either the flotilla episode or Turkey’s vote against the Iran sanctions resolution. “We have excellent relations with all members of the administration,” Tan said. “We are able to talk with them in an extensive, comprehensive manner, in face-to-face meetings and several phone conversations,” he said, citing recent conversations between Davutoglu and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and with National Security Adviser Jim Jones. Tan said Turkey shares the United States’ concern about the prospect that Iran could get a nuclear weapon. But he said Turkey’s vote against the Iran sanctions resolution will allow Turkey to remain an intermediary with Iran and therefore enable the U.S. and the international community “to keep the door open to” Iran’s returning to the negotiating table. The U.S. “has indicated publicly and privately that we are very unhappy” with Turkey’s “no” vote on the U.N. Security Council Iran resolution, “but [we] want to move forward on crucial elements of relations,” a U.S. official told POLITICO Monday on condition of anonymity. Turkish officials said the Obama administration has given them mixed signals on a possible Iran nuclear fuel swap proposal that Ankara and Brazil negotiated last month, under which 1,200 kilograms of Iran’s low-enriched uranium would be sent to Turkey in exchange for nuclear fuel for a Tehran reactor that supplies isotopes to treat Iranian cancer patients. Though the U.S. formally dismissed the Turkey-Brazil-Iran nuclear deal as insufficient and proceeded with a Security Council resolution sanctioning Iran earlier this month, Obama has said that the resolution does not close the door on diplomacy. “We don’t doubt Turkey’s sincerity in trying to find a diplomatic way forward and a genuine way to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons,” a senior administration official told POLITICO. “And they assert that what they were doing is consistent with our objectives.”

US-Turkey Relations High

US-Turkey cooperation over PKK still strong

AFP 6/21 (http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5isCQVH-i7jHrWLknxxs4H6PC\_\_Zw)

ANKARA — The United States supports Turkey's struggle against separatist Kurdish rebels and is ready to "urgently" consider any new request for help from Ankara, the US ambassador to Turkey said Monday. "We stand ready to review urgently any new requests from the Turkish military or government regarding the PKK," Ambassador James Jeffrey said in a written statement. He was referring to the separatist Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), listed as a terrorist group by both Ankara and Washington, which has dramatically stepped up violence in Turkey's southeast. "The PKK is a common enemy of both Turkey and the US and we actively support the efforts of our Turkish allies to defeat this terrorist threat," Jeffrey said. He stressed "there has been no change in the level of US-Turkey intelligence sharing regarding the PKK in northern Iraq." The United States has been supplying Turkey, a NATO ally, with intelligence on rebel movements in northern Iraq, used particularly in Turkish air raids on PKK hideouts in the region.

Relations strong—Obama trying to undo damage of invasion of Iraq

Amies 10 (Nick, freelance journalist, DW World, 2/6, http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,5641395,00.html)

Bilateral relations by their nature have mutual benefits and Turkey isn't the only partner seeking support. The United States sees Turkey as a key Muslim ally and the Obama administration has been working hard to repair the damage to relations caused by the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq. Turkey had refused at the time to allow the US to use its territory as a staging ground for invasion. Since then, the US and Turkey have set-up intelligence sharing networks in the on-going fight against international terrorism while Turkey hosts the US military infrastructure needed for its missions in neighbouring Iraq and Afghanistan. "Turkey is still a key Muslim ally to the US and is a favorite partner, one which is held up as an example of a predominantly Islamic country with a growing democracy," Joost Lagendijk said. "The US won't want to jeapordise that. If it turns on Turkey for any reason, then the whole rhetoric Washington has created about reforming the Islamic world will crumble."

US-Turkey Relations Low

Relations low now—differing interests in the Middle East and increasing independence

Abramovitz and Barkey 6/17 (Morton and Henri, former ambassador to Turkey and prof of international relations, National Interest, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23588)

Acrimony permeates American-Turkish relations. Harsh words have been exchanged at high levels over Gaza and Iran. The American right-wing has virtually declared Turkey beyond the pale and appears to long for the Turkish military to take over. Turkey’s nationalistic media talk about the country’s noble role in the flotilla crisis, and the words of senior leaders border on the conspiratorial. Many wonder whether our interests are now so different that they preclude close collaboration. This is not a new phenomenon. Turkey has always been a prickly ally, not one that simply saluted. During the Cold War the Turks closed U.S. bases and kicked out the Peace Corps after we imposed an arms embargo in response to their invasion of northern Cyprus. As for our secular Turkish military friends, they barely supported the United States in the first Gulf War and undermined it in the run up to the second; and refuse to send combat troops to Afghanistan. Besotted by the language of strategic partnership it invented for Ankara’s benefit, the United States has been slow in recognizing how Turkey’s perspective and interests have changed. Whatever America’s importance to Turkey, the dependency of the past is over. Russia is no longer an enemy but a valued economic partner. Turkey’s EU membership is distant and Ankara’s interest in the body is diminishing. AKP rule produced sizeable economic growth for much of this decade and Turkish economic activity is now global. Ankara is on the move and feeling it. Change would have happened under any circumstances, but the foreign-policy activism of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan and Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu hastened it. They moved on all fronts, but most importantly strengthened Turkey’s involvement in the Middle East, where they think the United States is vulnerable and wrong. Conflict with America has slowly developed, particularly over Iran and Israel. Erdogan can hardly contain his ambition to make Turkey a dominant regional actor and a global player.

Relations low—split over Israel and recognition of Armenian genocide

Kreiger 6/17 (Hilary Leila, Washington correspondent for Jerusalem Post, Jerusalem Post, http://www.jpost.com/International/Article.aspx?id=178687)

WASHINGTON – US Congressmen ratcheted up their criticism of Turkey Wednesday, warning that Ankara was risking its historically warm ties with Congress by reaching toward Iran and breaking with Israel. In a press conference defending Israel’s raid on a Turkish-flagged aid ship trying to break the Gaza blockade, several dozen of whose passengers had ties to terror organizations, numerous members of Congress turned their ire toward Turkey. “Turkey is responsible for the nine deaths aboard that ship. It is not Israel that’s responsible,” declared Rep. Shelley Berkley (D-Nevada), who pointed to Turkish funding and support for the expedition. “If Israel is at fault in any way, it’s by falling into the trap that was set for them by Turkey.” She continued: “The Turks have extraordinary nerve to lecture the State of Israel when they are occupiers of the island of Cyprus, where they systematically discriminate against the ecumenical patriarch, and they refuse to recognize the Armenian genocide.” Her comments – which were accompanied by an announcement that Turkish representatives were no longer welcome in her office – touched on sensitive issues with Turkey that the US has often shied away from pressing Ankara on aggressively. Her words raised the prospect that the US Congress at least would be more assertive about its displeasure with Turkey. Speaking at the same press conference, Rep. Mike Pence (R-Indiana) said he recently warned the Turkish ambassador that “With regard to Congress of the United States, there will be a cost if Turkey stays on its current path of growing closed to Iran and more antagonistic to the State of Israel.” Among other issues, he said, he was now likely to switch his vote to support a resolution recognizing the mass killing of Armenians during the Ottoman empire as a genocide, a move he had voted against in the past because he thought relations with Turkey were more important. Turkey has vehemently opposed the resolution, briefly recalling its ambassador to the US when the measure passed a House committee earlier this year

US-Turkey Relations Low

Iran splits US and Turkey

Abramovitz and Barkey 6/17 (Morton and Henri, former ambassador to Turkey and prof of international relations, National Interest, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23588)

Turkey has also parted company with the United States over Iran. While actively opposing additional sanctions, it has muddied the waters by making Israeli nuclear weapons—and not Pakistani or Indian ones—the issue instead of Iranian violations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to which it is a signatory. Ankara has legitimate reasons to oppose sanctions but refuses to comprehend the strategic importance Iran represents for the Obama administration. America spurned Turkey’s recent deal with Iran and Brazil as inadequate. NATO-member Ankara further alienated Washington by voting against sanctions instead of simply abstaining. The United States and Turkey still share important common interests and importantly work closely together in Iraq, Afghanistan and NATO, and on energy-related issues. The United States still wants Turkey ensconced in the EU. But the question increasingly is how Washington responds to a self-confident Turkey whose interests conflict with ours on major issues. It is complicated by the AKP leadership’s Islamic bent and differential morality, which ignores mass atrocities committed by Islamic nations—and even embraces those states. Turkey is a growing power and possesses assets we do not have. Where we can get their help we should elicit it. Where we differ we can acknowledge their interests. Retaliation is no answer to differences over key issues. The U.S. government does not and should not question whether Turkey is part of the West. Any Turkish government will pursue its own interests as it defines them at any point in time

All groups in Congress oppose Turkey—previous Turkey supporters and lobbies changed their mind

Bogardus 6/13 (Kevin, The Hill, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/102891-turkey-alliance-comes-under-increasing-criticism-from-lawmakers

Lawmakers have vigorously defended Israel after that one ship — out of the six in the flotilla — was raided by Israeli commandos on May 31, resulting in the death of nine activists and several injured soldiers. In turn, Turkey, often lauded for its Western-style democracy and strong military ties to the United States, has come under attack from members of Congress. Many have suggested that the country is not the strong U.S. ally that they expected, even implying it may be America’s enemy now. It is a marked shift from months ago, when several lawmakers came to the defense of Turkey when they were lobbying against a non-binding congressional resolution that would recognize the Ottoman Empire’s World War I-era killing of 1.5 million Armenians as genocide. The flotilla incident, along with Turkey’s vote last week against a new round of United Nations sanctions against Iran, has many in Congress moving against Turkey. Rep. Anthony Weiner (D-N.Y.) did not mince words when he discussed the flotilla’s supporters on the House floor Wednesday. “It had an enormous amount of support by some of the worst enemies of peace in that region, and some of the worst enemies, quite literally, not only of Israel, but of the United States as well. And I mean Turkey, Iran, Hamas. These are not entities that were looking for some peaceful resolution here,” Weiner said. In a statement last week, Rep. John Sarbanes (D-Md.) suggested Turkey should share some of the blame for the skirmish between the Israeli commandos and the activists. “Some have expressed the view that Israel alone should account for this incident. That perspective neglects the role that Turkey played in staging the flotilla and Turkey’s readiness to condone this kind of brinksmanship,” Sarbanes said. Criticism of Turkey has been bipartisan as well, and from self-proclaimed Turkish supporters in the past. “The complicity of Turkey in launching a flotilla to challenge the blockade in Gaza, the ensuing violence that occurred, the grievous loss of life is deeply troubling to those of us who have supported the U.S.-Turkish alliance in the past,” Rep. Mike Pence (R-Ind.) said on the House floor Wednesday. “Turkey needs to decide whether its present course is in its long-term interests, but America will stand with Israel.” U.S.-based Jewish lobby groups, traditionally supportive of Turkey during its congressional battles over the Armenian genocide resolution, have begun to distance themselves. For example, the Anti-Defamation League has called for the State Department to designate the Humanitarian Relief Foundation — the Turkish-based charity group that helped to organize the flotilla — as a terrorist group.

US-Turkey Relations Low

US-Turkey relations low—post Cold War era means each nation is defining its own role

Menon and Wimbush 7 (Rajan, Prof of International Relations, S. Enders, Director of Center for Future Security Strategies, March 25, http://www.hudson.org/files/pdf\_upload/turkey%20pdf.pdf)

The cold reality, then, is that Turkey and the United States are drifting apart—and rapidly. Senior officials and respected academic experts in Turkey and the United States now concur that there is something fundamentally wrong with the state of US-Turkish relations and that if both sides do not recognize this reality and attend to it with seriousness and vigor, a strategic partnership that has served both Americans and Turks well for more than half a century could suffer serious damage. This assessment is not overblown. It is grounded in considerable, compelling, and consistent evidence derived from opinion polls in Turkey, discussions in the Turkish media, and the analyses and pronouncements of those who conduct Turkish foreign policy, or influence it. Nor does this conclusion rest on a romanticized assumption that there was once an idyllic, perfect friendship that is now dissolving and that must and can be reconstituted in its pristine form. The past was never halcyon, and veteran observers of Turkey well understand that the United States and Turkey have disagreed on important issues in the past, that their relationship has encountered rough terrain on numerous occasions, and that such differences will surface in the future. Nevertheless, the current situation is different in their minds because the two countries are increasingly defining their place in the world, their assessments of major security threats, and their national interests in radically divergent ways. There will be two consequences if this trend is not revered: First, future crises that test the strongly strength of the bilateral bond will have greater destructive potential than before; second, even far less consequential instances of discord will prove harder to handle than ever before and the cumulative effect will take a steep toll on the alliance. This loss of cushioning is particularly important because, in the aftermath of the Cold War, Turkey and the United States face a new, unfamiliar, and complex environment and will be hard put to adapt their alliance creatively to new conditions without trust and goodwill, both of which are being depleted.

Turkey – Stable Now

Turkey is stable – Likely to remain stable in the futue

Celik and Naqvi 7 (Aliye - PhD and Leylac - MALD @ Canadian Defense and Foreign Affairs Institute, http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/Turkey%20Current%20and%20Future%20Political%20Economic%20and%20Security%20Trends.pdf, AD: 7/9/10) jl

The Republic of Turkey is a stable, peaceful, democratic and secular country in a region full of conflicts. In the current post-September 11th world in which there has been a trend towards polarization of East and West, Turkey is better poised to bridge these differences, real or perceived, than any other country in the world. In the years ahead, Turkey will likely continue to be a strong ally of the U.S. and EU as a member of NATO, while also seeking other alliances. Continued progress toward EU accession is the best course for Turkey, even taking into account that accession may never occur. A more positive tone from Europe with respect to Turkey's candidacy would send a very constructive message to Turkey as it continues to implement reforms. It would also send a message to the Muslim world that religion is no barrier to integration in Europe. The U.S., for its part, must understand that a strong relationship with Turkey is one of mutual benefit and approach Turkey's problem with the PKK with that in mind. With continued reform at home and the support of its allies, Turkey doubtlessly has a very important role to play in achieving development and peace in the region and in the world.

**Erdogan is bringing peace to Turkey in the squo**

Salem 7/6 [Paul, Carnegie Endowment for Intl Peace, http://carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=41113]

Third, on the Arab-Israeli conflict, it is useful and helpful that Prime Minister Erdogan staked out this rather hard line position because it enables him to appeal to the Arab and Muslim public. Turkey has been pushing for peace talks and stability for years and Erdogan now has strong credibility. So, the fact that there is somebody like Prime Minister Erdogan front and center and able to speak for an Arab and Muslim public is an opportunity. It is much better having Erdogan rather than President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran or Sheik Hassan Nasrallah of Hezbollah. Unfortunately, the Arab leaders who are engaged in these talks—like President Mubarak of Egypt, King Abdullah II of Jordan, or King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia—don’t have the pull or credibility in public opinion to actually make progress towards peace. Concessions and difficult decisions need to be made and Arab leaders are too weak at this point to be helpful—and Iran doesn’t want to help at all. Turkey’s position presents an opportunity. President Obama said from day one that the Arab-Israeli conflict is his number one priority. While Turkey’s recent involvement may have raised tensions a little bit, they were already high and no progress was being made. Perhaps the increased tensions will provide the momentum needed to move forward and Turkey can be an able partner in building peace in the region.

Turkey – Stable Now

Turkey stable – economy

Daily News 6/8 (Citing Professor John Kirton, poli sci academic at the U of Toronto Tuesday, June 8, ANKARA - Anatolia News Agency http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=8216turkey-is-a-symbol-of-stability8217-says-professor-2010-06-08) TBC 7/9/10

Turkey has shown how it can be a symbol of stability in the Middle East region during the economic crisis, according to Professor John Kirton, political science academic at the University of Toronto. Kirton was speaking at a round-table conference focusing on the management of the global economy, held in Ankara on Monday. The conference highlighted the importance of the forthcoming G-20 Summit being held in Toronto on June 26 and 27. Turkey’s move from membership to leadership is important for the stability of the G-20, Kirton said. Kirton is also the director of the G-20 Research Centre at the University of Toronto. The round-table conference is being held in collaboration with the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, or TEPAV, and the Canadian Embassy in Turkey. Speaking during the conference, Kirton talked about the impacts of the economic crisis on Turkey’s economy. “Turkey has proved how it can become a symbol of stability in the region during a global economic crisis,” Kirton said. “Turkey experienced an economic crisis in 2001 and needed financial support from various foreign countries. Turkey has today recovered from this point. Turkey’s position in this situation is a very good example for other countries,” he said. “Turkey has supported the stability of the G-20 concerning financial reforms. It has become the symbol of stability on this issue.” Kirton also talked about the G20 Summit being held in Toronto at the end of the month. A framework agreement concerning banking reform issues will be signed at the summit. The agreement will bring some significant changes in the liquidity structure of banks and in their operations, Kirton noted. It will also increase the capital adequacy ratio from 4 percent to at least an 8 percent level, he said. The critical point in this issue is which elements of these reforms will constitute the capital adequacy ratio, said Kirton, adding that some important decisions concerning new changes are expected to be taken in Toronto. Turkey has no problems concerning the debt crisis in Europe and the negative impacts of Hungary in the global markets, according to Kirton. Hungary is quite a small country, said Kirton, adding that it does not constitute a situation that could throw Europe into a larger economic crisis. “The main problem in Europe is Spain. The unemployment rate in Spain has reached nearly 20 percent and high debt rates, an untrained labor force and shortage of government reforms constitute the real problem for Europe,” Kirton said.

Turkey is a force of stability now – leadership role

AYŞE KARABAT 6/15 (Today’s Zaman correspondent Turkish, Arab pundits praise Turkey’s role in the Arab world http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/news-213168-turkish-arab-pundits-praise-turkeys-role-in-the-arab-world.html) TBC 7/9/10

Arab and Turkish intellectuals at the conference “Turkish-Arab relations: From long-standing inaction to a new dynamism in the early 21st century,” organized within the framework of the Turkish Arab Forum, praised the new role of Turkey in the Middle East and underlined that Turkey is returning to the region in a very active role. At the meeting, organized by the Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research (SETA), participants also stressed the role of the ruling Justice and Development Party (AK Party) as the main force behind these ties with the Arab world and underlined that the deepening economic and cultural ties between Turkey and Arab countries will make this role stable and sustainable. At the first session of the meeting, chaired by Bülent Aras from the Turkish Foreign Ministry, Jawad al-Hamad from Jordan’s Middle East Studies Center said that the Arab world perceives Turkey as a strong and experienced country which is balancing Middle East. He said that cooperation efforts among Arab countries have been disturbed by the policies of Israel but Turkey is aiming for peace and stability in the region. He underlined that Turkey is a country which is trying to promote dialogue in the region. Mustafa al-Labbad from the Egyptian Al-Sharq Center for Regional and Strategic Studies underlined that Turkey is a very ancient civilization in the region but was not active until recently. “The return of Turkey to the region gives further importance to the region. For stability and peace, Turkey’s role is a must,” he said. He added that not only had Turkey returned to region but that the Arab countries and people had returned to Turkey, also on moral grounds. Al-Labbad underlined that the trade volume between Turkey and Arab countries is increasing and the cooperation is not only between the governments but also among the public. He suggested that Turkish and Arab intellectuals, at the end of the meeting, should issue a joint deceleration of their support for these deepening relations. Tarek Abdelgalil, from Egypt’s Ayn Sems University and the Arabic translator of Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmed Davutoğlu’s book, said that active involvement by Turkey in the Middle East is leading to discussions of whether Turkey’s foreign policy is shifting towards the East but pointed out that these discussions are predominantly taking place in the West, although there are some Arab circles which are suspicious of this new policy of Turkey’s. “Turks are not the Ottomans. They are a new and modern Turkey. It is not only after its economic interests but aiming for cooperation and stability in the region,” he said. Fahmy Howeidi of Egypt’s El Shorouk Academy recalled that the relations between Arab countries and Turkey are not only at a foreign policy level but are improving at the economic and especially at the cultural level. He said that sometimes in the government-supported media organizations there are stories which are indirectly critical of Turkey but the Arab public is sure of the sincerity of the Turkish policies. “No one should have suspicions about the policies of Turkey. People should support Turkey for peace and stability in the region,” he said.

Turkey – Unstable Now

Instability now – civil unrest

Uslu 7/8 (Emrullah, Writer for The Jamestown Foundation, http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx\_ttnews[tt\_news]=36592&tx\_ttnews[backPid]=457&no\_cache=1, AD: 7/9/10) jl

The real reason behind the PKK’s recent attacks is related to the police crackdown on the PKK’s support bases in the city centers. Since April 2009, police have regularly launched operations against the KCK network.  In those operations, hundreds of alleged PKK supporters were arrested, including elected mayors and heads of the local chapters of the pro-PKK Peace and Democratic Party (Baris ve Demokrasi Partisi - BDP). The arrests were not welcomed by the local people. KCK operations temporarily limited the PKK’s activities in the city centers until a new KCK appointee could take over. The PKK’s self-perceived role as the guardian of Kurdish political institutions and municipalities against the operations of Turkish security forces created pressure on the group to take revenge.

Instability is coming – ceasefire has failed

Uslu 7/8 (Emrullah, Writer for The Jamestown Foundation, http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx\_ttnews[tt\_news]=36592&tx\_ttnews[backPid]=457&no\_cache=1, AD: 7/9/10) jl

The call to intensify the war this summer was given back in January. Cemil Bayik, deputy head of the PKK and deputy chairman of the Kurdistan Democratic Confederation (Koma Civaken Kurdistan – KCK, a Kurdish militant umbrella organization), laid out the PKK’s strategy as following: “There is no reason to maintain the ceasefire [declared in March 2009]. The Justice and Development Party government is the last resort in the hand of the Turkish state. If we remove the AKP from power the state has to sit down with the PKK and negotiate with the PKK” (gundem-online.net, January 6). The PKK’s imprisoned leader, Abdullah Ocalan, also thinks that the AKP’s Kurdish initiative aims to eliminate the PKK and its affiliates (gundem-online.net, May 28). In one of his weekly meetings with his lawyers, Ocalan stated that he would withdraw from being a peacemaker between the Kurds and Turkish state on May 31. From that time on it has been up to the PKK leaders in the field to decide whether or not to intensify the war (Firat News Agency, May 27).

Conflict now – PKK attacks

Uslu 7/8 (Emrullah, Writer for The Jamestown Foundation, http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx\_ttnews[tt\_news]=36592&tx\_ttnews[backPid]=457&no\_cache=1, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Yet the outlawed Kurdistan Workers Party (Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan - PKK) has recently stepped up its attacks once again. The intensified PKK violence prompted the army to carry out at least two air raids and a small-scale ground incursion on rebel bases in northern Iraq. In the last two months the PKK has killed more than 60 soldiers. According to the Turkish military, 130 PKK militants lost their lives in that same time period (Anadolu Ajansi, June 18, 2010).

Instability now – public demands accountability for violence

Uslu 7/8 (Emrullah, Writer for The Jamestown Foundation, http://www.jamestown.org/programs/gta/single/?tx\_ttnews[tt\_news]=36592&tx\_ttnews[backPid]=457&no\_cache=1, AD: 7/9/10) jl

It seems that in the last 25 years nothing has changed in Ankara. Instead of examining the causes of the problem and trying to understand what motivates the PKK to increase its use of violence, leaders in Ankara develop conspiracy theories and blame foreign states.  In the 1990s it was Syria, European countries, Russia and even the United States who were to blame, but now, soured Turkish-Israeli relations provide a perfect reason to point the finger at Israel. The blame-games of Turkish leaders, civilian and military alike, are usually related to domestic politics and are used to find an easy escape from responsibilities. This time, however, the Turkish public is asking its leaders to do something to end the violence, which leaves the Erdogan government on shaky ground.

Turkey – Unstable Now

PKK attacks make Turkey unstable

Evin 7 (Ahmet - Daily Star Corespondent, http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition\_id=10&categ\_id=5&article\_id=86532#axzz0tEMjWTxA, AD: 7/9/10) jl

The simmering tensions in the wake of Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) terrorism in Turkey reached a boiling point after the recent ambushes that killed scores of Turkish troops. The current crisis not only poses a serious danger of spreading further into the region, drawing other parties from the broader neighborhood into the fray.

Turkey – Presence High

Strong US presence in Turkey will only get bigger- PKK terrorism

Asbarez News 6/28 [Staff, 6/28/10,

http://asbarez.com/82666/turkey-wants-more-than-intelligence-from-us-in-war-against-pkk/] KLS

Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan has called on the U.S. to help Turkey in its war against the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) by providing the Turkish military with than just “intelligence sharing,” the Turkish Hurriyet Daily News reported on Monday. Erdogan made his remarks early Monday during a press conference in Toronto, where he attended the G-20 summit over the weekend and met separately with US President Barack Obama. According to the Turkish leader, an anti-terror mechanism set up between Turkey, Iraq and the United States should include functions other than “intelligence sharing.” Erdogan said he discussed this issue in talks with Obama. “This is being negotiated within the trilateral mechanism. I think that the steps to be taken in this regard will be implemented,” Erdogan said before his departure from Toronto. Erdogan said he and Obama focused on Turkey’s war against the PKK, disagreements over Iran sanctions and the ongoing row between Turkey and Israel. Erdogan said he asked Obama to enlarge American cooperation with Turkey against the PKK in light of what Erdogan called a recently launched “terror campaign” by the Kurdish freedom movement. The U.S. has been providing Turkey with intelligence since late 2007 and initiated the establishment of what they call the trilateral mechanism – a broad cooperative measure between Turkey, Iraq and the U.S. intended to restrict the movement of the PKK in Northern Iraq. Erdogan, however, said Turkey is unsatisfied with its function. He said Turkey has long been expecting a more operational form of cooperation against the PKK, but neither side has been willing to respond. “It seems that the region is ruled by the separatist terrorist organization [the PKK]. On the one hand we’ll talk about the territorial integrity of this country [Iraq], but on the other hand we’ll talk about a part of this country captured by the terror organization,” Erdogan said.

US presence in Turkey only to increase- response to PKK terrorism

Daloglu 9 [Tulin, Chief Washington Correspondant at Haberturk – Turkish news channel, Turkey Analyst Vol. 2 No. 11, 6/5/9, http://www.silkroadstudies.org/new/inside/turkey/2009/090605B.html] KLS

The relationship between the United States and Turkey has traditionally relied heavily on military cooperation. However, President Barack Obama’s April trip to Turkey created an impetus to build a stronger economic connection – provided that businesses find a profitable incentive to work together. But the most significant step toward “normalizing” relations between the countries came when the U.S. recognized that the separatist Kurdish organization PKK poses a threat not only to Turkey but also to America, and Iraq, as well. It was a step destined to ease the tension that has characterized, even poisoned the U.S.-Turkish relationship since the invasion of Iraq.

Turkey – Presence Low

Turkish restriction of US military presence in the status quo

Today’s Zaman 3/10 [2010, http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/news-203880-turkey-wants-concrete-steps-to-send-envoy-back-to-us.html] KLS

Bahçeli also urged the government to draft a new regulation on the US military’s use of İncirlik Air Base in Adana and called on Erdoğan to cancel a planned visit to Washington. Erdoğan is among the leaders who were invited by US President Barack Obama to participate in a White House Summit on Nuclear Security on April 13. “Our nation is expecting these reactions and precautions from Prime Minister Erdoğan. The rest is just empty words and has no correspondence in diplomacy,” Bahçeli said. Diplomatic sources have said self-isolating measures such as shutting down İncirlik Air Base or cutting defense imports from the US are unlikely at this stage. But damage to the partnership with Turkey is likely to hurt US strategic interests in the Middle East and Afghanistan, where Turkey is a key contributor to the NATO-led peacekeeping force. Its growing clout in the Middle East has given Turkey a key role in the region, making it a valuable ally for the US that is capable of exerting influence in areas and groups where the US presence and influence are limited.

US troops in Turkey have been cut to a minimum since 2003

Lachowski 7 [Zdzislaw, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, June, SIPRI Policy Paper No. 18, http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP18.pdf] KLS

The USA needs to maintain good relations with its allies and partners on whose territory US forces are stationed. Although not openly acknowledged as a problem, dependence on the political support of the host countries has been perceived as significantly hampering US military operations. The USA’s seeming distrust of other countries or reluctance to be tied to cooperation with them can be illustrated by several examples. On 12 September 2001, in response to the attacks on the USA, NATO invoked Article 5 of the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty to demonstrate the support of the other allies for the USA, but the United States did not take up the offer.24 In September 2003 the US Middle East air command post (Combined Air Operations Center) was moved from Saudi Arabia to the Al Udeid base in Qatar. The DOD has also signalled that the number of US forces in Kuwait may be reduced. In the wake of Turkey’s refusal to allow US forces to use the NATO airbase at Incirlik during the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the number of US forces there was cut to a minimum.

\*\*\*ACCIDENTAL LAUNCH\*\*\*

No Accidents

Risk of backlash prevents accidental war

Waltz 95 (Kenneth, Prof of Poli Sci @ Berkely, Ph.D in Poli Sci from Columbia U, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A debate, pp. 111)

Deterrence is also a considerable guarantee against accidents, since it causes countries to take good care of their weapons, and against anonymous use, since those firing the weapons can neither know that they will be undetected nor what form of punishment detection might bring. In life, uncertainties abound. In a conven-tional world, they more easily lead to war because less is at stake. Even so, it is difficult to think of wars that have started by accident even before nuclear weapons were invented. It is hard to believe that nuclear war may begin accidentally, when less frightening conventional wars have rarely done so.

Nuclear accidents wouldn’t escalate

Waltz 95 (Kenneth, Prof of Poli Sci @ Berkely, Ph.D in Poli Sci from Columbia U, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A debate, pp. 93-94)

“Love is like war,” the chaplain says in Bertolt Brecht’s Mother Courage, “it always finds a way.” For half a cen¬tury, nuclear war has not found a way. The old saying, “accidents will happen,” is translated as Murphy’s Law holding that anything that can go wrong will go wrong. Enough has gone wrong, and Scott Sagan has recorded many of the nuclear accidents that have, or have nearly, taken place. Yet none of them has caused anybody to blow anybody else up. In a speech given to American scientists in 1960, C. P. Snow said this: “We know, with the certainty of statistical truth, that if enough of these weapons are made—by enough different states—some of them are going to blow up. Through accident, or folly, or madness—but the motives don’t matter. What does mat¬ter is the nature of the statistical fact.” In 1960, statistical fact told Snow that within “at the most, ten years some of these bombs are going off.” Statistical fact now tells us that we are twenty-five years overdue. But the novelist and scientist overlooked the fact that there are no “statistical facts.”’ Half a century of nuclear peace has to be explained since divergence from historical experience is dramatic. Never in modern history, conventionally dated from 1648, have the great and major powers of the world en¬joyed such a long period of peace. Scott Sagan empha¬sizes the problems and the conditions that conduce to pessimism. I emphasize the likely solutions and the conditions that conduce to optimism, bearing in mind that nothing in this world is ever certain.

Fear of accidents prevents them

Waltz 95 (Kenneth, Prof of Poli Sci @ Berkely, Ph.D in Poli Sci from Columbia U, International Affairs, August 1995, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/wak01/) JPG

Fear of accidents works against their occurring. This is illustrated by the Cuban Missile Crisis. Accidents happened during the crisis, and unplanned events took place. An American U-2 strayed over Siberia, and one flew over Cuba. The American Navy continued to play games at sea, such games as trying to force Soviet submarines to surface. In crises, political leaders want to control all relevant actions, while knowing that they cannot do so. Fear of losing control propelled Kennedy and Khrushchev to end the crisis quickly. In a conventional world, uncertainty may tempt a country to join battle. In a nuclear world, uncertainty has the opposite effect. What is not surely controllable is too dangerous to bear.

Accidents wont escalate – fear, risk calculation, and institonal mechanisms

Wallace, Crissey and Sennott 86 (Michael D., Brian L., and Linn I., Michael – prof of Poli Sci @ Columbia U, Brian – Prof of Computing Sci @ Linfield College, and Linn – Prof of Mathematics @ ISU, Journal of Peace Research, vol. 23 no. 1, 1986, JStor) JPG

However, some scholars have made a strong counterargument to the effect that the historic arms race – war link has been rendered obsolete by nuclear weapons (Weede 1980; Atfield 1983). According to this view, the terrifying consequences of nuclear attack, combined with the enormous strategic and tactical uncertainties about the course of a nuclear conflict once initiated, lead to an unprecedented inhibition on escalation during crises. This inhibition even has been powerful enough to promote the development of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral conventions, agreements, an institutional mechanisms designed to ward off or de-escalate potentially serious crises. The data lend some indirect support to this view, as none of the major crises preceded by arms races after 1945 have escalated to war, even though the great majority before that date did so.

\*\*\*BIODIVERSITY\*\*\*

Biodiversity Low

Overwhelming decline in biodiversity in the status quo

Ricciardi 10 (Michael, former prof. of ecology and natural science @ Cape Cod, Mass.  June 16, <http://planetsave.com/blog/blog/2010/06/16/worlds-biodiversity-loss-not-slowing-major-analysis-finds-video/>) LL

In this International Year of Biodiversity, a multinational group of zoologists, biologists and ecologists has assessed 24 biodiversity indicators and found that global declines in these key indicators are either fluctuating or continuing. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), adopted in 2002, was a commitment to achieve significant reductions in biological diversity loss by 2010. With the recognition that biodiversity plays a significant role in human well-being and quality of life measurements, the convention’s goal was subsequently included in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. Publishing the results of their integrative study in the May 28, 2010 edition of Science Magazine (Global Biodiversity: Indicators of Recent Declines, Butchart et al), the group’s aggregate analysis “suggests that biodiversity has continued to decline over the past four decades, with most state (of biodiversity) indicators showing negative trends.” A new, aggregate study of key biological diversity indicators shows the rate of decline in genes, species loss, population loss, and ecosystem services is continuing. Previous analyses of gene, species and population losses have been published, but the group’s study is the first empirical analysis to integrate a broad spectrum of biodiversity indicators. In an effort to determine whether the CBD goal is being met, the team calculated “aggregate indices” reflecting the state of biodiversity (in a given region/area), the biodiversity “pressure” (impacting factors), environmental/ecological policy and management, and the state of “ecosystem services” (that people derive benefit from). The starting year for calculating (positive/negative) biodiversity trends was 1970. A schematic image illustrating the relationship between biodiversity, ecosystem services, human well-being, and poverty. The illustration shows where conservation action, strategies and plans can influence the drivers of the current biodiversity crisis at local, regional, to global scales. More specifically, the analysis found there to be continued declines in population trends of vertebrates, habitat-specialized birds, shore birds (worldwide), the extent of forested land, mangroves, seagrass beds, and the condition of coral reefs. The study also found that “aggregate species’ extinction risk (i.e., biodiversity loss at the species level) has accelerated.” This finding included data from the Red List Index–compiled annually by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)–showing the rate of change (in species loss) to be in a negative trend. Most of the indicators reflecting “pressures on biodiversity” show increasing trends (since 1970), and include: increases in “aggregate human consumption of ecological assets”, increases in the deposition of reactive nitrogen (typically through the over-use of synthetic fertilizers), the number of alien (invading) species (in Europe), the proportion of fish stocks that are over-harvested, and the impact of climate change on (European) bird populations.

**Biodiversity Low - Asia**

**Asian biodiversity low – regional extinctions prove**

Science Daily 4 (Feb 12, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2004/02/040211081530.htm>) LL

"Asia's wildlife is being sold on a massive scale throughout the region for food, medicines and pets, and populations of many species are declining or facing local extinction," said WCS scientist Dr Melvin Gumal, a participant at COP-7 and Director of WCS's Malaysia Program. The trade includes everything from small songbirds sold as pets, to reptiles sold on a massive scale for their skins and their meat, to animal parts for medicinal use. Even species once thought of as common are becoming rare as they are being trapped, shot or snared and sent to the marketplace. The result is loss of wildlife across the region. "In many parts of Asia, it is easier to see animals in the markets than in the forest," said COP-7 delegate Dr Kent Redford, Director of WCS's Conservation Institute and originator of the "empty forest syndrome" concept, used to describe forests after hunters decimate their animal populations. "As animals that perform vital roles in the forest as predators, pollinators and seed dispersers disappear, other species will also go." In last 40 years, 12 species of large animals have become extinct or virtually extinct in Vietnam due mainly to hunting and wildlife trade. Even protected areas are losing their wildlife. In Sulawesi, the ranges of the anoa (a small species of wild cattle) and babirusa (a member of the pig family) are shrinking because of hunting pressure. In Thailand's Doi Inthanon and Doi Suthep National Parks, all tigers, elephants or wild cattle have been hunted out. Some actions are being taken. Thailand and Lao PDR have both recently conducted major enforcement operations to try to reduce the illegal trade in their cities. Assisted by the NGO TRAFFIC, Singapore and Kuala Lumpur's airports have stepped up efforts to prevent transit of illegal wildlife.

**Biodiversity Low - Asia**

Asian biodiversity suffering now – deforestation and regional extinctions prove

Sodhi et al 4 (Navjot, Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, Dec 2004, <http://faculty.jsd.claremont.edu/emorhardt/159/pdfs/2006/Sodhi.pdf>) LL

Tropical ecosystems are exceptionally rich and exclusive reservoirs of much of the biodiversity on Earth. However, the rapid and extensive destruction of tropical habitats has become a serious threat to their native biota [1]. Deforestation is particularly severe in Southeast Asia, where natural habitats, such as lowland rain forests, are being destroyed at relative rates that are higher than those of other tropical regions [2]. If present levels of deforestation were to continue unabated, Southeast Asia will lose almost three-quarters of its original forest cover by the turn of the next century [2], resulting in massive species declines and extinctions [3]. More importantly, this biodiversity crisis is likely to develop into a full-fledged disaster, as the region is home to one of the highest concentrations of endemic species [4]. Here, we discuss the contribution of the unique geological history of Southeast Asia to its high species richness and endemism. We report on the current state of its terrestrial biota and highlight the primary drivers, such as forest conversion, that are responsible for the threat to the unique and rich biodiversity of the region. Finally, we discuss the major conservation challenges faced by this region. The unique geological history and biodiversity of Southeast Asia In a study reported in 2000, Myers et al. identified 25 ‘biodiversity hotspots’ in the world as those areas containing high concentrations of endemic species and undergoing immense habitat loss (Figure 1) [4]. Southeast Asia overlaps with four of these hotspots, each of which has a unique geological history that has contributed to its rich and often unique biota [5]. During the Pleistocene glacial episodes, some temperate species from northern Asia expanded their ranges southwards into Indo-Burma and retained their presence thereafter [6]. Fluctuating sea levels periodically converted mountains into geographically isolated islands, creating conditions that were ideal for speciation. The episodic sea-level changes also repeatedly connected the islands of Sundaland (covering the western half of the Indo-Malayan archipelago) to the Asian mainland, enabling biotic migrations from the mainland to the archipelago [7]. As the sea level rose, the isolation of these islands also facilitated speciation. The presence of rain forest refugia in parts of Sundaland during the Pleistocene also enabled the persistence of its forest biota [8]. Although it was never connected to the Asian mainland, Wallacea (covering the central islands of Indonesia to the east of Java, Bali and Borneo, and west of the province of Papua on the island of New Guinea) is one of the most geologically complex regions in the world, because its islands originated from land fragments that rifted from Gondwanaland at different geological time periods [9]. This unique geological history, together with its stable tropical climate and numerous insular biotas, enabled Wallacea to evolve highly endemic biotas of its own. The other geologically unique region of Southeast Asia, the Philippines, consists of w7000 islands, containing multiple centres of endemism [5]. The colonization of newly formed oceanic islands, followed by genetic differentiation and long-term persistence, has resulted in the extraordinarily high species richness and endemism of the Philippines [10]. As a result of the unique geological history Southeast Asia, the region ranks as one of the highest in the world in terms of species richness and endemism [5]. Furthermore, it features unique ecological processes, such as the strong synchrony of fruiting of trees (mast events) from the Dipterocarpaceae [11], which have major implications for forest ecology and conservation. The current state of biodiversity Three plant and eight animal species have been listed as ‘extinct’ in Southeast Asia by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) [12]. Because Southeast Asia has a fairly recent history of large-scale deforestation (i.e. over the past two centuries), many of the native species of the region, such as rare long-lived trees, might be persisting as ‘living dead’ and are doomed to extinction owing to isolation caused by the fragmentation of habitats [3]. Therefore, although the actual number of extinct species in the region is not presently alarming, the level of endangerment of extant species reveals the seriousness of threats, such as deforestation, that are faced by the regional biota. The number of threatened species in Southeast Asia, including those in the IUCN categories of ‘critically endangered’ (CE), ‘endangered’ (EN) and ‘vulnerable’ (VU) ranges from 20 (CE) to 686 (VU) species for vascular plants, six to 91 species for fish, zero to 23 species for amphibians, four to 28 species for reptiles, seven to 116 species for birds, and five to 147 species for mammals (see Online Supplementary Material) [12]. The loss of many of these regional populations is likely to result in global extinctions because of the high proportion of endemic species (Figure 1; see Online Supplementary Material) [13]. For example, 59.6% of the 29 375 vascular plant species in Indonesia do not occur anywhere else (see Online Supplementary Material) [13].

Biodiversity Low - Japan

Japan is experiencing large scale biodiversity loss

The Daily Yomiuri 1 (Feb 6, <http://www.yahoo-search.jp/?kw=February+6,+2001&ord=t&cs=sjis&id=300069>) LL

Many species have already disappeared from the Chiba countryside. Once-common birds, such as cranes, storks, geese and ibises, are no longer found here. Of these, the Asiatic White Stork and the Japanese Crested Ibis have gone extinct in Japan as a whole, but some populations still remain on the Asian mainland. The Japanese red fox and the badger have also disappeared, and the squirrel has been reduced to near invisibility. The only remaining medium-size mammals are the hare, tanuki and weasel. Frogs are often an excellent indicator species for regions with abundant fresh water wetland habitats. In the Chiba countryside, there are currently six species of frogs. One of these, the American bullfrog, is an introduced species, but the other five are native. Of these, the Japanese toad, Japanese tree frog and Schlegel's tree frog seem to be holding their own. The Japanese brown frog and the Tokyo daruma pond frog, however, are in precipitous decline, and are even in danger of regional extinction. Both these species are important indicators of the ecological health of the countryside ecosystem. The Japanese brown frog (Rana japonica=Nihon akagaeru) lays its eggs in the rice paddies, but the adults spend most of their time foraging on the forest floor. This species thus requires both excellent paddy habitat and adjacent coppice forest.

Biosphere Resilient

Biodiversity not key – millions of years of history prove

Dodds 0 (Donald, M.S. P.E., President of North Pacific Research, 2000, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:X8s-Gaf_5r0J:northpacificresearch.com/downloads/The_myth_of_biodiversity.doc+the+planet+was+microbial+and+not+diverse.+Thus,+the+first+unexplainable+fact+is+that+the+earth+existed+for+3.5+billion+years&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>) LL

Biodiversity is a corner stone of the environmental movement. But there is no proof that biodiversity is important to the environment. Something without basis in scientific fact is called a Myth. Lets examine biodiversity through out the history of the earth. The earth has been a around for about 4 billion years. Life did not develop until about 500 million years later. Thus for the first 500 million years bio diversity was zero. The planet somehow survived this lack of biodiversity. For the next 3 billion years, the only life on the planet was microbial and not diverse. Thus, the first unexplainable fact is that the earth existed for 3.5 billion years, 87.5% of its existence, without biodiversity. Somewhere around 500 million years ago life began to diversify and multiple celled species appeared. Because these species were partially composed of sold material they left better geologic records, and the number of species and genera could be cataloged and counted. The number of genera on the planet is a indication of the biodiversity of the planet. Figure 1 is a plot of the number of genera on the planet over the last 550 million years. The little black line outside of the left edge of the graph is 10 million years. Notice the left end of this graph. Biodiversity has never been higher than it is today.

Ecosystem resilient – redundancy proves

Maser 92 (Chris, governmental consultant, Ecological diversity in sustainable development: the vital and forgotten dimension <http://books.google.com/books?id=PjlGRffQvMMC&pg=PA55&lpg=PA55&dq=strengthens+the+ability+of+the+system+to+retain+the+integrity+of+its+basic+relationships.+The+insurance+of+redun&source=bl&ots=-WfxonNR-Q&sig=ekb6BoZHQQGsmw5ehiodDcVQSj0&hl=en&ei=ZYE3TJ75MJGksQPD4KRS&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=2&ved=0CBcQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q=strengthens%20the%20ability%20&f=false>) LL

Redundancy means that more than one species can perform similar functions. It’s a type of ecological insurance policy, which strengthens the ability of the system to retain the integrity of its basic relationships. The insurance of redundancy means that the loss of a species or two is not likely to result in such severe functional disruptions of the ecosystem so as to cause its collapse because other species can make up for the functional loss.

**Limited species lose does not collapse ecosystems - resiliency prevents any impacts.**

Sedjo 0 (Roger, Sr. Fellow, Resources for the Future, Conserving Nature’s Biodiversity: insights from biology, ethics and economics, eds. Van Kooten, Bulte and Sinclair, 2000, p. 114) LL

As a critical input into the existence of humans and of life on earth, biodiversity obviously has a very high value (at least to humans). But, as with other resource questions, including public goods, biodiversity is not an either/or question, but rather a question of “how much.” Thus, we may argue as to how much biodiversity is desirable or is required for human life (threshold) and how much is desirable (insurance) and at what price, just as societies argue over the appropriate amount and cost of national defense. As discussed by Simpson, the value of water is small even though it is essential to human life, while diamonds are inessential but valuable to humans. The reason has to do with relative abundance and scarcity, with market value pertaining to the marginal unit. This water-diamond paradox can be applied to biodiversity. Although biological diversity is essential, a single species has only limited value, since the global system will continue to function without that species. Similarly, the value of a piece of biodiversity (e.g., 10 ha of tropical forest) is small to negligible since its contribution to the functioning of the global biodiversity is negligible. The global ecosystem can function with “somewhat more” or “somewhat less” biodiversity, since there have been larger amounts in times past and some losses in recent times. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to indicate that small habitat losses threaten the functioning of the global life support system, the value of these marginal habitats is negligible. The “value question” is that of how valuable to the life support function are species at the margin. While this, in principle, is an empirical question, in practice it is probably unknowable. However, thus far, biodiversity losses appear to have had little or no effect on the functioning of the earth’s life support system, presumably due to the resiliency of the system, which perhaps is due to the redundancy found in the system. Through most of its existence, earth has had far less biological diversity. Thus, as in the water-diamond paradox, the value of the marginal unit of biodiversity appears to be very small.

Biosphere Resilient

The environment is resilient; human impact is minimal

Easterbrook 96 (Gregg, sr editor, The New Republic, former fellow at the Brookings Institute, A Movement on the Earth, p. 25) LL

"Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

Biodiversity Not Key

Biodiversity not key to ecosystem success

Warrick 97 (Joby, Washington Post, Aug 29, Lexis) LL

Ecologists have long maintained that diversity is one of nature's greatest strengths, but new research suggests that diversity alone does not guarantee strong ecosystems. In findings that could intensify the debate over endangered species and habitat conservation, three new studies suggest a greater abundance of plant and animal varieties doesn't always translate to better ecological health. At least equally important, the research found, are the types of species and how they function together. "Having a long list of Latin names isn't always better than a shorter list of Latin names," said Stanford University biologist Peter Vitousek, co-author of one of the studies published in the journal Science. Separate experiments in California, Minnesota and Sweden, found that diversity often had little bearing on the performance of ecosystems -- at least as measured by the growth and health of native plants. In fact, the communities with the greatest biological richness were often the poorest when it came to productivity and the cycling of nutrients. One study compared plant life on 50 remote islands in northern Sweden that are prone to frequent wildfires from lightning strikes. Scientist David Wardle of Land care Research in Lincoln, New Zealand, and colleagues at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, found that islands dominated by a few species of plants recovered more quickly than nearby islands with greater biological diversity. Similar findings were reported by University of Minnesota researchers who studied savannah grasses, and by Stanford's Vitousek and colleague David Hooper, who concluded that functional characteristics of plant species were more important than the number of varieties in determining how ecosystems performed. British plant ecologist J.P. Grime, in a commentary summarizing the research, said there is as yet no "convincing evidence that species diversity and ecosystem function are consistently and causally related." "It could be argued," he added, "that the tide is turning against the notion of high biodiversity as a controller of ecosystem function and insurance against ecological collapse."

No Impact – Alt Causes

Alt causes – overhunting, unintentional killing and pollution.

Eiperin 8 (Juliet, Washington Post, Oct 7, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/06/AR2008100600641.html>) LL

At least a quarter of the world's wild mammal species are at risk of extinction, according to a comprehensive global survey released here Monday. The new assessment -- which took 1,700 experts in 130 countries five years to complete -- paints "a bleak picture," leaders of the project wrote in a paper being published in the journal Science. The overview, made public at the quadrennial World Conservation Congress of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), covers all 5,487 wild species identified since 1500. It is the most thorough tally of land and marine mammals since 1996. "Mammals are definitely declining, and the driving factors are habitat destruction and over-harvesting," said Jan Schipper, the paper's lead writer and the IUCN's global mammals assessment coordinator. The researchers concluded that 25 percent of the mammal species for which they had sufficient data are threatened with extinction, but Schipper added that the figure could be as high as 36 percent because information on some species is so scarce. Land and marine mammals face different threats, the scientists said, and large mammals are more vulnerable than small ones. For land species, habitat loss and hunting represent the greatest danger, while marine mammals are more threatened by unintentional killing by pollution, ship strikes and being caught in fishing nets.

Alt cause – Climate change.

Mongabay 7 (Environmental Science and Conservation Site, http://news.mongabay.com/2007/0326-extinction.html) LL

While some argue that species have managed to survive worse climate change in the past and that current threats to biodiversity are overstated, many biologists say the impacts of climate change and resulting shifts in rainfall, temperature, sea levels, ecosystem composition, and food availability will have significant effects on global species richness. There is little doubt that climate has played a critical role in past fluctuations of biodiversity levels. Among the five recognized mass extinction events -- the Ordovician, the Devonian, the Permian, the Triassic and the Cretaceous -- at least four are believed to have some correlation to climate change.

No Impact – Biodiversity Loss Inevit.

Biodiversity loss inevitable – past conservation failures prove

The Nature Conservancy 10 (Apr 29, <http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/wilderness-resources/stories/new-study-biodiversity-continues-to-decline-worldwide>) LL

Species continue to be lost at steady rates across nearly every habitat type on Earth — this despite an international commitment eight years ago to significantly reduce the rate of such losses by 2010, according to a new study coauthored by a Nature Conservancy scientist. The study, published today in Science magazine, is the first to comprehensively measure progress toward achieving the goals of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), a treaty that pledged to significantly reduce 2002 rates of biodiversity loss by this year toward the end of alleviating global poverty. The study’s authors found that virtually all of the indicators of the state of biodiversity — everything from species’ population trends to extinction risk to habitat conditions — have declined since 2002. Alarmingly, these declines have continued despite increases in policies and funds to promote biodiversity, write the authors. The drivers for these declines include invasive alien species, the impacts of climate change and aggregate human consumption of Earth’s ecological assets.

\*\*\*BIOPOLITICS\*\*\*

Biopolitics – Democracy Checks

Democracy checks back their biopolitics impact

Dickinson 4 (Edward, Assistant Professor of History at University of Cincinnati Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy, Central European History)

Why was Europe’s twentieth century, in addition to being the age of biopolitics and totalitarianism, also the age of biopolitics and democracy? How should we theorize this relationship? I would like to offer . ve propositions as food for thought. First, again, the concept of the essential legitimacy and social value of individual needs, and hence the imperative of individual rights as the political mechanism for getting them met, has historically been a cornerstone of some strategies of social management. To borrow a phrase from Detlev Peukert, this does not mean that democracy was the “absolutely inevitable” outcome of the development of biopolitics; but it does mean that it was “one among other possible outcomes of the crisis of modern civilization.”112 Second, I would argue that there is also a causal fit between cultures of expertise, or “scientism,” and democracy. Of course, “scientism” subverted the real, historical ideological underpinnings of authoritarian polities in Europe in the nineteenth century. It also in a sense replaced them. Democratic citizens have the freedom to ask “why”; and in a democratic system there is therefore a bias toward pragmatic, “objective” or naturalized answers— since values are often regarded as matters of opinion, with which any citizen has a right to differ. Scientific “fact” is democracy’s substitute for revealed truth, expertise its substitute for authority. The age of democracy is the age of professionalization, of technocracy; there is a deeper connection between the two, this is not merely a matter of historical coincidence. Third, the vulnerability of explicitly moral values in democratic societies creates a problem of legitimation. Of course there are moral values that all democratic societies must in some degree uphold (individual autonomy and freedom, human dignity, fairness, the rule of law), and those values are part of their strength. But as people’s states, democratic social and political orders are also implicitly and often explicitly expected to do something positive and tangible to enhance the well-being of their citizens. One of those things, of course, is simply to provide a rising standard of living; and the visible and astonishing success of that project has been crucial to all Western democracies since 1945. Another is the provision of a rising standard of health; and here again, the democratic welfare state has “delivered the goods” in concrete, measurable, and extraordinary ways. In this sense, it may not be so simpleminded, after all, to insist on considering the fact that modern biopolitics has “worked” phenomenally well. Fourth, it was precisely the democratizing dynamic of modern societies that made the question of the “quality” of the mass of the population seem— and not only in the eyes of the dominant classes — increasingly important. Again, in the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the expected level of the average citizen’s active participation in European political, social, cultural, and economic life rose steadily, as did the expected level of her effective influence in all these spheres. This made it a matter of increasing importance whether the average person was more or less educated and informed, more or less moral and self-disciplined,more or less healthy and physically capable,more or less socially competent. And modern social reform — “biopolitics” defined very broadly—seemed to offer the possibility of creating the human foundation for a society ordered by autonomous participation, rather than by obedience. This too was part of the Machbarkeitswahn of modernity; but this was potentially a democratic “Wahn,” not only an authoritarian one. Fifth, historically there has been a clear connection between the concept of political citizenship and the idea of moral autonomy. The political “subject” (or citizen — as opposed to the political subject,who is an object of state action) is also a moral subject. The citizen’s capacity for moral reasoning is the legitimating postulate of all democratic politics. The regulation of sexual and reproductive life has long been understood in European societies to be among the most fundamental issues of morality. There is, therefore, a connection between political citizenship on the one hand, and the sexual and reproductive autonomy implied in the individual control that is a central element of the modern biopolitical complex, on the other. The association in the minds of conservatives in the late imperial period between democracy and declining fertility was not a panicky delusion; panicky it certainly was, but it was also a genuine insight into a deeper ideological connection.113 Perhaps it should not be surprising, therefore, that the first great homeland of eugenic legislation was the United States — the first great homeland of modern democracy. In fact the United States served both as a kind of promised land for racial and eugenic “progressives” in Germany, and as a worst-case scenario of “regression into barbarism” for those opposed to coercive eugenic measures. 114 Nor should it be surprising that, apart from Nazi Germany, the other great land of eugenic sterilization in Europe in the 1930s was Scandinavia, where democratic governments heavily in uenced by social democratic parties were busily constructing the most ambitious and extensive welfare states in the world.115 The lesson is not that modern democracy is “dangerous” or destructive, much less that it is crypto-fascist — that, as Jacques Donzelot put it, the 1930s was the age of “social fascism” and our own age that of “social sector fascism.” 116 The relevant message is, rather, that it is time to place the less familiar history of modern democratic biopolitics alongside the more familiar history of modern totalitarian biopolitics. The dream of perfectibility — Machbarkeitswahn — is central to modernity. But social engineering, the management of society, can be organized in different ways. Historically, totalitarian biopolitics was a self-destructive failure. Democratic biopolitics has, in contrast, been— not in any moral sense, but politically —a howling success. For the historian interested in modernity, that story is no less interesting or important than the story of the implosion of the Nazi racial state.

Biopolitics – Democracy Checks

Biopolitics is only bad in totalitarian regimes – our democracy checks

Dickinson 4 (Edward, Assistant Professor of History at University of Cincinnati Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy, Central European History)

In an important programmatic statement of 1996 Geoff Eley celebrated the fact that Foucault’s ideas have “fundamentally directed attention away from institutionally centered conceptions of government and the state . . . and toward a dispersed and decentered notion of power and its ‘microphysics.’”48 The “broader, deeper, and less visible ideological consensus” on “technocratic reason and the ethical unboundedness of science” was the focus of his interest.49 But the “power-producing effects in Foucault’s ‘microphysical’ sense” (Eley) of the construction of social bureaucracies and social knowledge, of “an entire institutional apparatus and system of practice” ( Jean Quataert), simply do not explain Nazi policy.50 The destructive dynamic of Nazism was a product not so much of a particular modern set of ideas as of a particular modern political structure, one that could realize the disastrous potential of those ideas. What was critical was not the expansion of the instruments and disciplines of biopolitics, which occurred everywhere in Europe. Instead, it was the principles that guided how those instruments and disciplines were organized and used, and the external constraints on them. In National Socialism, biopolitics was shaped by a totalitarian conception of social management focused on the power and ubiquity of the völkisch state. In democratic societies, biopolitics has historically been constrained by a rights-based strategy of social management. This is a point to which I will return shortly. For now, the point is that what was decisive was actually politics at the level of the state. A comparative framework can help us to clarify this point. Other states passed compulsory sterilization laws in the 1930s — indeed, individual states in the United States had already begun doing so in 1907. Yet they did not proceed to the next steps adopted by National Socialism — mass sterilization, mass “eugenic” abortion and murder of the “defective.” Individual . gures in, for example, the U.S. did make such suggestions. But neither the political structures of democratic states nor their legal and political principles permitted such policies actually being enacted. Nor did the scale of forcible sterilization in other countries match that of the Nazi program. I do not mean to suggest that such programs were not horrible; but in a democratic political context they did not develop the dynamic of constant radicalization and escalation that characterized Nazi policies.

\*\*\*CAPITALISM\*\*\*

Capitalism – Alt. Cause

Patriarchy is the root of capitalism – must solve for patriarchy first

Gordon 96 (April A. Gordon, Transforming Capitalism and Patriarchy: Gender and Development in Africa. P. 22)

Much of the Western feminist theoretical analysis of women and development in Africa echoes the work of Marxist-socialist feminist scholars. For example, in Mies's influential work on women and global capitalism she argues that **"capitalism cannot function without patriarchy."** Capitalism requires never-ending capital accumulation; therefore, **it requires patriarchal man-woman relations.** Mies also believes that **capitalism and patriarchy are not two separate systems, but intrinsically connected as capitalist patriarchy: Violence against women and extracting women's labour through coercive labour relations are, therefore, part and parcel of capitalism. They are necessary for the capitalist accumulation process and not peripheral to it. In other words, capitalism has to use, to strengthen, or even to invent, patriarchal men-women relations if it wants to maintain its accumulation model**. If all women in the world had become "free" wage earners, "free" subjects, the extraction of surplus would, to say the least, be severely hampered.This is what women as housewives, workers, peasants, prostitutes, from the Third World and First World countries, have in common.

\*\*\*CHINA\*\*\*

No Escalation

China war won’t escalate- unwilling to use nukes

Roberts 5 (Brad, member of the research staff at the Institute for Defense Analyses, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1/26 http://www.carnegieendowment.org/events/?fa=eventDetail&id=740) my

In Roberts' assessment, there are at least five elements in this picture. While there is no official Chinese description of a possible nuclear confrontation, these elements seem to inform the thinking of Chinese experts both inside and outside their government. The first is the assumption that the burden of crisis escalation would fall on the U.S. The Chinese believe that they would largely hold the initiative in a crisis and would be able to choose the time and manner of engagement. In other words, it would be left to the United States to react to a losing situation by choosing whether or not to escalate. The second element is a belief that that because of the asymmetry of interests, it is unlikely that the United States would be willing to use nuclear weapons in a Taiwan crisis. Whereas Taiwan is vital to Beijing’s sense of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as its regime survival, the U.S. interest in Taiwan is seen as less than vital. Thus, they believe that the United States would be unwilling to “trade Los Angeles for Taipei.” Third, the Chinese believe that the threshold for U.S. nuclear retaliation is high. As a consequence, they debate the possibility that there might be ways that China could use nuclear weapons without facing U.S. retaliation. Fourth, Chinese analysts tend to believe that any unwanted escalation would be manageable on their part. This has something to do with Chinese strategic culture and their belief in China’s skill in creating, exploiting, and if necessary prolonging crisis. Moreover, some Chinese analysts cite the experience of 1968 when China confronted the Soviet Union as proof of China’s nuclear crisis management ability. In particular, Beijing could seek to counter U.S. nuclear deterrence by demonstrating its resolve through its own nuclear attacks. The essence of such a tactic would be to exert escalation control by instilling escalation uncertainty. Fifth, and finally, Chinese analysts seem to believe that the final outcome of a worst case scenario in a nuclear Taiwan crisis would be the reversion to the status quo ante. Beijing, thus, would be no worse off than what it started with. Altogether, these notions seem to inform Chinese confidence in the viability of their nuclear deterrent and their ability to escape or even win a nuclear confrontation with the United States, despite the huge disparity in force size and capability. How does, however, the problem look from the U.S. side? The difference in Chinese and American views is striking. Indeed, a diametrically opposite set of assumptions seems to underpin U.S. thinking. Dr. Roberts noted that these assumptions are to be found in the thinking and commentary of analysts and are harder to trace in official statements, which seem not to have come directly to this topic. First, American analysts tend to believe that because of America’s military superiority, the burden of escalation falls not on the U.S., but on China. Second, there is a widely held conviction that the Chinese would never use nuclear weapons in a Taiwan crisis, for doing so would cause China to incur significant costs and severe punishment from the United States. Third, there is deep skepticism that Beijing would ever strike preemptively. Fourth, American analysts tend to believe that unwanted escalation would prove controllable—largely through U.S. escalation dominance. Strategic culture again plays a role, as American analysts tend to greatly credit the U.S.’s ability to manage and swiftly terminate crises on terms favorable to the U.S. Fifth, and finally, most American experts seem to hold completely different assumptions from their Chinese counterparts about the long-term consequences of nuclear confrontation over Taiwan. Few believe that the U.S. would allow a return to the status quo ante, as efforts would be undertaken to prevent the re-occurrence of nuclear confrontation .

No – US-China War

China is not a threat; no escalation

Steketee 8 (Mike, The Australian, Aug 19, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/china-wont-fight-over-taiwan-expert/story-e6frg6t6-1111117233275>) LL

CHINA is unlikely to be a military threat and the chances of a conflict over Taiwan are diminishing, according to a US defence expert. Jonathan Pollack, professor of Asian and Pacific studies at the US Naval War College, told The Australian that China would become a much more potent military force in the long run. "They see this as an inevitable and logical outgrowth of their economic emergence," Professor Pollack said. "For all the shiny new systems they are acquiring, China has not gone to war for 30 years. I don't see them as a kind of budding overlord of East Asia. I don't think that is the way they conceptualise these things." China has reported average real increases in military spending of 9.6per cent in the 15 years to 2005; outside estimates are much higher. The US Defence Department has been among those expressing concern about a military build-up that could put regional balances at risk. Professor Pollack, who has been visiting China for 30 years, said he could not preclude China becoming a military threat, but added: "I just don't see it as terribly likely." Professor Pollack is in Australia as a guest of the Centre for International Security Studies and the US Studies Centre, both at Sydney University. He recently visited Taiwan, whose Government, elected this year, comprised realists who knew they had to try to find a means of dealing with China. "They have to find a way to give China clear incentives to collaborate with them, hopefully in a transition to some longer-term accommodation, the terms of which they don't know yet," Professor Pollack said. "As long as you have a Government in Taipei that is going to work hard to not provoke the Chinese, I would see the probability (of China using military force against Taiwan) diminishing, not increasing, even as China becomes much more capable militarily."

China’s No First Use policy prevents escalation into nuclear warfare

Lieggi 5 (Research Associate, East Asia Nonproliferation Program, [http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_70.html#fn4#fn4](http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_70.html#fn4)) LL

Keeping in mind Beijing's rebuff of Zhu's comment, the question remains as to what his statement meant—if anything—about Chinese nuclear doctrine.[20] To fully assess the current status of China's NFU policy, it is important to go beyond the rhetoric coming from all sides of the debate. The NFU policy has been a part of China's nuclear doctrine for over four decades. Despite massive changes in China since then, many of the factors that dictated Beijing's doctrine in the past still impact policies today. These factors—including deterrence capabilities, resource limitations, regional stability, and perceptions of what is best for China strategically—continue to guide China's nuclear doctrine.

China has nothing to gain in a conflict with the US

Lieggi 5 (Research Associate, East Asia Nonproliferation Program, [http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_70.html#fn4#fn4](http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_70.html#fn4)) LL

There is no doubt that Taiwan remains the top most national security issue for the Chinese leadership and Beijing is willing (though not anxious) to risk a military conflict with the United States to keep the island from permanent separation. But this acknowledgement does not equate to Beijing discarding decades-old doctrines, such as NFU. Chinese political leaders, as well as many military leaders, recognize that China has nothing to gain if a conflict with the United States turned nuclear. At that point, China would quickly lose any ability to control the escalation of the conflict. If Beijing were to attack first with nuclear weapons, even in a situation where Chinese conventional forces were certain to lose the fight for Taiwan, there is no way for the leadership to predict the extent to which Washington would retaliate. The United States would see any nuclear attack by China, even on purely military targets, as provocation to escalate the conflict further, a step that could likely mean the collapse of the current leadership in Beijing. Ultimately, Taiwan would be lost either way. The NFU policy has served China well by assuring strategic stability, assisting in a relatively more efficient allocation of limited resources, and allowing Beijing to take the high moral ground on nuclear weapons use. Despite speculation about a shift in China's nuclear doctrine, a careful analysis of official Chinese positions and recent trends in Chinese nuclear weapons modernization would suggest Major General Zhu Chenghu's remarks do not provide any new clues to China's nuclear doctrine, nor do they indicate a move towards building a more offense-capable and war-fighting nuclear posture. A look at the history of China's no-first-use policy, nuclear program, and doctrine, along with its current military planning and modernization, indicate that a move away from the NFU policy is not likely in the near-to-mid-term. Even in the long-term, China's resources and planning will likely be considered better spent on other priorities, and not the costly expansion of its nuclear arsenal.

No – US-China War

U.S.-China war won’t happen- 4 reasons

Dyer 9 (Gwynne, Jakarta Post, Mar 29, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2005/03/12/china-unlikely-engage-military-confrontation.html>) LL

Given America's monopoly or huge technological lead in key areas like stealth bombers, aircraft carriers, long-range sensors, satellite surveillance and even infantry body armor, Goss's warning is misleading and self-serving. China cannot project a serious military force even 200 miles (km) from home, while American forces utterly dominate China's ocean frontiers, many thousands of miles (kilometers) from the United States. But the drumbeat of warnings about China's ""military build-up"" continues. Just the other week U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was worrying again about the expansion of the Chinese navy, which is finally building some amphibious landing ships half a century after Beijing's confrontation with the non-Communist regime on the island of Taiwan began. And Senator Richard Lugar, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned that if the European Union ends its embargo on arms sales to China, the U.S. would stop military technology sales to Europe. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that the major U.S. defense review planned for this year will concentrate on the rising ""threat"" from China, or that this year for the first time the joint U.S.-Japanese defense policy statement named China as a ""security concern"", or that the Taiwan government urged the ""military encirclement"" of China to prevent any ""foreign adventures"" by Beijing. It comes as no surprise -- but it still makes no sense. China's defense budget this year is 247.7 billion yuan: Around US$30 billion at the official exchange rate. There are those in Washington who will say that it's more like $60 billion in purchasing power, but then there used to be ""experts"" who annually produced hugely inflated and frightening estimates of the Soviet defense budget. Such people will always exist: to justify a big U.S. defense budget, you need a big threat. It's true that 247.7 billion yuan buys an awful lot of warm bodies in military uniform in the low-wage Chinese economy, but it doesn't actually buy much more in the way of high-tech military systems. It's also true that the Chinese defense budget has grown by double-digit increases for the past fourteen years: This year it's up by 12.6 percent. But that is not significantly faster than the Chinese economy as a whole is growing, and it's about what you have to spend in order to convert what used to be a glorified peasant militia into a modern military force. It would be astonishing if China chose NOT to modernize its armed forces as the rest of the economy modernizes, and the end result is not going to be a military machine that towers above all others. If you project the current growth rates of military spending in China and the United States into the future, China's defense budget catches up with the United States about the same time that its Gross Domestic Product does, in the late 2030s or the early 2040s. As to China's strategic intentions, the record of the past is reassuring in several respects. China has almost never been militarily expansionist beyond the traditional boundaries of the Middle Kingdom (which do include Tibet in the view of most Chinese), and its border clashes with India, the Soviet Union and Vietnam in the first decades of Communist rule generally ended with a voluntary Chinese withdrawal from the disputed territories. The same moderation has usually applied in nuclear matters. The CIA frets that China could have a hundred nuclear missiles targeted on the United States by 2015, but that is actually evidence of China's great restraint. The first Chinese nuclear weapons test was forty years ago, and by now China could have thousands of nuclear warheads targeted on the U.S. if it wanted. (The United States DOES have thousands of nuclear warheads that can strike Chinese targets.) The Beijing regime is obsessed with economic stability, because it fears that a severe downturn would trigger social and political upheaval. The last thing it wants is a military confrontation with its biggest trading partner, the United States. It will go on playing the nationalist card over Taiwan to curry domestic political favor, but there is no massive military build-up and no plausible threat of impending war in East Asia.

No – US-China War

US cooperation and diplomatic strength can prevent confrontation

Rosemont 8 (Henry, Asia Times, Feb 12, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/JB12Ad01.html>) LL

Head to Head? A significant number of people profit greatly from the present U.S. defense budget. Since even people with little knowledge of military tactics realize that aircraft carriers and nuclear attack submarines are worthless for deterring ideologically driven young people from strapping IEDs to their waists, a more compelling threat must be conjured up is to justify increased Pentagon spending. Since the end of the Cold War, China has become the candidate of choice among illusionist hawks.15 Confrontation with China is not, however, inevitable. Perhaps the best reason for China not to seek a blue-ocean navy comes from an initially most unlikely source: The U.S. Navy. Its former head, Admiral Michael Mullen proposed a “Thousand Ship Navy” (TSN) that would mark “a new chapter in cooperation as it emphasizes the management of shared security interests of all maritime nations.” China could become a significant component of this TSN, and thus keep its shipping lanes secure at relatively little cost beyond present expenditures. Given the fact that 90% of all world trade and almost 70% of all petroleum is transported by sea, it clearly behooves both countries to cooperate closely to keep the maritime commons free of pirates, terrorists, and drug traffickers. Cooperation at sea is equally needed for missions of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. Unfortunately, the highly invasive foreign policies of the United States, combined with its overwhelming military superiority, provide the Chinese with very good reasons to continue distrusting U.S. motives (including the TSN). It is therefore the responsibility of the United States to take meaningful initiatives to build support for closer cooperation with the soon-to-be world’s second largest economic power. Some of those initiatives would deal directly with China, such as providing materiel and advanced training for the Chinese military to conduct search-and-rescue missions. The United States could also foster far greater trust and cooperation specifically with the Chinese by clarifying the U.S. position toward Taiwan. Taipei should understand that the United States will come to its immediate aid in case of attack. But should Taipei seek independence and a seat at the UN, Washington will use all its diplomatic strength to insure that other nations do not recognize these claims. The United States could also signal to China that it is willing to be a more cooperative international player. For instance, the United States could significantly reduce its nuclear stockpile and renounce the first-strike use of nuclear weapons, as China did long ago. It should also sign and ratify the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea as 155 nations have done (including China) since it was promulgated in 1982. Ending the brutal occupation of Iraq is another global measure, as would placing U.S. troops in Afghanistan under UN administration and signing a peace treaty with North Korea (55 years after the cease-fire). Holding out an olive branch to Iran, and stopping the one-sided U.S. support of the Israelis would also provide clear signals to the Chinese and the rest of the world of a major shift in U.S. foreign policy. A reduction of U.S. threats to the world – from nuclear weapons, regional wars such as Iraq and Afghanistan, and potential conflicts with Iran and North Korea – would decrease the likelihood of confrontation with China as well as undercut any rationale for China’s own increased military spending. Such a shift in U.S. national security strategy would not only increase the security of China and the United States but the world as well.

No – US-China War

No China war- China’s small nuclear arsenal and no first use pledge

Moore 6 (Scott, Undergrad research assistant, NTI, 10/18, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_80.html) my

Despite the tumult, there is broad consensus among experts that the concerns generated in this discussion are exaggerated. The size of the Chinese nuclear arsenal is small, estimated at around 200 warheads;[3] Jeffrey Lewis, a prominent arms control expert, claims that 80 is a realistic number of deployed warheads.[4] In contrast, the United States has upwards of 10,000 warheads, some 5,700 of which are operationally deployed.[5] Even with projected improvements and the introduction of a new long-range Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, the DF-31A China's nuclear posture is likely to remain one of "minimum deterrence."[6] Similarly, despite concern to the contrary, there is every indication that China is extremely unlikely to abandon its No First Use (NFU) pledge.[7] The Chinese government has continued to deny any change to the NFU policy, a claim substantiated by many Chinese academic observers.[8] In sum, then, fears over China's current nuclear posture seem somewhat exaggerated. This document, therefore, does not attempt to discuss whether China's nuclear posture poses a probable, general threat to the United States; most signs indicate that even in the longer term, it does not. Rather, it seeks to analyze the most likely scenarios for nuclear conflict. Two such possible scenarios are identified in particular: a declaration of independence by Taiwan that is supported by the United States, and the acquisition by Japan of a nuclear weapons capability.

No risk of China war- China wants economic and political stability and diplomacy checks

O’Hanlon and Bush 7 (Michael E., senior fellow at Brookings, and Richard, Director at Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, Brookings, 5/3, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2007/0503china.aspx) my

But most of the issues and frictions that accompany China's rise can be managed. The good news is that China and the United States, not to mention other key regional players like Japan, now have politicians and bureaucracies that are relatively good at preventing serious problems from becoming grounds for war. China will want to flex military muscle more in the future, but it also wants economic prosperity for the political stability that comes with it. In addition, the United States and its regional partners know how to maintain open dialogue with Beijing while sustaining vigorous defense alliances. China has enough reason to worry about nuclear weapons and global instability that it will not be totally oblivious to our concerns about proliferating countries such as Iran and North Korea. Conflict with the littoral nations of Japan, the Philippines or Vietnam over disputed seabed resources (like oil in the East China Sea or small islets in the South China Sea) is highly unlikely.

No – US-China War

No conflict – No motivation for war

Adams 7 (Jonathan, MSNBC Reporter, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/16809379/site/newsweek/, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Could China be calculating that the United States might stay out of a Taiwan conflict?   
That doesn’t seem to be the case. China’s new grand strategy is to squeeze out the leading influence of the United States in East Asia without war, but with economy and culture. The rapidly modernizing military capabilities of [China’s People’s Liberation Army] will serve as a backbone of Beijing’s extra-military instruments, like diplomacy.

There’s a very strong consensus among the leaders in Beijing [that] the most important thing for China now is to seize this window of opportunity, which has not occurred in centuries: “There’s no serious threat outside China, this is the time when we can make economic growth.” So they want to have a peaceful environment and achieve economic growth first.

No war – China is deterred by the US

Chen Jen-Shuai 8(Writer for the Henry L. Stimson Center, September 2008 http://www.stimson.org/eastasia/pdf/Col\_Chen\_Report\_SEP\_08.pdf )

The Chinese are slowly modernizing their small strategic nuclear arsenal to make it less vulnerable to a preemptive attack from the world’s most potent nuclear 30 force—the U.S. strategic arsenal of thousands of warheads. But even with such modernization, China’s nuclear arsenal will pale in comparison with the robust U.S. nuclear force. The Chinese currently have only about 20 long-range missiles—housed in fixed silos—that can reach the United States. As long as the Chinese do not undertake a massive nuclear buildup to achieve parity with the United States (which they cannot afford and have shown no inclination to do), the modernization of China’s nuclear weapons by the fielding of more invulnerable road-mobile missiles could actually increase the nuclear stability between China and the United States. The Chinese have only one ballistic missile submarine, which usually remains at the dock for repairs. Even at sea, to fire its missiles, the submarine must operate fairly close to the United States—where it would be more vulnerable to attack. In contrast, the United States has 14 ballistic missile submarines that are the most powerful weapon systems ever built and can launch their missiles at a target from across the ocean. The Chinese have a successor ballistic missile submarine in development, but they have never had much luck perfecting the technology. The only time China’s small nuclear arsenal could become a problem for the United States would be in an emotional Chinese reaction to U.S. intervention in a crisis between China and Taiwan. According to the Defense Intelligence Agency, by 2010, even the best 10 percent of the Chinese military will have equipment that is more than 20 years behind the capabilities of the U.S. military (equivalent to U.S. equipment in the late 1980s). The other 90 percent of the Chinese military will have even more outdated equipment. O’Hanlon and Gill also conclude that the Chinese military lags behind U.S. forces by at least 20 years and that it will be that long before China’s armed forces could significantly challenge the United States and allied nations in East Asia. The assessments of DoD, Blair, and O’Hanlon and Gill are most likely predicated on the excessively expansive conception of U.S. interests in East Asia that currently holds sway in U.S. foreign policy circles. If a more restrained view of U.S. interests in the region were adopted, the slow Chinese military modernization would be even less threatening to the United States. The United States spends more than $40 billion a year on research and development for weapons (again, roughly equal to total annual Chinese defense spending) and more than $60 billion yearly on weapons procurement. Thus, the speed of U.S. military modernization dwarfs the pace of improvements in parts of the antiquated Chinese forces. Even though the Chinese military is modernizing more rapidly than in the past, the speed of the modernization is less than that of the modernization of the already vastly superior U.S. force. The U.S. military is way ahead and the gap is actually widening. .

No – US-China War

US-China conflict won’t go nuclear

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette 4 (Pennsylvania September 9/29, 2004)

U.S. military capacity is now so overstretched by the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts that a Chinese move to realize its own top strategic objective, the scooping up of Taiwan to complete the hat trick with Hong Kong and Macao, would find the United States hard-pressed to be able to respond at all. A U.S. threat of a nuclear attack on China -- with China's inevitable nuclear counterstrike -- would be so wildly unacceptable in political terms in the United States itself as to be out of the question for any U.S. administration. The idea of causing Los Angeles to disappear because China had seized Taiwan would be a trade-off that no American leader would even dare contemplate. America is lucky so far that China has not yet sought to match its economic reach in Asia with a corresponding assertion of political influence. That doesn't mean that Asia will inevitably become a sphere of Chinese dominance. What will happen instead -- what is already happening, in fact -- is that other Asian powers such as Japan, Korea and India will increasingly take steps to check Chinese power by increasing their own military capacity. In other words, what was a situation in which the United States stood between Japan and Korea and the imposition of Chinese influence will now become one in which those countries will become more dependent on their own resources to defend themselves. The response of the Koreans could be said to be a move toward resolving the problems between South and North Korea to enable them to present a united front to the Chinese. The response of Japan that can be expected will be limited remilitarization. The health and peace of the region will depend on the degree to which the competition among these countries will be economic, rather than political and military. What will this modification of the balance of power in Asia mean for the United States? First of all, none of this will happen tomorrow. The extension of China's reach and the Japanese and Korean response will be gradual and spread out across the years, although there may well be some pinpricks at the extremities sooner rather than later. The Chinese themselves will avoid direct confrontation with the United States at all costs. It is not their way. Conflict between the two countries would be asymmetrical in the extreme in any case. Basically, the two can't attack each other. Nuclear warfare is out. The million-man People's Liberation Army isn't portable. The Chinese are definitely not into terrorism.

No – US-China War – AT: Taiwan

Deterrence checks Chinese aggression in Taiwan

Ross 2 (Robert Prof of Political Science at Boston College Spring 2002, Project Muse )

The challenge for the United States is to maintain its deterrence of the Chinese use of force against Taiwan, thus protecting Taiwan's security, democracy, and prosperity, while not contesting Chinese security interests. During the first ten years of the post-Cold War era, the United States increased its superiority over China in naval power and high-technology weaponry, enhanced its forward presence through greater access to military facilities in Singapore and the Philippines, and consolidated its alliance with Japan. Simultaneously, it acknowledged [End Page 84] PRC interests in Taiwan, pursued limited diplomatic and military ties with Taipei, and cautioned Taiwan from moving toward independence. Given long-term U.S. escalation dominance and China's perception of U.S. resolve, this could be U.S. policy for the next ten years and beyond. Rather than needlessly challenge Chinese security, the United States should use its strategic advantage to expand cooperation with China and maintain the security of Taiwan.

China won’t start that war – US deters, not competent enough, and wouldn’t risk losing trade

Corson 4 (Trevor Corson, Writer on East Asia, The Atlantic Monthly, “Strait-jacket”, Volume 294, Issue 5, December, 2004, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2004/12/strait-jacket/3631/)

On some level, of course, the idea that China would actually attack Taiwan—rather than merely threaten to do so, as it has for years—makes no sense. Attacking would invite a military response from the United States, and even without American intervention, it's not clear that China's military is up to the task of seizing the island. China would also risk losing the trade relationships that drive its economic growth.

No – Asia War

All their scenarios for conflict are conflated – interdependence prevents conflict

Desker 7/8 (Barry, Dean of S.Rjaratnum Shool of IR, Int. Studies, http://www.nationmultimedia.com/worldhotnews/30076709/Why, AD: 7/8/10) jl

Nevertheless, the Asia-Pacific region is more stable than one might believe.  Separatism remains a challenge but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance but its impact is contained.  The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearization of the peninsula.  Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict (especially after the KMT victories in Taiwan).  The region also possesses significant multilateral structures such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the nascent Six Party Talks forum and, in particular, ASEAN, and institutions such as the East Asian Summit, [Asean](http://www.nationmultimedia.com/search/adsearch.php?keyword=+Asean+) + 3 (which brings together the [Asean](http://www.nationmultimedia.com/search/adsearch.php?keyword=+Asean+) 10 with China, Japan and South Korea) and the [Asean](http://www.nationmultimedia.com/search/adsearch.php?keyword=+Asean+) Regional Forum which [Asean](http://www.nationmultimedia.com/search/adsearch.php?keyword=+Asean+) has conceived.

Yes – Asia War

Multiple factors make Asian conflict uniquely likely

Desker 7/8 (Barry, Dean of S.Rjaratnum Shool of IR, Int. Studies, http://www.nationmultimedia.com/worldhotnews/30076709/Why, AD: 7/8/10) jl

THE ASIA-PACIFIC region can, paradoxically, be regarded as a zone both of relative insecurity and of relative strategic stability.  On the one hand, the region contains some of the world's most significant flashpoints - the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen glacier - where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of resulting in a major war.  The region is replete with border issues, the site of acts of terrorism (the Bali bombings, Manila superferry bombing, Kashmir, etc.), and an area of overlapping maritime claims (the Spratly Islands, Diaoyu islands, etc).  Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance, sitting astride key sea lines of communication (SLOCS) and important chokepoints.

\*\*\*COMPETITIVENESS\*\*\*

Alt Causes – Competitiveness

Globalization kills competitiveness

Segal 4 (Adam, Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, November/December Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html?mode=print) JPG

Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

Lack of R&D kills competitiveness

India Post 7 (Staff, 3/18/7, http://indiapost.com/article/india/6/) JPG

6. Outsourcing will continue and build momentum and what will go next is research and design. The loss of R&D is what poses the real threat to U.S. competitiveness. 7. These new jobs will require more Masters and PhDâ€™s. 8. China now graduates more Masters and PhDâ€™s in engineering than the U.S. Over a 10 year period, India and U.S. graduation rates have shown relatively very small increases.

D.) Europe surge kills US competitiveness

Hill 7 (Steven, director of New America Foundation’s program, 10/7/7, Washington Post,

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/05/AR2007100501041\_pf.html) JPG

Who're you calling sclerotic? The European Union's $16 trillion economy has been quietly surging for some time and has emerged as the largest trading bloc in the world, producing nearly a third of the global economy. That's more than the U.S. economy (27 percent) or Japan's (9 percent). Despite all the hype, China is still an economic dwarf, accounting for less than 6 percent of the world's economy. India is smaller still. The European economy was never as bad as the Europessimists made it out to be. From 2000 to 2005, when the much-heralded U.S. economic recovery was being fueled by easy credit and a speculative housing market, the 15 core nations of the European Union had per capita economic growth rates equal to that of the United States. In late 2006, they surpassed us. Europe added jobs at a faster rate, had a much lower budget deficit than the United States and is now posting higher productivity gains and a $3 billion trade surplus. 2. Nobody wants to invest in European companies and economies because lack of competitiveness makes them a poor bet. Wrong again. Between 2000 and 2005, foreign direct investment in the E.U. 15 was almost half the global total, and investment returns in Europe outperformed those in the United States. "Old Europe is an investment magnet because it is the most lucrative market in the world in which to operate," says Dan O'Brien of the Economist. In fact, corporate America is a huge investor in Europe; U.S. companies' affiliates in the E.U. 15 showed profits of $85 billion in 2005, far more than in any other region of the world and 26 times more than the $3.3 billion they made in China. And forget that old canard about economic competitiveness. According to the World Economic Forum's measure of national competitiveness, European countries took the top four spots, seven of the top 10 spots and 12 of the top 20 spots in 2006-07. The United States ranked sixth. India ranked 43rd and mainland China 54th.

Alt Causes – Competitiveness

East Asian technology kills competitiveness

Segal 4 (Adam, Sen. Felow @ Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs November/December ed.

, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html?mode=print) JPG

Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing.

Competiveness Low

Competitiveness low now

Lechleiter 7/9 (John C. writer @ Wall Street Journal, 7/9/10,

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704111704575354863772223910.html) JPG

Unfortunately, America's economy is in danger of losing what has always been our greatest competitive advantage: our genius for innovation. A recent study ranked the U.S. sixth among the top 40 industrialized nations in innovative competitiveness, but 40th out of 40 in "the rate of change in innovation capacity" over the past decade. The ranking, published last year by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, measured what countries are doing—in higher education, investment in research and development, corporate tax rates, and more—to become more innovative in the future. The U.S. ranked dead last. In other words, we're at serious risk of falling behind. The evidence is certainly mounting that we are facing today nothing short of an innovation crisis in America's life sciences. The industry I know best, biopharmaceuticals, is facing unprecedented pressure. R&D costs continue to rise, fewer potential new medicines gain regulatory approval, and key products lose patent protection. In fact, the number of new molecular entities approved by the FDA over the past five years—92—is lower than in any other five-year period since I entered the industry in the late 1970s. Meanwhile, the rest of the world is not standing still. The U.S. is not the only country looking to the life sciences to drive economic growth, and the very qualities that brought much of the world's research capacity to our shores could just as easily attract that work to Asia or elsewhere.

No Competitiveness Theory

Competitiveness theory is wrong – based on flawed arithmetic and overwhelming evidence disproves

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) JPG

Guess what? Delors didn't confront the problems of either the welfare state or the ems. He explained that the root cause of European unemployment was a lack of competitiveness with the United States and Japan and that the solution was a program of investment in infrastructure and high technology. It was a disappointing evasion, but not a surprising one. After all, the rhetoric of competitiveness - - the view that, in the words of President Clinton, each nation is "like a big corporation competing in the global marketplace" -- has become pervasive among opinion leaders throughout the world. People who believe themselves to be sophisticated about the subject take it for granted that the economic problem facing any modern nation is essentially one of competing on world markets -- that the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi -- and are unaware that anyone might seriously question that proposition. Every few months a new best-seller warns the American public of the dire consequences of losing the "race" for the 21st century. A whole industry of councils on competitiveness, "geo-economists" and managed trade theorists has sprung up in Washington. Many of these people, having diagnosed America's economic problems in much the same terms as Delors did Europe's, are now in the highest reaches of the Clinton administration formulating economic and trade policy for the United States. So Delors was using a language that was not only convenient but comfortable for him and a wide audience on both sides of the Atlantic. Unfortunately, his diagnosis was deeply misleading as a guide to what ails Europe, and similar diagnoses in the United States are equally misleading. The idea that a country's economic fortunes are largely determined by its success on world markets is a hypothesis, not a necessary truth; and as a practical, empirical matter, that hypothesis is flatly wrong. That is, it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets. The growing obsession in most advanced nations with international competitiveness should be seen, not as a well-founded concern, but as a view held in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. And yet it is clearly a view that people very much want to hold -- a desire to believe that is reflected in a remarkable tendency of those who preach the doctrine of competitiveness to support their case with careless, flawed arithmetic.

The necessity of competitiveness is exaggerated

Krugman 91 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Science New Series Vol. 254 No. 5033, 11/8/91, pp. 811-815, Jstor) JPG

There are valid reasons for concern over U.S. international competitiveness, but they are not what most people think. The common fear is that an economy that fails to keep up with its trading partners will suffer severe economic damage-incurable trade deficits, large-scale unemployment, perhaps economic collapse. This fear is unjustified. Both in theory and in practice, countries with lagging productivity are still able to balance their international trade, because what drives trade is comparative rather than absolute advantage. Maintaining productivity growth and technological progress is extremely important; but it is important for its own sake, not because it is necessary to keep up with international competition. The real competitive issue is subtler. There is no question that in many cases comparative advantage arises from self-reinforcing ex- ternal economies rather than as a result of underlying national resources. In such cases international competition may exclude a country from an industry in which it could have established a comparative a dvantage,or drive a country from an industry in which comparative advantage could have been maintained. In these cases, a intellectually respectable argument can be made for government policies to create or preserve advantage. The fact that an argument is intellectually respectable does not mean that it is right. Concerns over competitiveness that are valid in principle can be and have been misused or abused in practice. Competitiveness is both a subtler and a more problematic issue than is generally understood.

Competitiveness Not Key to Econ

Competitiveness not key– no interdependence and domestic growth outweighs

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) JPG

Well, here are the numbers. Over the period 1959-73, a period of vigorous growth in U.S. living standards and few concerns about international competition, real gnp per worker-hour grew 1.85 percent annually, while command gnp per hour grew a bit faster, 1.87 percent. From 1973 to 1990, a period of stagnating living standards, command gnp growth per hour slowed to 0.65 percent. Almost all (91 percent) of that slowdown, however, was explained by a decline in domestic productivity growth: real gnp per hour grew only 0.73 percent. Similar calculations for the European Community and Japan yield similar results. In each case, the growth rate of living standards essentially equals the growth rate of domestic productivity -- not productivity relative to competitors, but simply domestic productivity. Even though world trade is larger than ever before, national living standards are overwhelmingly determined by domestic factors rather than by some competition for world markets. How can this be in our interdependent world? Part of the answer is that the world is not as interdependent as you might think: countries are nothing at all like corporations. Even today, U.S. exports are only 10 percent of the value-added in the economy (which is equal to gnp). That is, the United States is still almost 90 percent an economy that produces goods and services for its own use. By contrast, even the largest corporation sells hardly any of its output to its own workers; the "exports" of General Motors -- its sales to people who do not work there -- are virtually all of its sales, which are more than 2.5 times the corporation's value-added. Moreover, countries do not compete with each other the way corporations do. Coke and Pepsi are almost purely rivals: only a negligible fraction of Coca-Cola's sales go to Pepsi workers, only a negligible fraction of the goods Coca-Cola workers buy are Pepsi products. So if Pepsi is successful, it tends to be at Coke's expense. But the major industrial countries, while they sell products that compete with each other, are also each other's main export markets and each other's main suppliers of useful imports. If the European economy does well, it need not be at U.S. expense; indeed, if anything a successful European economy is likely to help the U.S. economy by providing it with larger markets and selling it goods of superior quality at lower prices.

Competitiveness false – leads to bad policy making

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Economics and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton, 1994, <http://infoshako.sk.tsukuba.ac.jp/~takasaki/Teaching_U/IEU/Krugman(1994).pdf)> LL

It was a disappointing evasion, but not a surprising one. After all, the rhetoric of competitiveness -- the view that, in the words of President Clinton, each nation is "like a big corporation competing in the global marketplace" -- has become pervasive among opinion leaders throughout the world. People who believe themselves to be sophisticated about the subject take it for granted that the economic problem facing any modern nation is essentially one of competing on world markets -- that the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi -- and are unaware that anyone might seriously question that proposition. Every few months a new best-seller warns the American public of the dire consequences of losing the "race" for the 21st century. A whole industry of councils on competitiveness, "geo-economists" and managed trade theorists has sprung up in Washington. Many of these people, having diagnosed America's economic problems in much the same terms as Delors did Europe's, are now in the highest reaches of the Clinton administration formulating economic and trade policy for the United States. So Delors was using a language that was not only convenient but comfortable for him and a wide audience on both sides of the Atlantic.Unfortunately, his diagnosis was deeply misleading as a guide to what ails Europe, and similar diagnoses in the United States are equally misleading. The idea that a country's economic fortunes are largely determined by its success on world markets is a hypothesis, not a necessary truth; and as a practical, empirical matter, that hypothesis is flatly wrong. That is, it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets. The growing obsession in most advanced nations with international competitiveness should be seen, not as a well-founded concern, but as a view held in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. And yet it is clearly a view that people very much want to hold -- a desire to believe that is reflected in a remarkable tendency of those who preach the doctrine of competitiveness to support their case with careless, flawed arithmetic. This article makes three points. First, it argues that concerns about competitiveness are, as an empirical matter, almost completely unfounded. Second, it tries to explain why defining the economic problem as one of international competition is nonetheless so attractive to so many people. Finally, it argues that the obsession with competitiveness is not only wrong but dangerous, skewing domestic policies and threatening the international economic system. This last issue is, of course, the most consequential from the standpoint of public policy. Thinking in terms of competitiveness leads, directly and indirectly, to bad economic policies on a wide range of issues, domestic and foreign, whether it be in health care or trade.

Competitiveness Bad – Resources

Competitiveness causes misallocation of resources – hurts service sectors

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) JPG

During the 1950s, fear of the Soviet Union induced the U.S. goverment to spend money on useful things like highways and science education. It also, however, led to considerable spending on more doubtful items like bomb shelters. The most obvious if least worrisome danger of the growing obsession with competitiveness is that it might lead to a similar misallocation of resources. To take an example, recent guidelines for government research funding have stressed the importance of supporting research that can improve U.S. international competitiveness. This exerts at least some bias toward inventions that can help manufacturing firms, which generally compete on international markets, rather than service producers, which generally do not. Yet most of our employment and value-added is now in services, and lagging productivity in servicesrather than manufactures has been the single most important factor in the stagnation of U.S. living standards.

Competitiveness Cause Trade Wars

Competitiveness causes trade wars – turns the internal link

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) JPG

A much more serious risk is that the obsession with competitiveness will lead to trade conflict, perhaps even to a world trade war. Most of those who have preached the doctrine of competitiveness have not been old-fashioned protectionists. They want their countries to win the global trade game, not drop out. But what if, despite its best efforts, a country does not seem to be winning, or lacks confidence that it can? Then the competitive diagnosis inevitably suggests that to close the borders is better than to risk having foreigners take away high-wage jobs and high-value sectors. At the very least, the focus on the supposedly competitive nature of international economic relations greases the rails for those who want confrontational if not frankly protectionist policies. We can already see this process at work, in both the United States and Europe. In the United States, it was remarkable how quickly the sophisticated interventionist arguments advanced by Laura Tyson in her published work gave way to the simple-minded claim by U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor that Japan's bilateral trade surplus was costing the United States millions of jobs. And the trade rhetoric of President Clinton, who stresses the supposed creation of high-wage jobs rather than the gains from specialization, left his administration in a weak position when it tried to argue with the claims of NAFTA foes that competition from cheap Mexican labor will destroy the U.S. manufacturing base.

\*\*\*DEMOCRACY\*\*\*

Democracy – Doesn’t Solve War

Democracy doesn’t solve war – leaders go to war despite public opposition.

Mansfield And Snyder 95 (Edward, Polisci@Columbia University, and Jack, polisci@Columbia University, May, Foreign Affairs, “Democratization and War”, Volume 74, Issue 3, pg 79)KM

ALTHOUGH DEMOCRATIZATION in many cases leads to was, that does not mean that the average voter wants war. Public opinion in democratizing states often starts off highly averse to the costs and risks of war. In that sense, the public opinion polls taken in Russia in early 1994 were typical. Respondents said, for example, that Russian policy should make sure the rights of Russians in neighboring states were not infringed, but not at the cost of military intervention. Public opinion often becomes more belligerent, however, as a result of propaganda and military action presented as faits accomplis by elites. This mass opinion, once aroused, may no longer be controllable. For example, Napoleon III successfully exploited the domestic prestige from France's share of the victory in the Crimean War to consolidate his rule, despite the popular reluctance and war-weariness that had accompanied the war. Having learned this lesson well, Napoleon tried this tactic again in 1859. On the eve of his military intervention in the Italian struggle with Austria, he admitted to his ministers that "on the domestic front, the war will at first awaken great fears; traders and speculators of every stripe will shriek, but national sentiment will [banish] this domestic fright; the nation will be put to the test once more in a struggle that will stir many a heart, recall the memory of heroic times, and bring together under the mantle of glory the parties that are steadily drifting away from one another day after day."(2) Napoleon was trying not just to follow opinion but to make public opinion bellicose, in order to stir a national feeling that would enhance the state's ability to govern a split and stalemated political arena. Much the same has happened in contemporary Serbia. Despite the memories of Ustashe atrocities in World War II, intermarriage rates between Croats and Serbs living in Croatia were as high as one in three during the 1980s. Opinion has been bellicized by propaganda campaigns in state-controlled media that, for example, carried purely invented reports of rapes of Serbian women in Kosovo, and even more so by the fait accompli of launching the war itself. In short, democratizing states are war-prone not because war is popular with the mass public, but because domestic pressures create incentives for elites to drum up nationalist sentiment.

Democracy – Doesn’t Solve War

Democratic peace theory is a lie – democratic institutions foster conflict and wars – Africa proves.

Zakaria, 99 (Fareed, professor IR @ Harvard, Columbia, and Case Western, “The Rise of Illiberal Democracy,” November, http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/other/democracy.html)KM

On December 8,1996, Jack Lang made a dramatic dash to Belgrade. The French celebrity politician, formerly minister of culture, had been inspired by the student demonstrations involving tens of thousands against Slobodan Milosevic, a man Lang and many Western intellec tuals held responsible for the war in the Balkans. Lang wanted to lend his moral support to the Yugoslav opposition. The leaders of the move ment received him in their offices?the philosophy department?only to boot him out, declare him "an enemy of the Serbs," and order him to leave the country. It turned out that the students opposed Milosevic not for starting the war, but for failing to win it. Lang's embarrassment highlights two common, and often mistaken, assumptions?that the forces of democracy are the forces of ethnic harmony and of peace. Neither is necessarily true. Mature liberal democracies can usually accommodate ethnic divisions without violence or terror and live in peace with other liberal democracies. But without a background in constitutional liberalism, the introduction of democracy in divided societies has actually fomented nationalism, ethnic conflict, and even war. The spate of elections held immediately after the col lapse of communism were won in the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia by nationalist separatists and resulted in the breakup of those countries. This was not in and of itself bad, since those countries had been bound together by force. But the rapid secessions, without guarantees, insti tutions, or political power for the many minorities living within the new countries, have caused spirals of rebellion, repression, and, in places like Bosnia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, war. Elections require that politicians compete for peoples' votes. In societies without strong traditions of multiethnic groups or assimilation, it is easiest to organize support along racial, ethnic, or religious lines. Once an ethnic group is in power, it tends to exclude other ethnic groups. Compromise seems impossible; one can bargain on material issues like housing, hospitals, and handouts, but how does one split the difference on a national religion? Political competition that is so divisive can rapidly degenerate into violence. Opposition move ments, armed rebellions, and coups in Africa have often been directed against ethnically based regimes, many of which came to powerthrough elections. Surveying the breakdown of African and Asian democracies in the 1960s, two scholars concluded that democracy "is simply not viable in an environment of intense ethnic preferences." Recent studies, particularly of Africa and Central Asia, have confirmed this pessimism. A distinguished expert on ethnic conflict, Donald Horowitz, concluded, "In the face of this rather dismal account. . . of the concrete failures of democracy in divided societies . . . one is tempted to throw up one's hands. What is the point of holding elec tions if all they do in the end is to substitute a Bemba-dominated regime for a Nyanja regime in Zambia, the two equally narrow, or a southern regime for a northern one in Benin, neither incorporating the other half of the state?"8

Democracy – Long Timeframe

Democratization takes decades.

Diamond 0 (Larry, professor. “Democracy Promotion for the Long Haul.” 11-30 http://www.stanford.edu/~ldiamond/papers/AIDpartners.pdf) km

It will not do to promote free and fair elections if we do not effectively promote the other elements of democracy as well. And this is not a short-term agenda. A great danger in political assistance is the temptation to seek a big bang, a breakthrough election, and then phase out and walk way. If we want to be effective in promoting democracy, we have to be prepared to be engaged in countries for a long period of time, in a variety of sectors, and at multiple levels of governance. We have to stick with countries—at least with embattled civil societies—when things get grim, and we to sustain our efforts when a crisis subsides and democrats settle into the protracted, prosaic work of gradually building and reforming democratic institutions. We are swimming against long histories and huge odds. We cannot expect to be able to reverse decades of institutional deformity and decay and to transform deeply entrenched cultures and social structures in a few years. We need a strategic view of democracy 4 promotion for the long term. Ten years on, in most of the countries where we work, we are still in the early stages of the struggle for liberal, accountable, legitimate, and sustainable democracy, in other words, for democratic consolidation. If we do not lose our nerve, our energy, our conviction, and our vision, we can help to build new patterns of governance that do truly transform the world.

\*\*\*DETERRENCE\*\*\*

Deterrence Fails – Generic

Actors are psychologically unpredictable making deterrence useless.

Record 4(Jeffery former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee “Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation” July 8 The CATO Institute)AQB

That said, nuclear deterrence, like its nonnuclear varieties, is a psychological process and therefore inherently difficult to manage. Colin Gray astutely points out that “the intended deterree is at liberty to refuse to allow his policy to be controlled by foreign menaces.” In other words, “Whether or not the intended deterree decides he is deterred is a decision that remains strictly in his hands.”17 And his decision may be governed by not only an entirely different set of values than that of the deterrer but also a much greater stake in the outcome of the crisis at hand. Keith Payne at the National Institute for Public Policy and Dale Walton at Southwest Missouri State University observe that the presumption of rationality “does not . . . imply that the decision-maker’s prioritization of goals and values will be shared by or considered sensible to outside observers. Nor does rationality imply that any particular moral standard guides the selection of goals and values.” In fact, “rational decision making can underlie behavior judged to be unreasonable, shocking, and even criminal by an observer because that behavior is so far removed from any shared norms and standards. Rational leaders with extreme ideological commitments, for instance, may have goals that appear irrational to outside observers.”18 Johnson administration decision makers in 1965 fatally underestimated North Vietnam’s strength of interest in the struggle for South Vietnam and believed that Hanoi could be brought to heel via a coercive bombing campaign. They failed to understand that a reunified Vietnam under communist auspices was a nonnegotiable war aim for Hanoi and, for that very reason, that the Vietnamese communists were prepared to make—and made—manpower sacrifices “irrational” in magnitude.19 Additionally, the deterree, whatever his values and priorities, might not regard a deterrent threat as credible. The foundation of successful deterrence is the deterree’s conviction that the deterrer means what he says, that he has the will to do what he threatens to do. Nonnuclear deterrence was a significant problem for the United States in the years separating defeat in Vietnam and the 9/11 attacks. The so-called “Vietnam syndrome,” enshrined in the Weinberger-Powell doctrine and reinforced by humiliating military evacuations under fire in Lebanon and Somalia and by agonizing indecision in the Balkans, conveyed an image of military power greatly in excess of a willingness to use it and use it decisively. Both Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were motivated to attack U.S. interests in part out of a low regard for America’s willingness to sustain bloody combat overseas.

Deterrence Fails – Proliferation

Models of nuclear deterrence fail to show that deterrence is the sole factor that prevents proliferation.

Record 4(Jeffery former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee “Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation” July 8 The CATO Institute)AQB

That is not to deny the inherent difficulty of maintaining credible deterrence, especially against adversaries whose culture and values are alien to our own. Deterrence is a psychological phenomenon, and as such is inherently unstable. Nor can one ignore the impossibility of proving the negative. The success of deterrence is measured by events that do not happen, and one cannot demonstrate conclusively that an enemy refrained from this or that action because of the implicit or explicit threat of unacceptable retaliation. The argument here is that deterrence should continue to be the policy of first resort in dealing with hostile states acquiring or seeking to acquire WMD and that preventive war—as opposed to preemptive military action aimed at disrupting an imminent attack—is almost always a bad and ultimately self-defeating option. Richard K. Betts at Columbia University observes that past American arguments for preventive war against the Soviet Union and Mao’s China “proved terribly wrong.”4

Deterrence Fails – Non State Actors

9/11 proves that deterrence fails against non-state actors like terrorists.

Record 4(Jeffery former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee “Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation” July 8 The CATO Institute)AQB

The Bush administration believes that the 9/11 attacks demonstrate a diminished efficacy of nuclear deterrence. With respect to nonstate enemies, especially fanatical terrorist organizations like al Qaeda, deterrence is clearly inadequate. How does one deter an enemy with which one is already at war and which presents little in the way of assets—territory, population, governmental infrastructure, and so forth—that can be held hostage to retaliation? Preventive military action, in contrast, is integral to the prosecution of hostilities against state and nonstate enemies; once a war is underway, military action to deny the enemy the ability to fight another day is inevitable and imperative, whether that “another day” is tomorrow or a potential future war years away. To destroy and disrupt is to deny and prevent. Striking first inside a war is not an issue. Thus, in the war against al Qaeda, having “already been attacked, it is logical for the United States . . . to strike first against al Qaeda and similar groups whenever doing so is militarily feasible and effective,” noted Betts before the Iraq War. “The issue arises in regard to states who have not attacked us—at least not yet. This distinction between Iraq and al Qaeda, obscured in much discussion of this issue, must be clearly maintained.”5

Deterrence Fails – AT: Cold War Proves

Cold war is a horrible example – no way to test events that didn’t happen.

Record 4(Jeffery former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee “Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation” July 8 The CATO Institute)AQB

It remains unclear whether the Soviet Union fully accepted the logic of assured destruction, which was based on the American assumption of rational decision making on both sides, and on the more specific assumption that the Soviets would, in the face of nuclear threats, behave reasonably by U.S. standards.11 What is clear is that until the mid1960s the United States enjoyed a substantial superiority in both first- and second-strike nuclear forces, and that subsequent Soviet attainment of quantitative superiority in land based first-strike capabilities vis-à-vis the United States never effectively compromised the security of America’s devastating second strike capabilities. By the early 1970s a condition of mutually assured destruction had emerged, prompting American nuclear strategists to assume that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union “would ever be sufficiently motivated, foolish, ignorant, or incoherent to accept the risk of nuclear war; both would be rational when it came to calculating the potential costs and benefits in the conduct of their foreign policies.”12 Though some disputed the postulation of rationality, the fact remains that the Cold War remained cold. From the end of World War II to the end of the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union abjured direct military engagement—nuclear or otherwise— as an instrument of policy against each other. Though both constructed vast nuclear arsenals and on occasion threatened their use, they never launched nuclear weapons. Was there a cause-and-effect relationship between the presence of nuclear weapons and the absence of war? It is easy to assume that a condition of mutual nuclear deterrence accounted for the “long peace.” But, as former secretary of state Henry Kissinger (among many others) has pointed out: Since deterrence can only be tested negatively, by events that do not take place, and since it is never possible to demonstrate why something has not occurred, it became especially difficult to assess whether the existing policy was the best possible policy or just barely an effective one. Perhaps deterrence was even unnecessary because it was impossible to prove whether the adversary ever intended to attack in the first place.13 Thus, it is possible that nuclear weapons had little or nothing to do with the absence of a NATO-Warsaw Pact war.14

Deterrence Works – Rogue States

Deterrence has been proven to work on rouge states attempting to get nuclear weapons.

Record 4(Jeffery former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee “Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation” July 8 The CATO Institute)AQB

To substitute preventive war for deterrence is to ignore the fact that traditional nuclear deterrence was directed at states already armed with nuclear weapons and was aimed at deterring their use in time of crisis or war; it was not enlisted as a means deterring the acquisition of nuclear weapons. That task was, at least until 9/11, left primarily to the regime established by the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also known as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), and to the U.S. policy of providing nuclear guarantees to allies that might otherwise have felt the need to develop their own nuclear weapons. The administration’s security strategy is further challenged by the broader question of whether it is possible over the long run to prevent proliferation of WMD on the part of states determined to acquire them. Traditional nonproliferation policy implied that nuclear proliferation could be contained and treated all proliferation as undesirable despite evidence that it could be stabilizing as well as destabilizing.3 Moreover, as the American experience with Iraq has shown, preventive war is a costly and risky enterprise subject to the law of unintended consequences. And it is not at all self-evident that preventive war is necessary, at least against states (as opposed to nonstate entities); on the contrary, preventive war may actually encourage proliferation, although the impact of Operation Iraqi Freedom on North Korean and Iranian attitudes toward nuclear weapons remains as yet unclear. In the final analysis, it is not the mere presence of WMD in hostile hands—but rather their use—that kills and destroys. Accordingly, if their use can be deterred—and the evidence suggests that deterrence does work against rogue states if not terrorist organizations, then deterrence of their use is manifestly a much more attractive policy option than war to prevent their acquisition.

\*\*\*DISEASE\*\*\*

Disease – No Impact

No impact – diseases evolve to be more mild and humans evolve past vulnerabilities.

Achenbach 3 (Joel, Washington Post Staff Writer, "Our Friend, the Plague," Nov, http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/0311/resources\_who.html)KM

Whenever a new disease appears somewhere on our planet, experts invariably pop up on TV with grave summations of the problem, usually along the lines of, "We're in a war against the microbes"—pause for dramatic effect —"and the microbes are winning." War, however, is a ridiculously overused metaphor and probably should be bombed back to the Stone Age. Paul Ewald, a biologist at the University of Louisville, advocates a different approach to lethal microbes. Forget trying to obliterate them, he says, and focus instead on how they co-evolve with humans. Make them mutate in the right direction. Get the powers of evolution on our side. Disease organisms can, in fact, become less virulent over time. When it was first recognized in Europe around 1495, syphilis killed its human hosts within months. The quick progression of the disease—from infection to death—limited the ability of syphilis to spread. So a new form evolved, one that gave carriers years to infect others. For the same reason, the common cold has become less dangerous. Milder strains of the virus—spread by people out and about, touching things, and shaking hands—have an evolutionary advantage over more debilitating strains. You can't spread a cold very easily if you're incapable of rolling out of bed. This process has already weakened all but one virulent strain of malaria: Plasmodium falciparum succeeds in part because bedridden victims of the disease are more vulnerable to mosquitoes that carry and transmit the parasite. To mitigate malaria, the secret is to improve housing conditions. If people put screens on doors and windows, and use bed nets, it creates an evolutionary incentive for Plasmodium falciparum to become milder and self-limiting. Immobilized people protected by nets and screens can't easily spread the parasite, so evolution would favor forms that let infected people walk around and get bitten by mosquitoes. There are also a few high-tech tricks for nudging microbes in the right evolutionary direction. One company, called MedImmune, has created a flu vaccine using a modified influenza virus that thrives at 77°F instead of 98.6°F, the normal human body temperature. The vaccine can be sprayed in a person's nose, where the virus survives in the cool nasal passages but not in the hot lungs or elsewhere in the body. The immune system produces antibodies that make the person better prepared for most normal, nasty influenza bugs. Maybe someday we'll barely notice when we get colonized by disease organisms. We'll have co-opted them. They'll be like in-laws, a little annoying but tolerable. If a friend sees us sniffling, we'll just say, Oh, it's nothing—just a touch of plague.

Disease burns out before it can cause extinction – lethal viruses will kill their hosts too fast.

Understanding Evolution 7 (Website on Evolution from UC Berkeley, "Evolution from a virus's view," December, http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/news/071201\_adenovirus)KM

Since transmission is a matter of life or death for pathogen lineages, some evolutionary biologists have focused on this as the key to understanding why some have evolved into killers and others cause no worse than the sniffles. The idea is that there may be an evolutionary trade-off between virulence and transmission. Consider a virus that exploits its human host more than most and so produces more offspring than most. This virus does a lot of damage to the host — in other words, is highly virulent. From the virus's perspective, this would, at first, seem like a good thing; extra resources mean extra offspring, which generally means high evolutionary fitness. However, if the viral reproduction completely incapacitates the host, the whole strategy could backfire: the illness might prevent the host from going out and coming into contact with new hosts that the virus could jump to. A victim of its own success, the viral lineage could go extinct and become an evolutionary dead end. This level of virulence is clearly not a good thing from the virus's perspective.

Disease – No Impact

Diseases strong enough to cause quick deaths kill their hosts too fast to spread rapidly.

Lafee 9 (“Viruses versus hosts: a battle as old as time”, SCOTT MAY 3, http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2009/may/03/1n3virus01745-viruses-versus-hosts-battle-old-time/?uniontrib)KM

Generally speaking, it's not in a virus's best interest to kill its host. Deadly viruses such as Ebola and SARS are self-limiting because they kill too effectively and quickly to spread widely. Flu viruses do kill, but they aren't considered especially deadly. The fatality rate of the 1918 “Spanish flu” pandemic was less than 2.5 percent, and most of those deaths are now attributed to secondary bacterial infections. The historic fatality rate for influenza pandemics is less than 0.1 percent. Humans make “imperfect hosts” for the nastiest flu viruses, Sette said. “From the point of view of the virus, infecting humans can be a dead end. We sicken and die too soon.”

Diseases strong enough to kill will burnout – evolution is on our side.

Adam 5 (Mike, Staff Writer for Newstarget.com, "Why the bird flu virus is less deadly but more dangerous," June 21, http://www.outlivetheflu.com/why-the-bird-flu-virus-is-less-deadly-but-more-dangerous.htm)KM

If you're a really deadly virus -- like Ebola, which kills 90 percent of the people infected -- then you're actually not very good at spreading from one person to the next. Why? You kill your host too quickly. You're so deadly that your host dies before you get a chance to be infectious. In order to be a pandemic, a virus must be highly infectious; it must be able to spread from one person to another in an undetectable way. When a virus becomes less-immediately lethal, it is able to survive in the host in an undetectable state, for a longer period of time. This is what makes viruses really, really dangerous: A dangerous virus is not lethal to one individual; rather, it can exist in a hidden state and be passed from one person to the next. It's the contagiousness of a virus that makes it dangerous. Let's say you're a virus and you consider "success" to be wiping people out. Obviously, viruses don't have that sort of thought process, this is just a way to explain their strategies. If you're a virus and you're trying to infect and kill people, you're going to be far more "successful" if you have a low kill rate but infect a billion people, rather than having a very high kill rate and only infecting 10 or 20 people. If you are a very deadly virus in the Congo, for example, and you manage to wipe out a small village, even though you were rather horrifying to the village and fatal to those people, you as a virus haven't been very successful. Why? You wiped out the village; there's nobody left to spread it. Now, again, of course viruses don't think this way: They don't have plans, they don't have strategies -- this is just evolutionary biology in play. On the other hand, let's say you are a virus with a very small kill rate -- you only kill one or two percent of your hosts -- but you're highly infectious. You, as this type of virus, can easily spread from one person to the next. Since 98 or 99 percent of the people who are infected with you won't die from it, they can walk around cities, airports and football stadiums and spread you to all the other hosts out there. If you are that kind of virus, you're going to be a lot more "successful" in spreading. In the history of infectious disease, the most deadly viruses, in terms of the total number of people killed worldwide, were highly infectious, not necessarily highly lethal. If you look at the 1918 so-called "Spanish" flu (which really wasn't from Spain, but that's another story), the virus did not have a kill rate anywhere near 90 percent, or even 70 percent. I believe it was well under 20 percent. But this virus was good at spreading from one host to another, which is what made it extremely dangerous.

Disease – No Impact

Traveling restriction limit the ability for diseases to spread world wide.

Camitz and Liljeros 5 (Martin, Swedish Institute for Infectious Disease Control, Fredrik, Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institute, "The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of a highly contagious disease in Sweden," Oct 5, http://arxiv.org/ftp/q-bio/papers/0505/0505044.pdf)KM

Our results show clearly that traveling restrictions will have a significant beneficial effect, both reducing the geographical spread and the total and local incidence. This holds true for all three levels of inter-community infectiousness simulated, g. g is influenced by many factors, most notably by total travel intensity, but also by the medium of travel, the behavior of the traveler, the model of dispersal by travel and by the infectiousness of the disease. Hufnagel calibrated g using data from the actual outbreak. As mentioned, no attempt was made on our part to find the “true” value of g in the new settings, as no such outbreak data is available for Sweden. This would be considered a flaw for a quantitative study on a SARS outbreak in Sweden. By simulating for different values of the parameter, however, we can be confident in the qualitative conclusion, namely, that the same general behavior can be expected in the unrestricted scenario and in response to the control measures, regardless of g. In light of the fact that inter-municipal travel heavily influences incidence even at a local level, one may justifiably be concerned about the boundary conditions. We treat Sweden as an isolated country, but quite obviously, the incidence will be underestimated for areas with frequent traffic across the borders. This includes in particular the Öresund region around Malmö, and to a lesser extent, international airports and the small towns bordering on Norway and Finland. Even though there is presently no treatment or vaccine for SARS, results show that limited quarantine as suggested here drastically decreases the risk of transmission and this may well turn out to be the most expedient form of intervention. In many countries, Sweden included, limiting freedom of travel is unconstitutional and must take the form of general recommendations. Additionally, certain professions of crucial importance to society during a crisis situation must be exempt from travel restrictions. The study shows that even if a substantial fraction of the population breaks the restrictions, this strategy is still viable. For other types of disease for which preventive treatment (pandemic flu) or vaccine (small-pox) are available, our results show that long-distance travelers are an important group for targeted control measures.

Diversity checks – no one disease is universal to all humans.

Sowell 1 (Thomas, Fellow @ Hoover Institution, Jewish World Review, “The Dangers of “Equality””, 3-5, http://www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/sowell030501.asp)

People have different vulnerabilities and resistances to a variety of diseases. That is why one disease is unlikely to wipe out the human species, even in one place. An epidemic that sweeps through an area may leave some people dying like flies while others remain as healthy as horses.

Burnout checks – viruses deadly enough to kill everyone kill too fast to spread.

The Guardian 3(“Second Sight”, September 25, http://technology.guardian.co.uk/online/story/0,3605,1048929,00.html)KM

The parallel with the natural world is illustrative. Take the case of everyone's favourite evil virus, Ebola. This is so virulent that it kills up to 90% of infected hosts within one to two weeks. There is no known cure. So how come the entire population hasn't dropped dead from haemorrhaging, shock or renal failure? The "organism" is just too deadly: it kills too quickly and has too short an incubation period, so the pool of infected people doesn't grow.

Disease – AIDS – No Impact

AIDS won’t cause extinction – even in high prevalence areas they aren’t affecting population growth.

Caldwell 0 (Joseph, PhD in mathmatics @ The University of North Carolina, "The End of the World, and the New World Order," March 6, http://www.foundationwebsite.org/TheEndOfTheWorld.htm)KM

Disease could wipe out mankind. It is clear that HIV/AIDS will not accomplish this – it is not even having a significant impact on slowing the population explosion in Africa, where prevalence rates reach over thirty percent in some countries. But a real killer plague could certainly wipe out mankind. The interesting thing about plagues, however, is that they never seem to kill everyone – historically, the mortality rate is never 100 per cent (from disease alone). Based on historical evidence, it would appear that, while plagues may certainly reduce human population, they are not likely to wipe it out entirely. This notwithstanding, the gross intermingling of human beings and other species that accompanies globalization nevertheless increases the likelihood of global diseases to high levels.

Humans can evolve to withstand AIDS – Northern Europeans prove.

Smith 6 (Stephen, Reporter at Health and Science Desk for Boston Globe, “A Darwinian view of AIDS”, March, http://www.boston.com/news/science/articles/2006/03/13/a\_darwinian\_view\_of\_aids/?page=full)KM

As researchers unlocked the secrets of HIV, they found a gene mutation they suspect may protect against the virus that causes AIDS. Human cells have locks on their surface -- scientists call them receptors -- and a virus must insert its key into these locks to gain entry. One of those is called CCR5, and HIV needs to unlock it to be able to infect cells. But scientists in recent years discovered that 5 to 10 percent of people in northern Europe don't have CCR5 receptors. ''And that's where the story gets interesting," said Dr. Calvin Cohen, research director for Community Research Initiative of New England, which conducts trials of AIDS drugs. In contrast, people in Africa and Asia universally possess CCR5. So researchers theorized that lower HIV rates in northern Europe might be due in part to some people lacking the cellular lock. But why don't they have it? Right now, it's only an informed hunch, but scientists suspect that the mutation exhibited by northern Europeans may be an artifact of the bubonic plague. The theory goes like this: As the plague swarmed Europe starting in the 14th century, it wiped out people who possessed CCR5 but spared those who lacked it. ''What we're talking about is a Darwinian process," Harmit Malik, who specializes in the study of genetic conflict at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle. ''What was a really rare mutation was what survived. Everyone else had fallen prey to this particular pathogen."

No impact – AIDS is evolving into a less deadly form to prevent burnout.

Daily News Central 5 (Health News provides news geared toward health consumers, Health News, “HIV Virus May Be Evolving to Less Deadly Form”, September, http://health.dailynewscentral.com/content/view/1716/0)KM

New evidence suggests that the AIDS virus, HIV, may be weakening. Scientists in Belgium compared samples of HIV-1, the most dangerous strain of the virus, from the 1980s and 2002. Laboratory tests showed that the older viruses were significantly "fitter." They multiplied more easily and were better able to resist anti-retroviral drugs. The findings appear to contradict recent trends which indicate a growth in HIV drug resistance. But they support theories which suggest that viruses sometimes evolve to become less virulent in order to safeguard their survival. Infection Rates In this respect, HIV may be following in the footsteps of the virus which causes myxomatosis in rabbits. When the myxoma virus was deliberately introduced as a control measure in Australia in 1950, rabbit populations were decimated. But weakened strains of the virus quickly emerged, so that many rabbits now develop a chronic form of the disease instead of dying. Experts warn, however, that HIV infection rates are continuing to rise in the UK and elsewhere, and there should be no scaling down of efforts to curb its spread. Replicative Fitness The researchers, led by Kevin Arien from the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Antwerp, looked at HIV-1-infected cells obtained from patients in 1986-89 and 2002-03. The older viruses out-competed the new ones on 176 occasions out of 238. In nine out of 12 specially controlled and carefully matched tests, the 1980s viruses proved the stronger. The researchers wrote in the journal AIDS: "These findings suggest that HIV-1 replicative fitness may have decreased in the human population since the start of the pandemic." Symbiotic Existence Previous models simulating the spread of infective agents have suggested that many lethal viruses and bacteria may evolve away their virulence, even to the point of "symbiotic existence" where they actually benefit the host. If a virus is too deadly, it risks working against itself by killing off many of its potential hosts. Becoming less prolific may also help to shield a virus from the host's immune system.

Disease – AIDS – No Impact

AIDS is weakening in the status quo – lower mortality rates are key to its evolutionary fitness.

Levin, 96 (Bruce R., Emory University, "The Evolution and Maintenance of Virulence in Microparasites" Emerging Infectious Diseases v. 2 http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/eid/vol2no2/levin.htm)KM

The predictions that can be made on the basis of the current view of the evolution of virulence differ from predictions that might follow conventional wisdom because the new view allows for natural selection in the parasite population to favor the evolution and maintenance of some level of virulence. Moreover, even when there is a positive association between a parasite’s virulence and its transmissibility, under the conditions described in the following paragraph, the predictions of new methods can still converge with those of conventional wisdom. If the density of the sensitive host population is regulated by the parasite, an extension of the enlightened theory predicts that natural selection in the microparasite population can lead to continuous declines in the level of virulence, possibly to immeasurable values (46). Although not stated in this general way, the same conclusion about declining virulence can be drawn from models of the epidemiology of HIV/AIDS (36, 37). During the epidemic phase of a microparasitic infection, when the host population is composed primarily of susceptible hosts, selection favors parasites with high transmission rates and thus high virulence. As the epidemic spreads, the proportion of infected and immune hosts increases and the density of susceptible hosts declines. As a result, the capacity for infectious transmission becomes progressively less important to the parasite’s Darwinian fitness and persistence in the host population. Selection now favors less virulent parasites that take longer to kill their host and, for that reason, are maintained in the host population for more extensive periods. Analogous arguments have been made for the latent period of a bacteriophage infection (47), the evolution of lysogeny (48), the tradeoff between vertical and horizontal transmission (49, 50), and the advantages of microparasite latency in general (40).

Disease – Swine Flu – No Impact

No risk of an impact – swine flu is just like a seasonal flu.

Nicks 9 (Health Technology Examiner Victoria, November 16, “Swine flu dangers exaggerated - Proportion of H1N1 deaths similar to annual seasonal flu deaths”, http://www.examiner.com/x-29228-LA-Health-Technology-Examiner~y2009m11d16-Swine-flu-dangers-exaggerated--Proportion-of-H1N1-deaths-similar-to-annual-seasonal-flu-deaths)KM

When comparing the average number of seasonal flu deaths that occur each year to the number of deaths from the Pandemic (H1N1) flu virus, commonly known as the swine flu, there is an obvious disparity. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), approximately 36,000 people die from the seasonal flu in the United States each year. Flu season is in full swing, and approximately 4,000 Americans have died so far. Doctor from Canada speaks out In a recent statement, Dr. David Butler-Jones stated, "the mortality rate from this (H1N1) is no worse than seasonal flu." This statement is contrary to the worldwide hysteria that surrounds the flu virus that has been labeled a "pandemic" and a "national emergency. So what are the real facts?

No risk of swine flu becoming a super-virus.

US News 9 (September 1, “Swine Flu May Be Less Dangerous Than Predicted: Study”, http://health.usnews.com/health-news/managing-your-healthcare/research/articles/2009/09/01/swine-flu-may-be-less-dangerous-than-predicted.html)KM

Fears that the H1N1 swine flu will turn into a "superbug" this year may be unfounded, say researchers at the University of Maryland. In laboratory tests, the virus responsible for the swine flu pandemic did not take a virulent turn when combined with other strains of seasonal flu. But it did spread more rapidly than the other viruses, confirming the need for swine flu vaccinations, the researchers said.

The numbers are false – states had bad methodology in determining numbers.

Burks 9 (Fred, October 29, “CDC and Swine Flu Deception: CBS News Reveals Numbers Greatly Exaggerated”, Coto report admin, http://coto2.wordpress.com/2009/10/29/cdc-and-swine-flu-deception-cbs-news-reveals-numbers-greatly-exaggerated/)KM

President Obama has declared a national emergency for the swine flu, noting a “rapid increase in illness.” A recent CNN article covering this critical topic goes on to quote CDC director Dr. Thomas Frieden, “since the H1N1 flu pandemic began in April, millions of people in the United States have been infected, at least 20,000 have been hospitalized and more than 1,000 have died.” Yet excellent investigative reporting by CBS News shows that the actual number of swine flu cases is being significantly exaggerated. The lead paragraph of this CBS article states: “If you’ve been diagnosed ‘probable’ or ‘presumed’ 2009 H1N1 or swine flu in recent months, you may be surprised to know this: odds are you didn’t have H1N1 flu. In fact, you probably didn’t have the flu at all. That’s according to state-by-state test results obtained in a three-month-long CBS News investigation.” The CBS report goes on to point out that the CDC strangely advised states to stop testing and to stop counting the number of swine flu cases last July. The CDC website explains that states are no longer differentiating between the regular flu and the swine flu, reporting instead all influenza and pneumonia-related hospitalizations and deaths in one count. This alone could lead to a great exaggeration of reported swine flu cases, particularly as the CDC website states that every year in the U.S. on average 5 to 20% of the population gets the seasonal flu. This means between 15 and 60 million people come down with some version of the flu every year. Complications from the seasonal flu are claimed to kill about 36,000 people (100 per day on average), while more than 200,000 are hospitalized annually.

No risk of swine flu – their impact authors are corporate hype.

Macrae 10 (4th June 2010, FIONA, “The pandemic that never was: Drug firms 'encouraged world health body to exaggerate swine flu threat'” http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1284133/The-pandemic-Drug-firms-encouraged-world-health-body-exaggerate-swine-flu-threat.html#ixzz0tD9FkXSz)KM

Declaring a swine flu pandemic was a 'monumental error', driven by profit-hungry drug companies spreading fear, an influential report has concluded. It led to huge amounts of taxpayers' money being wasted in stockpiling vaccines, it added. Paul Flynn, the Labour MP charged with investigating the handling of the swine flu outbreak for the Council of Europe, described it as 'a pandemic that never really was'. The report accuses the World Health Organisation of grave shortcomings in the transparency of the process that led to its warning last year. The MP said that the world relied on the WHO, but after 'crying wolf', its reputation was in jeopardy. The report questions whether the pandemic was driven by drug companies seeking a profit. Mr Flynn said predictions of a 'plague' that would wipe out up to 7.5million people proved to be 'an exaggeration', with fewer than 20,000 deaths worldwide.

Disease – Bird Flu – No Impact

Bird won’t mutate to infect humans and even if it did it wouldn’t spread.

Siegel 5 (Medicine@New York University, Marc, “Don’t Worry Be Healthy: Fear is more likely to get you than the Avian Flu”, September 13th, http://www.slate.com/id/2126233/)KM

Yet the science behind all the worry is questionable. It rests on the unproven claim that the avian flu will develop exactly like the strain that caused the flu pandemic of 1918. A March 2004 article in Science showed that the 1918 flu—which infected close to a billion people and killed 50 million or more—made the jump from birds to humans through a slight change in the structure of its hemagglutinins, the molecules by which the virus attaches itself to body cells. This mutation allowed the virus to kill more World War I soldiers than weapons did, effectively ending the war when forces on both sides became too sick to fight. The current bird flu, however, has a different molecular structure than the 1918 bug. And though it has infected millions of birds, there is no direct evidence that it is about to mutate into a form that would transmit from human to human. In isolated cases, food handlers in Asia have gotten sick, but that doesn't mean that a wildly lethal mutation is about to occur. As Wendy Orent points out in the New Republic, diseases that come from animals are often hard for humans to transmit. They lack the "essential characteristics" of virulent human infections—they're not durable, or waterborne, or carried by hospital workers, or transmitted sexually. Even if the worst-case scenario does occur and the virus mutates, there is no current indication that it will spread the way the Spanish flu did in 1918. That disease incubated in the World War I trenches before it spread across the world, infecting soldiers who were exhausted, packed together in trenches, and lacked access to hygiene. These conditions were an essential breeding ground for the virus. Today, there is no way a huge number of people would be packed together in WWI-like conditions. Also, technology allows doctors to diagnose and isolate flu patients far more effectively.

Bird flu won’t spread – genetic dispositions vary.

Xinhua 6 (November 2, “Genetic factors might influence human bird flu infection: WHO”, http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/200611/03/eng20061103\_317926.html)KM

Genetic factors might influence human infection of bird flu, which may explain why some people get the disease and others don't, and why it remains rare, the World Health Organization (WHO) said on Thursday. Scientists suspect some people have "a genetic predisposition" for bird flu infection, and others don't, the UN agency said in a report, which generalized conclusions of a WHO expert meeting in September. The theory is based on data from rare instances of human-to- human transmission in genetically-related persons. "This possibility, if more fully explored, might help explain why human cases are relatively rare, and why the virus is not spreading easily from animals to humans or from human to human," the WHO said.

Bird flu is not a threat – mutation risks are low.

Chicago Tribune 5 (November 1, “Bird flu risk hinges on computation, mutation”, Mike Dorning, Washington Bureau, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2005-11-01/news/0511010146\_1\_avian-flu-bird-flu-public-health/3)KM

How imminent a threat the bird flu might be depends on factors that scientists don't fully understand. For example, how many changes in the virus' genetic makeup would it take before it could easily infect and spread among humans? Influenza viruses are constructed of RNA, the genetic cousin of the much more stable DNA. As an RNA virus reproduces itself from inside a human cell, its copying mechanism makes numerous small errors in genetic translation--as though every time a newspaper article were reproduced another word was misspelled. Those errors--or mutations--are why last year's vaccine does not protect against this year's strain. As a result, for many in the U.S. and other highly developed countries, getting an annual "flu shot" has become a winter ritual. Although flu viruses constantly mutate in small ways, the more mutations needed to easily infect humans, the longer such an adaptation would probably take--and the less likely it would be to occur at all. Palese thinks the evidence suggests that relatively large numbers of mutations would be required, indicating the threat is probably not immediate. The first human cases of the new avian flu were reported in Hong Kong in 1997. So the virus has been circulating and mutating for at least eight years without adapting to move from person to person, Palese noted. And other data suggest that a related virus--or possibly the same virus--has been circulating in large areas of China for even longer, perhaps since before 1992, he said.

Disease – Bird Flu – No Impact

No impact – bird flu can’t be spread from one person to another.

Huffman 6 (Mark, March 23, ConsumerAffairs.com, Bird Flue Pandemic Fears May Be Exagerrated,” http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/2006/03/bird\_flu\_fears.html)KM

Scientists say the bird flu virus could still mutate so that it spreads from human to human, but two new studies indicate that process may be more difficult, and perhaps less likely, than previously believed. As the lethal virus has spread among wild and domestic birds around the world, medical experts have warned that the virus, known as H5N1, could mutate into a form that could easily be spread among humans. So far, the virus has proved deadly to the few humans who have contracted it, all of whom had direct contact with sick birds. The new studies may explain why the virus hasn't mutated so that it can be spread from one human to another. The disease appears to lodge in an unusual part of the human respiratory tract, far deeper in the lungs than most viruses settle. Using human tissue samples, the researchers have found that H5N1 in this part of the body can't be spread by sneezing and coughing, the way regular, seasonal cold and flu germs are. Researchers familiar with the study are taking comfort from the findings, because they say it could make it more difficult for H5N1 to mutate into the deadly human pandemic many have feared. Since 2003, only 183 people worldwide have contracted the H5N1 virus, almost all from contact with infected birds. But of the 183 infected, 103 have died, alarming public health experts who are concerned a human pandemic stemming from this virus could be particularly catastrophic. "Our findings provide a rational explanation for why H5N1 viruses rarely infect and spread from human to human although they can replicate efficiently in the lungs," University of Wisconsin-Madison researchers said in their study, reported in the journal Nature. "No one knows whether the virus will evolve into a pandemic strain, but flu viruses constantly change," Yoshihiro Kawaoka, the group's leader, said. "Certainly multiple mutations need to be accumulated for the H5N1 virus to become a pandemic strain." A group of Dutch researchers reported similar findings, published this week in the online journal Science.

No impact – as transmissibility increases, lethality decreases.

Medical News Today 6 (“Mutated Bird Flu Virus Might Not Spread Easily” 8-1, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/48478.php)KM

Although many scientists have been concerned that the H5N1 bird flu virus may mutate one day and become easily human transmissible, a recent study seems to indicate that it might not spread easily among humans. Researchers from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), USA, tried to combine a common human flu virus with H5N1 and found it does not spread easily. This could mean that the mutated virus may not be such a giant threat to global human health. You can read about this study in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, August 2. Scientists infected ferrets with genetically engineered H5N1 viruses and found that the infected animals did not spread their illness to other healthy ferrets - all the animals were very close to each other. They also found that the 'mutated' virus was not as virulent as the original H5N1. (Virulent = Potent, powerful) The H5N1 bird flu virus strain may one day mutate by exchanging genetic information with a normal human flu virus. It could infect a human who also had the normal human flu and mutate. Dr. Jackie Katz, one of the researchers, said the study was carried out to see what would happen when H5N1 acquired the genetic changes needed for better transmission. The researchers mixed H5N1 genetic material with other viruses. Ferrets and humans catch and transmit flu in a very similar way, hence, ferrets were used in this study. Ferrets infected with 'mutated' H5N1 viruses did not pass on the virus to healthy ferrets in the same cage. This does not mean that a mutated H5N1 will never be dangerous to humans. It just means that the chances of a mutated virus being a serious threat to global public health are smaller than feared. There are 50 possible combinations of the viruses.

\*\*\*HEGEMONY\*\*\*

No – Unipolarity

Unipolarity collapse inevitable – fundamentally unstable

Layne 6 (Christopher, Prof Intl Relations at Texas A&M, The Peace of Illusions, p. 150-151) LL

In a unipolar world, eligible states have real incentives to transform their latent capabilities into actual hard power. Given the anarchic nature of the international political system, eligible states can gain security only by building themselves into counterweights to the hegemon’s power. In this sense, unipolar systems contain the seeds of their own demise, because the hegemon’s unchecked power, in itself, stimulates eligible states, in self-defense, to emerge as great powers. The emergence of new great powers erodes the hegemon’s relative power, ultimately ending its dominance. Thus, from the standpoint of balance-of-power theory, “unipolarity appears as the least stable of international configurations.”TM The two prior unipolar moments in international history—France under Louis XIV and mid-Victorian Britain— suggest that hegemony prompts the near-simultaneous emergence of several new great powers and the consequent transformation of the international system from unipolarity to multipolarity. It can be argued, of course, that these examples are not germane to predicting the future of American hegemony. By any objective measure, the United States today is far more dominant in international politics than were late seventeenth-century France and Victorian Britain. Still, the lessons of the two prior unipolar moments should not be discounted. Because it often is difficult to assess the actual distribution of power accurately, policymakers’ perceptions of the balance of power are as important—often more so—than objective reality.65 With the advantage of hindsight, we can debate whether late seventeenth-century France or Victorian Britain were in fact hegemonic. 66 At the time, however, leaders of eligible states did perceive that the distribution of power in the international system was unipolar, and, because they regarded this as menacing, they engaged in internal and external balancing to counter the hegemon’s preponderant power.

Multipolarity now—Russian and Chinese rise

Ritcher 9(Thomas, University of Kent, April 27, “Is U.S. Power in Decline?”. http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984, accessed 7/10/10)jn

The final political factor that needs to be considered is the rise of China and the re-emergence of Russia as a new power within the international system. China in light of its rapid economic growth and its military spending growing, with “an average of 9.7 percent yearly”[[15]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn15) China is clearly seeking a new role within the international system. The same goes for Russia, which is reflected in the confrontation over gas prices earlier this year[[16]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn16) and the ongoing dispute with the United 8tates about a Missile Defence Shield in Eastern Europe. Both Russia and China are growing influences and while not directly threatening US power it clearly limits the options available to the United States in dealing with countries like Iran, North Korea or even in questions of NATO expansion. Having considered some political/military factors that directly impact US power within the world we further need to consider the economic and social factors. While the United States is still the world’s leading economy, its slowing down with the pace of growth averaged only 1¼ percent in the last three quarters of 2008 according to the IMF[[17]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn17) compared to China’s “10½ percent (year over year) in the first half of 2008″[[18]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn18). With the financial crisis the US government furthermore has to invest billions of dollars into supporting the economic system leading to a drastic rise in state debt and thus raising questions about future spending plans, as laid out during the Presidential campaign in 2008. The decline in the economy is also reflected in the rise of unemployment in the US having reached a “25-year high”[[19]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn19) as well as the high costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan putting further financial stain on the US economy and thus representing what Ikenberry called “the ‘long tail’ of burdens and commitments that come with every major military action.”[[20]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn20) Thus the difficulties of the US economy, with unemployment predicted to increase to 6.9 percent[[21]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn21), will have profound effects in the short and long-term for the US’s ability to influence the world economy and on the projection of military and political power as the US struggles and other countries, like China, Russia and India, enjoy continuing high growth[[22]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn22).

No – Unipolarity

Transition to multipolarity is inevitable—multiple reasons

Ritcher 9(Thomas, University of Kent, April 27, “Is U.S. Power in Decline?”. http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984, accessed 7/10/10)jn

Ultimately, the biggest indicators that US power is in decline are comments made in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) report entitled “Global Trends 2025: A transformed World”. In this assessment of the current trends the US intelligence services clearly state that “By 2025 the US will find itself as one of a number of important actors on the world stage”[[28]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn28), thus implying that we will see the strengthening of other major powers. Additionally, the US in light of a “shrinking economic and military capacities may [have to accept] a difficult set of tradeoffs between domestic versus foreign policy priorities.”[[29]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn29) Therefore the report acknowledges a decline in US power. Thus, having considered political, military, economic and social factors influencing US power the conclusion is that while the United States currently is and for the foreseeable future will remain the dominant power of the international system we can see a clear decline in US power on both a political-military and economic scale. Former supporters of the US empire theory, such as Neil Ferguson now argue that “weighed down by doubts about its original imperial role, not to mention unbalanced domestic finances, the lifespan of the US empire is…finite.”[[30]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn30) As pointed out above, much of US post-World War II power relied on the support for the international system that had been established with the United Nations as well as international law in general. The system has been steadily dismantled by American unilateral action and ignorance of the rules in the past years. This lead to a loss of cooperation with allies, such as France and Germany, and an increased hostility towards the US by countries such as Iran and North Korea who now fear ‘regime change’ and therefore aim to undermine US power worldwide. I have argued above that power is defined in terms of the ability to influence domestic and international issues or regions in relation to others by military, political, economic and social means. If we apply this concept to US power projection we see that its military power remains unrivalled and thus in realist terms, where only power counts, the US remains the hegemon of the international system. Nevertheless as Robert Cooper points out that there are limits to the usefulness of military power in today’s age.[[31]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn31) Today, political and economic powers are becoming more and more important and on both fronts the US is losing ground to Europe, China and Russia. If there is a fundamental change in US policy towards working through international institutions and to re-establish the acceptance of the principle that “the rule of law creates the trust that enables markets to function”[[32]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn32) the United States can regain a stronger role within the world. The National Intelligence Council acknowledged that within the next 15 years there would be “an historic transfer of relative wealth and economic power from West to East….By 2025, the international system will be a global multipolar one.”[[33]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn33) American power is decline because it tried to impose a new set of rules on the global game and triggered antagonism and resentment in a divided and transforming world, leaving the US weaker than before. Thus the real question to ask is not whether US power is in decline but “how successfully the United States will adjust to the process.”[[34]](http://www.e-ir.info/?p=984" \l "_ftn34)

Multipolarity inevitable—rising powers

National Intelligence Council 8(“Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World”, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF\_2025/2025\_Global\_Trends\_Final\_Report.pdf, accessed 7/10/10)jn

By 2025, the United States will find itself in the position of being one of a number of important actors on the world stage, albeit still the most powerful one. The relative political and economic clout of many countries will shift by 2025, according to an International Futures model measuring GDP, defense spending, population, and technology for individual states (see graphic on page 28). 6 Historically, emerging multipolar systems have been more unstable than bipolar or even unipolar ones; the greater diversity and growing power of more countries portends less cohesiveness and effectiveness for the international system. Most emerging powers already want a greater say and, along with many Europeans, dispute the notion of any one power having the right to be a hegemon. The potential for less cohesiveness and more instability also is suggested by the relatively steeper declines in national power of Europe and Japan.

No – Unipolarity

Multipolarity coming—economic imbalances and a shift of power

National Intelligence Council 8(“Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World”, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF\_2025/2025\_Global\_Trends\_Final\_Report.pdf, accessed 7/10/10)jn

The international system—as constructed following the Second World War—will be almost unrecognizable by 2025 owing to the rise of emerging powers, a globalizing economy, an historic transfer of relative wealth and economic power from West to East, and the growing influence of nonstate actors. By 2025, the international system will be a global multipolar one with gaps in national power 2 continuing to narrow between developed and developing countries. Concurrent with the shift in power among nation-states, the relative power of various nonstate actors—including businesses, tribes, religious organizations, and criminal networks—is increasing. The players are changing, but so too are the scope and breadth of transnational issues important for continued global prosperity. Aging populations in the developed world; growing energy, food, and water constraints; and worries about climate change will limit and diminish what will still be an historically unprecedented age of prosperity. Historically, emerging multipolar systems have been more unstable than bipolar or unipolar ones. Despite the recent financial volatility—which could end up accelerating many ongoing trends—we do not believe that we are headed toward a complete breakdown of the international system, as occurred in 1914-1918 when an earlier phase of globalization came to a halt. However, the next 20 years of transition to a new system are fraught with risks. Strategic rivalries are most likely to revolve around trade, investments, and technological innovation and acquisition, but we cannot rule out a 19th century-like scenario of arms races, territorial expansion, and military rivalries. This is a story with no clear outcome, as illustrated by a series of vignettes we use to map out divergent futures. Although the United States is likely to remain the single most powerful actor, the United States’ relative strength—even in the military realm—will decline and US leverage will become more constrained. At the same time, the extent to which other actors—both state and nonstate—will be willing or able to shoulder increased burdens is unclear. Policymakers and publics will have to cope with a growing demand for multilateral cooperation when the international system will be stressed by the incomplete transition from the old to a still-forming new order. Economic Growth Fueling Rise of Emerging Players In terms of size, speed, and directional flow, the transfer of global wealth and economic power now under way—roughly from West to East—is without precedent in modern history. This shift derives from two sources. First, increases in oil and commodity prices have generated windfall profits for the Gulf states and Russia. Second, lower costs combined with government policies have shifted the locus of manufacturing and some service industries to Asia. Growth projections for Brazil, Russia, India, and China (the BRICs) indicate they will collectively match the original G-7’s share of global GDP by 2040-2050. China is poised to have more impact on the world over the next 20 years than any other country. If current trends persist, by 2025 China will have the world’s second largest economy and will be a leading military power. It also could be the largest importer of natural resources and the biggest polluter. India probably will continue to enjoy relatively rapid economic growth and will strive for a multipolar world in which New Delhi is one of the poles. China and India must decide the extent to which they are willing and capable of playing increasing global roles and how each will relate to the other. Russia has the potential to be richer, more powerful, and more self-assured in 2025 if it invests in human capital, expands and diversifies its economy, and integrates with global markets. On the other hand, Russia could experience a significant decline if it fails to take these steps and oil and gas prices remain in the $50-70 per barrel range. No other countries are projected to rise to the level of China, India, or Russia, and none is likely to match their individual global clout. We expect, however, to see the political and economic power of other countries—such as Indonesia, Iran, and Turkey—increase. For the most part, China, India, and Russia are not following the Western liberal model for selfdevelopment but instead are using a different model, “state capitalism.” State capitalism is a loose term used to describe a system of economic management that gives a prominent role to the state. Other rising powers—South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore—also used state capitalism to develop their economies. However, the impact of Russia, and particularly China, following this path is potentially much greater owing to their size and approach to “democratization.” We remain optimistic about the long-term prospects for greater democratization, even though advances are likely to be slow and globalization is subjecting many recently democratized countries to increasing social and economic pressures with the potential to undermine liberal institutions.

No – Multipolarity

Unipolarity now—U.S. has massive lead

Logan 9(Justin, associate director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, August 10, “Stephen Brooks’ Response to Me, and Mine to Him”, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/2009/08/10/stephen-brooks-response-to-me-%20and-mine-to-him/, accessed 7/10/10)jn

Second, our main point about the financial crisis does not concern the US policy response.  Rather, the essential point is that the crisis does not change the fact that America’s lead over its competitors is very, very large and that relative power shifts slowly.  Knowing that the US is so far ahead is sufficient for us to reach the conclusion that the US will long remain the sole superpower. My response is as follows: Let me start by making clear that I think Brooks and Wohlforth have the better of the “is unipolarity ending?” argument.  I also think they have the better of the argument about the likely implications of the financial crisis on the balance of power.  Due to interdependence and a number of other factors, the United States will almost certainly emerge from the wreckage with its unipolar status intact.

Soft Power – No Impact

Soft power fails – States won’t buy it

Layne 2 (Christopher, Christopher, visiting fellow in foreign policy studies at Cato, Los Angeles Times, October 6)

U.S. strategists believe that "it can't happen to us," because the United States is a different kind of hegemon, a benign hegemon that others will follow willingly due to the attractiveness of its political values and culture. While flattering, this self-serving argument misses the basic point: Hegemons are threatening because they have too much power. And it is America's power--not the self-proclaimed benevolence of its intentions--that will shape others' response to it. A state's power is a hard, measurable reality, but its intentions, which can be peaceful one day but malevolent the next, are ephemeral. Hegemony's proponents claim that the United States can inoculate itself against a backlash by acting multilaterally. But other states are not going to be deceived by Washington's use of international institutions as a fig leaf to cloak its ambitions of dominance. And in any event, there are good reasons why the U.S. should not reflexively embrace multilateralism. When it comes to deciding when and how to defend American interests, Washington should want a free hand, not to have its hands tied by others.

Military power overwhelms and makes all other sources of power credible

Nau 4 (Henry, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at George Washington, http://pseudoconservativewatch.blogspot.com/2006/11/principles-of-conservative-foreign.html, AD: 7/9/10) jl

IT IS USEFUL to remind conservatives what they have in common, especially compared to liberals. A conservative strategy for American foreign policy is based on four general principles. These principles encompass all conservatives--neoconservatives, conservative realists and nationalists--and reflect the different choices that conservatives and liberals make when they face tradeoffs in real world situations. In these situations, conservatives generally take the following positions: Individual and national liberty (freedom) count more than collective and universal equality; competition is a better engine of change and protector of liberty than institutional cooperation; military power takes precedence over economic, diplomatic or soft power because without military power, other forms of power are impotent; and legitimacy derives more from commitments to democracy than from universal participation in international institutions many of whose members are not democratic. From these principles, several strategic guidelines follow for conservative foreign policy. First, a balance of power in international affairs preserves the independence and freedom of individual states. As long as many states are not democratic, the balance of power is to be preferred over a collective security system or reliance on international institutions, especially if the result is to empower a non-democratic majority in international institutions. International institutions are not objectives in themselves but are useful only if they support, as the president's 2002 National Security Strategy document stated, "a balance of power that favors human freedom." Second, a global marketplace fosters competition and indirectly supports independence while advancing growth and development. Open markets are the principal engines of change that respect independence and freedom. Some institutional framework is necessary to establish market rules (for example, to lower trade barriers, establish currency relationships and so on), but this framework should be limited and have the principal objective of fostering equality of opportunity, not equality of results (for example, through some sort of international redistribution of wealth). History demonstrates that markets, as long as they are competitive, spread rather than concentrate wealth. Third, military power is not a last but a pervasive resort, and it makes credible all other sources of power. Soft power is deception if it is not backed up by a nation's willingness to defend and assert its political convictions by force when necessary. Market power is an illusion if there is no military power to safeguard the marketplace. And, as Frederick the Great once memorably remarked, "negotiations without arms are like music without instruments." Military power not only defends national security and freedom, it underwrites the stability that a prosperous global economy requires, and validates a national and international diplomacy without which there could be no serious international negotiations.

Soft Power – No Impact

Soft power doesn’t increase hegemony

Reus-Smit 4 (Christian, Professor of International Relations at the Australian National University, *American Power and World Order*, p54-55) jl

We see here yet another expression of the assumed causal connection between power resources and political influence, this time applied to culture. If anything, however, the problems are multiplied. Let us assume that in one sense at least neo-conservatives are right, that many people around the globe do indeed covet certain ‘American’ (now globalized) cultural values and artifacts, from Ivy League education to Disneyland and Nikes. It is the height of blind chauvinism, however, to think that this necessarily translates into American political influence. To begin with, many of the world’s citizens appear quite capable of holding at least two ideas in their heads at the same time. ON the one hand, they might want to do a doctorate at Harvard, watch a Hollywood movie or wear Nike runners, but at the same time they can be deeply worried about the nature and consequences of American foreign policy. Second, even if it made sense to speak of culture as a power ‘resource’, it is a resource that defies control. Culture – in the form of values or artifacts – is inherently intersubjective, and, even if it does ‘radiate outward’ from a particular society, it is never passively received; it is always reinterpreted, grafted to other values and turned to new purposes. Both of these points are nicely illustrated by the example of the British empire and Indian nationalists. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, young Indian elites flocked to Cambridge, Oxford and London universities. This did not mean, however, that they uncritically accepted imperial rule; on the contrary, they took the ideas of liberalism and democracy they imbibed in the imperial heartland and fashioned them into anti-imperialist nationalism.

Soft Power EXT—Can’t Solve

Soft power can’t solve—leverage is unsuccessful

Hampson and Oliver 98(Fen and Dean, June, “Pulpit diplomacy: a critical assessment of the Axworthy doctrine”, *International Journal*, Lexis)

Perhaps the two best examples of the continued utility of military force are the Persian Gulf conflict of 1990-1 and the coalition deployment to the same region, led by the United States (and supported by the United Nations), in early 1998 to ensure Iraq's compliance with the 1991 ceasefire agreement. Both missions have occasioned much debate in the scholarly community, and deservedly so, but we take it as axiomatic that for both sides on each occasion the role of military force was critical in the evolution -- and resolution -- of the crisis. In 1990-1, this would appear to be self-evident, while in 1998 no less a commentator than Kofi Annan, in the wake of Iraq's decision to again permit weapons inspectors access to its presidential palaces, dubbed the United States and Britain 'the perfect UN peacekeepers' for their show of force in support of UNSCOM. It is important to note that in each case soft power proved singularly unable to affect the actions of a single, isolated, pariah state, albeit one that possessed considerable military wherewithal and a modicum of regional legitimacy. It is certainly dangerous to generalize from the Iraqi example, but one might at least question the applicability of soft power to powerful rogue states in bold defiance of international law and international agreements.

Soft power irrelevant—decline proves

Kagan 6(Robert, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, January 15, “Still the Colossus”, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17894&prog=zgp&proj=zusr, accessed 7/10/10)jn

This does not mean the United States has not suffered a relative decline in that intangible but important commodity: legitimacy. A combination of shifting geopolitical realities, difficult circumstances and some inept policy has certainly damaged America's standing in the world. Yet, despite everything, the American position in the world has not deteriorated as much as people think. America still "stands alone as the world's indispensable nation," as Clinton so humbly put it in 1997. It can resume an effective leadership role in the world in fairly short order, even during the present administration and certainly after the 2008 election, regardless of which party wins. That is a good thing, because given the growing dangers in the world, the intelligent and effective exercise of America's benevolent global hegemony is as important as ever.

Soft power fails—opposition

Wolf 4(Charles, Senior research fellow@The Hoover Institution, “Public Diplomacy: How to Think About it and Improve it”, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2004/RAND\_OP134.pdf, accessed 7/10/10)jn

Still, a reformed and enhanced public diplomacy should be accompanied by limited expectations about what it can realistically accomplish. U.S. policies—notably in the Israel- Palestine dispute as well as in Iraq—inevitably and inherently will arouse in the Middle East and Muslim worlds opposition and deafness to the public diplomacy message that the United States wishes to transmit. While these policies have their own rationale and logic, the reality is that they do and will limit what public diplomacy can or should be expected to accomplish. The antipathy for the United States that some U.S. policies arouse is yet another argument that supports outsourcing some aspects of public diplomacy. The message America is trying to sell about pluralism, freedom, and democracy need not be delivered by the U.S. government. The message itself may be popular among potential constituents who view the United States unfavorably, but if the government delivers the message, the message may go unheard. Nevertheless, even if outsourcing proves more effective, expectations should be limited. While outsourcing may put some distance between a potentially favorable message (pluralism, freedom, and democracy) and an unfavorable messenger (the United States government), inevitably the two will be linked.

No – Readiness

Readiness is low now—multiple wars and weapons prices

Shalal-Esa 8(Andrea, Reuters Staff Writer, April 29, “Iraq,cost issues sap US military readiness-lawmaker”, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN2942030920080429, accessed 7/10/10)jn

A senior Democratic lawmaker on Tuesday called for urgent action to improve military readiness, saying the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and cost overruns in weapons programs had sapped the ability of U.S. troops to respond quickly to a crisis elsewhere. Rep. Ike Skelton, a Missouri Democrat who heads the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, said military officials had finally begun to acknowledge these problems after years of questioning by Congress. "Should a major unexpected contingency occur today, it could not be answered in a timely fashion and this worries me to death," Skelton told a group of defense writers. "We are in dire need of upgrading our readiness," he said, citing concerns about military training, the strain of repeated deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and difficulties ensuring troops had the equipment they needed. It has been five years since the Iraq war began, Skelton said, adding that the average time between major conflicts over the past decades had been about five years. Skelton said he hoped to include language in the fiscal 2009 defense spending bill for improved military readiness, to put more of a priority on winning the war in Afghanistan, and to underscore the need for more help from the U.S. State Department and other federal agencies. The legislation will be drafted by his committee next month. Cost growth in nearly every major U.S. weapons program was a major problem compounding the issue, Skelton said, citing the need to invest in future technologies while also buying weapons to win the current wars. "You really can't put off success today, particularly in Afghanistan," Skelton said, when asked about recent comments by Defense Secretary Robert Gates about the Air Force's need to produce more unmanned airplanes that could be used in Iraq and Afghanistan, rather than focusing on its stealth F-22 fighter jet that is geared for combat against another military force.

\*\*\*HUMAN RIGHTS\*\*\*

**Human Rights – Alt. Cause**

**Alt Cause- There are human rights abuses everywhere from refuses refugees to the war on terror**

Heale 10 (Jack, July , the Director of the Human Rights Action Center http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jack-healey/renewing-the-american-foc\_b\_641499.html accessed 7/9) CM

Much like the flowers in the Peter, Paul and Mary song, human rights as a core ingredient of U.S. policy is also gone. Mentioned rarely by the Obama administration and mocked by the Bush administration, the high standard of human rights once demanded by U.S. policymakers seems to have died. It has been lost in the prisons of Gitmo and Abu Ghraib, smothered by the debris of the drone strikes and mocked by the continual use of enhanced interrogation methods. Recently, a French poll found that 42% of the French population is concerned that human rights all over the world are deteriorating, and 72% of the population considers the present economic crisis as an upfront threat for human rights. These figures signal a change in the West. During the days of the Cold War, the United States played the 'good guys' and attacked the human rights abuses committed by the USSR and other countries. We considered our democracy the perfect solution to extending human rights to all citizens, and looked to our government to promote global human rights using the standard we ourselves had set. Since the demise of the USSR in 1991, human rights issues have largely disappeared from the media. As governments have moved away from human rights as a foundational policy issue, the media has followed suit, and human rights issues are no longer a focus in the forum of international and domestic politics. The United States was not perfectly vigilant in its attempts to set an international standard for human rights. Few seem to remember that when over 300,000 people were killed in Central America in the 1980's, our government looked the other way. Reagan's way of 'helping' was to illegally funnel weapons to Nicaragua in order to help the Contras fight the Sandanistas. Our government treated Mandela and the ANC as communists, and ignored the terrible bloodshed that came as a result of the racial upheaval occurring in South Africa. Many hoped for a renewed focus on the issue of human rights when President Clinton took office in 1992. Yet he failed to grant Haitian refugees asylum and forcefully prevented many Haitians from entering the country. His administrations similarly failed to take control of the disastrous human rights crises occurring in Somalia and Bosnia. He prevented the United States from the joining the International Criminal Court (ICC); arguably paving the way for George W. Bush to later circumvent human rights statutes and order the use of enhanced interrogation methods in the war on terror.

The US is pushing human rights now Clinton China speech proves

Heale 10 (Jack, July , the Director of the Human Rights Action Center http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jack-healey/renewing-the-american-foc\_b\_641499.html accessed 7/9) CM

Somehow, the pretense that the United States is a promoter of human rights is alive and well under the Obama administration. In Oslo, Obama lectured the world on the meaning of a 'just war,' as though the wars we are currently engaged in are in some way driven by a desire to expand global human rights. The Democrats have another three years to right this situation. Because both Clinton and Obama are responsible for the neglect and thus demise of human rights as a focus of U.S. foreign policy, the Democratic Party should take it to heart that human rights, once again, need to be at the foundation of foreign policy. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton recently delivered a searing and profound speech in China saying, among other things, that women's rights are human rights. The citizens of the world await and would welcome a renewed focus and movement promoting human rights from our government. Obama promised it. He will be judged by history if this promise is not kept. Deeds are needed, not rhetoric.

Human Rights – Alt. Cause

**Alt cause predator drones are a violation of human rights**

Callam 10 **(Andrew, 2/21,** writer for the International Law Review, International Law review (XIX) http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/144 accessed 7/9) CM

It is also unclear whether the CIA’s Predator program in Pakistan, which is not a recognized war zone, falls in line with international law. Before deploying the weaponized Predator drone, the U.S. government deemed armed UAVs fully compliant with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty and other international agreements. However, the U.S. government has yet to conduct a review that ensures that the targeted killings are in accordance with international law. Many lawyers conclude that the attacks meet the basic test to target civilian terror suspects abroad, but certain questions remain. P.W. Singer, “in the hundreds of interviews” he conducted for his book Wired for War, found no references to international law. He also found that no one could answer who in the chain of command would be prosecuted if mistakes were made. Columbia University Law Professor Matthew Waxman notes that there is no consensus on the principal of proportionality in international law, namely how to balance the equation of military gains with civilian casualties. Recently, that it is not randomly a United Nations human rights investigator stated that “the United States must demonstrate killing people in violation of international law through its use of drones.” As the drone program continues to cause civilian casualties, it will likely come under greater scrutiny regarding its compliance with international law.

Human Rights – Don’t Excuse

Human rights do not exist

Hamilton 04( Charles, 4-14, speaker and writer on human rights, speaker @ the Midwest Political Science Conference,*Paper presented at the annual meeting of the The Midwest Political Science Association*<http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p82840\_index.html>

Human rights do not exist. Human rights are rights that belong to human beings simply by virtue of being human. A right to X indicates that an individual has, or ought to have, a legitimate claim to X that obligates other individuals not to deny the individual X and obligates the government to protect the individual's possession of X. Given this understanding of rights, to qualify as a right, a proposed right must meet at least two minimal conditions. The first is that there actually are other individuals to be so obligated. The second is that there is an effective government mechanism for protecting the object of the proposed right. Human beings may inhabit circumstances or contexts in which either or both conditions are not met without losing their humanity. In such circumstances or contexts, it would be inconsistent to claim that such human beings would continue to possess rights. Since there are circumstances or contexts in which it does not make sense to claim that a human being has a right to anything, human rights cannot exist. Human beings cannot have rights simply by virtue of being human. Rights have to be founded on an alternative basis.

\*\*\*INDO-PAK\*\*\*

Indo-Pak – Tensions Low Now

India and Pakistan want to cooperate – they’re having talks

AP 10 (Associated Press, 2/25/10, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=india-pakistan-hold-first-talks-in-15-months-2010-02-25) GAT

India and Pakistan held wide-ranging discussions Thursday about terrorism, Kashmir and other disputes in the first talks between the rival nations since the 2008 Mumbai attacks. India said the four-hour meeting between the two countries' foreign secretaries in New Delhi was intended to begin the process of rebuilding a relationship badly damaged by that deadly siege, which India blames on Pakistan-based militants. "We have set out to take a first step toward rebuilding trust," Indian Foreign Secretary Nirupama Rao told reporters after the talks. No issues were resolved in the meeting, which India billed only as "talks about talks." But just meeting after 15 months to reduce tensions was seen as an important achievement that could help Pakistan concentrate its resources on supporting the U.S. in its fight against the Taliban and al-Qaida. Pakistan has called for the resumption of comprehensive peace talks, but India has demanded it crack down on militant groups operating from its soil first. Rao said she reiterated to Pakistani Foreign Secretary Salman Bashir that his Islamic nation must do more to dismantle terror networks and gave him dossiers on those linked to the Mumbai attacks, an al-Qaida-linked militant who has issued threats against India, and Indian fugitives hiding in Pakistan. Pakistan is trying seven men on charges they planned and carried out the Mumbai attacks, which led to the deaths of 166 people, but the militant network blamed for the assault continues to operate relatively freely in the Pakistani city of Lahore. Pakistan used the meeting to raise broader issues including the dispute over Kashmir, allegations that India is aiding militants in the Pakistani province of Baluchistan and a conflict over shared water resources, Rao said. There was no immediate comment from Pakistani officials, who were to hold a news conference later Thursday. The United States has pushed the two sides to resume talks in hopes that a reduction in tensions would help Pakistan shift its focus from the Indian border to the offensive against Taliban militants along its border with Afghanistan. The talks are a political risk for New Delhi because of public mistrust of Pakistan. However, the government does not want to write off diplomacy and wants to keep tensions low between the countries. There was no talk of a second meeting between the officials, but Rao said she and Bashir had agreed to remain in contact. India is convinced that "we must not shut the door on dialogue with Pakistan and that such dialogue, if it gathers momentum, holds tremendous potential for the progress and well being of the people of our region," she said.

Obama is gently putting pressure on them to reduce tensions

Reuters 4/29 (4/29/10, http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N2998082.htm) GAT

President Barack Obama sees reducing tensions between India and Pakistan as a "very high priority" but American support for that process is best done in a quiet fashion, a U.S. official said on Thursday. "It's certainly a very high priority for the president, for Secretary (of State Hillary) Clinton, for this administration, to be as supportive as we can in reducing tensions between India and Pakistan," Paul Jones, a senior State Department official, told a congressional hearing. The prime ministers of India and Pakistan held talks on Thursday and asked their officials to take steps as soon as possible to normalize relations, signaling an unexpected thaw. Ties between the nuclear-armed rivals went into a diplomatic freeze after India blamed Pakistan-based militants for the Mumbai attacks in November 2008. Any reduction in tensions could mean Pakistan might be able to devote more long-term resources to battle al Qaeda and Taliban insurgents in its territory, seen as key to U.S. efforts to win the war in neighboring Afghanistan. Jones, deputy special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, acknowledged progress with Friday's bilateral India-Pakistan talks. "It's a very complex situation and ... it's very clear that our support is best done in a quiet fashion in just encouraging the process and offering the support to the parties that we can," he said.

Pakistan admits they will not start a nuclear war

Kristensen 9 (Hans M., “Strategic Security Blog, http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2009/01/chinapaper.php, AD: 7/1/09) GAT

Actually, most other nuclear weapons states don’t have a no-first-use policy. India has stated one, but also said it reserves the right to use nuclear weapons against chem/bio weapons. Pakistan recent said it would not initiate a nuclear war, which is similar but still not a declared no-first-use policy. Russia adopted a no-first-use policy in 1982, but then abandoned it in 1993. The United States, France and United Kingdom have explicitly rejected a no-first-use policy.

Indo-Pak – Deterrence Checks

Nuclear deterrence and ideological barriers prevent conflict

Malik 3 (Mohan, “The stability of nuclear deterrence in South Asia: the Clash Between State and Antistate Actors,” Asian Affairs: An American Review September 22, 2003) GAT

The presence of nuclear weapons certainly makes states exceedingly cautious; notable examples are China and Pakistan's postnuclear behavior. The consequences of a nuclear war are too horrendous to contemplate. Policymakers in New Delhi and Islamabad have a sound understanding of each other's capabilities, intentions, policies, and, more important, red lines, which they are careful not to cross. This repeatedly has been demonstrated since the late 1980s. Despite the 1999 Kargil War and the post-September 11 brinkmanship that illustrate the "stability-instability" paradox that nuclear weapons have introduced to the equation in South Asia, (23) proponents of nuclear deterrence in Islamabad and New Delhi believe that nuclear deterrence is working to prevent war in the region. They point to the fact that neither the 1999 Kargil conflict nor the post-September 11 military standoff escalated beyond a limited conventional engagement due to the threat of nuclear war. So the stability argument is based on the reasonable conclusion that nuclear weapons have served an important purpose in the sense that India and Pakistan have not gone to an all-out war since 1971. (24) Just as nuclear deterrence maintained stability between the United States and the USSR during the cold war, so it can induce similar stabilizing effects in South Asia. Regarding the technical requirements of stable deterrence, questions about command, control, and safety procedures continue to be raised. Both Pakistan and India claim to have maintained tighter controls over their arsenal--it is not in their own interests to see antistate actors gaining control of nuclear technology. Both India and Pakistan publicly have declared moratoriums on further nuclear tests, and India's adherence to no-first-use (NFU) posture and confidence-building measures--such as prenotification of missile tests and an agreement not to attack each other's nuclear installations--promotes crisis stability. Devin Hegarty argues that this is responsible behavior in stark contrast to U.S.-Soviet nuclear options, including "deployment of tens of thousands of nuclear warheads, bombers flying on 24-hour alert status, and the nuclear safety lapses that characterized the superpower arms race." (25) Post-September 11 measures to promote greater security and control over nuclear weapons and materials have been accorded the topmost priority. India's nuclear arsenal is firmly under the control of civilian leadership, and the Pakistani army always has retained the real authority over its country's nuclear weapons, regardless of who is head of state. Pakistan's military chain of command appears intact despite internal turmoil and reshuffling at the top of the government. (26) The United States reportedly is considering offering assistance to ensure the physical protection of sensitive nuclear assets with vaults, sensors, alarms, tamperproof seals and labels, and other means of protection, ensuring personnel reliability and secure transport of sensitive items. (27)

Indo-Pak – No Escalation

Indo-Pak conflict doesn’t go nuclear except in incredibly unlikely scenarios that they can’t defend

Markey 10 (Daniel, writer for Council on Foreign Relations, “Terrorism and Indo-Pakistani Esclation”) GAT

A military exchange between India and Pakistan sparked by a terrorist attack in India is not likely

to cross the nuclear threshold. Several conceivable circumstances could alter this conclusion, but two

stand out: (1) India suffers additional catastrophic terrorist attacks in the midst of the crisis, driving it

to intensify the conflict to a point where Pakistan’s army determines it cannot defend the state by

conventional means, and (2) Pakistan’s nuclear command, as yet untested by major conventional attacks,

is blinded or confused to the point that it authorizes a first strike.

Even if nuclear weapons are involved, India-Pakistan war doesn’t escalate beyond that region

Dyer 2 (Gwynne, “Nuclear war a possibility over Kashmir,” Hamilton Spectator, May 24, 2002) GAT

For those who do not live in the subcontinent, the most important fact is that the damage would be largely confined to the region. The Cold War is over, the strategic understandings that once tied India and Pakistan to the rival alliance systems have all been cancelled, and no outside powers would be drawn into the fighting. The detonation of a hundred or so relatively small nuclear weapons over India and Pakistan would not cause grave harm to the wider world from fallout.

Even if deterrence fails and a conventional conflict breaks out, Kargil proves that nuclear warfare isn’t an option

Chandrasekharan 99 (Dr. S., writer for South Asia Analysis, http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/\papers\paper71.html) GAT

If a fundamental tenet of proliferation optimism is that a war between possessors is deterred, then the Kargil conflict proved otherwise. When both India and Pakistan had emerged as nuclear powers and tentative steps had been taken to avoid an accidental or otherwise of a nuclear exchange, the Kargil conflict showed that such a presumption cannot be made with certainty. While India had declared a no first use policy, Pakistan even while the operations were going on, maintained that in view of asymmetry of conventional forces, they cannot accept a "no first use" policy. And as long as Pakistan refuses to agree to a "no first use", nuclear stability cannot be taken for granted. If in spite of asymmetry in conventional forces, Pakistan had ventured into a conflict with the potential for a full scale war, Indian fears of the possibility of Pakistan using nuclear bombs at the time of "use or lose"situation were justified. Pakistan is aware that the asymmetry is not only in conventional forces but also for a long time to come, in nuclear capability. Geographic proximity, population centres being close to the Indian border, lack of strategic depth, absence of space at present to disperse the delivery systems are points which were not in favour of Pakistan. Yet Pakistan chose to initiate a major confrontation even before the ink on the Lahore Declaration was dry.

Indo-Pak – No Escalation

No risk of escalation

Quinlan 5 (Michael Conflict Writer, Vol. 47, Iss. 3; pg 103. ProQuest) jl

Since the 1999 Kargil conflict and the 2002 confrontation political relations between India and Pakistan have eased considerably, with leaders on both sides spearheading a drive to improve the climate and to do practical business together, including on Kashmir. Nuclear-weapon concepts and doctrines seem to have evolved prudently, though information is limited. The buildup of armouries, slower than some observers foresaw, does not at present threaten deterrent balance, though worries about ballistic missile defence may lie ahead. Further cooperation on confidence-building measures, and dialogue on entrenching stability, remain important. Both countries, but especially Pakistan after the A.Q. Khan scandal, have global responsibilities in the non-proliferation

Indo-Pak – No Accidents

India and Pakistan will prevent accidental nuclear launches

Goncharov 8 (Pyotr, Russian News and Information Agency, http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20080125/97772224.html, AD: 7/10/10) jl

A Muslim state with nuclear weapons and extremists is also testing missiles? But this criticism is hardly justified. What should Pakistan do if it has nuclear warheads? It couldn't possibly carry them by aircraft. Needless to say, there are some risks for the world in the Pakistani nuclear potential, but they are not much more serious than those involved in the nuclear potentials of India or Israel, the United States or Russia. Everything depends on which capital looks at these risks. Islamabad has never concealed that its nuclear weapons are meant exclusively for India, or, to be more precise, for deterring its aggression. India is fully aware of this and, judging by all, is not too worried. Moreover, since 2005, the sides have been developing their missile potentials without creating problems for each other. Early last year, Pakistan and India resumed the discussion of problems in their relations. Last February, they signed an agreement on preventing the risk of accidents with nuclear weapons. It is aimed at removing the threat of nuclear confrontation and the development of reliable nuclear arms control systems.

\*\*\*IRAN\*\*\*

Iran ≠ Expansionist

Iran is seeking regional diplomacy

Press Tv 6/19 (Staff, 6/19/10, http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=116529&sectionid=351020101) JPG

Secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council Saeed Jalili has stressed the importance of adopting strategies to establish sustainable security in the Caucasus. "Iran has a strategic approach for resolving regional woes and crises in the Middle East, the Caucasus and the Persian Gulf region," the Iranian Students News Agency quoted Jalili as saying in a meeting with Georgian Foreign Minister Grigol Vashadze in Tehran. He said sustainable security would pave the way for promoting amicable relations between nations, emphasizing that "Interests of the regional countries necessitate the bolstering of security cooperation."

Iran-Israel First Strike

A) US attacks on Iran inevitable – failed diplomacy

Couglin 10 (Con, Exec Foreign editor @ the Telegraph, telegraph,

http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/concoughlin/100021911/if-iran-continues-to-defy-the-west-barack-obama-will-be-forced-to-launch-military-action/) JPG

When U.S General David Petraeus, the head of Centcom, says the American military has drawn up [plans to attack Iran’s nuclear programme](http://http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/6963311/Iran-can-be-bombed-says-General-Petraeus.html), it suggests the international crisis over Iran’s refusal to give up its illicit nuclear activities is reaching a critical juncture. As one would expect of a polished political performer such as Gen Petraeus, he was careful to stress that the plans are nothing more than a contingency, in the event that President Barack Obama needs to give serious consideration to attacking Iran. But we should not be fooled by this. Various contigency plans to overthrow Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein were put together from early 2002, we now learn from the Chilcot inquiry into the Iraq war, even though military action wasn’t actually launched until the spring of 2003. Even though Mr Obama’s deadline for Iran to respond to his offer of direct talks to resolve the crisis expired on New Year’s Day, the U.S. and the other European powers tasked with bringing the Iranians to their senses would still like to have one last go at diplomacy, even if it means trying to tighten the sanctions at the U.N. as a means of persuading the hardline regime of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad that they mean business. But I fear this will fail for two fundamental reasons, the first one being that I can’t see either Russia or China signing up for the kind of “crippling” sanctions that Hillary Clinton, the U.S. Secretary of State,  is demanding. Beijing and Moscow might have signed up to a U.N. -sponsored censure motion against Iran last November, but this was more to punish Iran for building a second enrichment plant at Qom without informing their Russian and Chinese sponsors than a radical change of position. China, in particular, is more interested in Iran’s oil than its nuclear programme, while the Russians have little interest in resolving a security issue that they regard as being a Western priority, rather than a Russian one. Then there is the attitude of the Iranian government itself to the issue, which has showed no sign of softening since Mr Ahmadinejad was elected to serve a second four-year term as president in controversial circumstances last summer. Since then the Iranian leader has repeatedly said that the nuclear issue is non-negotiable, and has pressed ahead with the development programme, going so far as to announce he wants to build an extra 20 uranium enrichment plants. In addition Iran has made impressive progress in developing the missile systems that could deliver nuclear warheads, which hardly suggests that Iran’s nuclear intentions are peaceful. All of which suggests to me that the Iran negotiations are not going to make any significant progress this year, and that, sooner or later, White House will be calling on Gen Petraeus to present his proposals for resolving the issue by force of arms.

B) US attack on Iran shut down their nuclear and military capabilities

Plesch and Butcher 7 (Dan and Martin, Dan – Director of Oriental and African Studies Centre for Intl Studies & Diplomacy, Martin – internaional consultant,

, September 2007, http://www.rawstory.com/images/other/IranStudy082807a.pdf) JPG

The US B-2A carries a new earth penetrating conventional weapon, the Massive Ordnance penetrator. The MOP is a 30,000lb bomb carrying 6.000lbs of explosives and capable of penetrating up to 60 meters [200 feet] through 5,000 psi reinforced concrete.5 This puts at risk even the most hardened facilities such as Natanz and increases the flexibility of STRATCOM’s conventional strike options.6 This weapon is in the final testing stage and could be fitted to the B2 bomber in late 2007 or early 2008.7 In recent years, hugely increased funding for military technology has taken "smart bombs" to a new level. New "bunker-busting" conventional bombs weigh only 250lb. According to Boeing, the GBU-39 small-diameter bomb "quadruples" the firepower of US warplanes, compared to those in use even as recently as 2003. A single stealth or B-52 bomber can now attack between 150 and 300 individual points to within a metre of accuracy using the global positioning system.8 One B2 bomber dropped 80 500lb bombs on separate targets in 22 seconds in a test flight. Using just half the available force, 10,000 targets could be attacked almost simultaneously. This strike power alone is sufficient to damage Iranian political, military, economic and transport capabilities. Such a strike would take "shock and awe" to a new level and leave Iran with few if any conventional military capabilities to block the straights of Hormuz or provide conventional military support to insurgents in Iraq. ] The US air force can hit the last-known position of Iranian military units, political leaders and supposed sites of weapons of mass destruction. One can be sure that, if war comes, George Bush will not want to stand accused of using too little force and allowing Iran to fight back. "Global Strike" means that, without any obvious signal, what was done to Serbia and Lebanon can be done overnight to the whole of Iran. We, and probably the Iranians, would not know about it until after the bombs fell. Forces that hide will suffer the fate of Saddam's armies, once their positions are known.

A2 – Iran Attacks Israel

Iran has a limited capability to attack Israel – the effects will be minimal anyway

Creveld 7 (Martin van, Prof of Military History @ Hebrew U, 10/24/7, Intl Herald Tribune, http://www.iht.com/articles/2007/10/24/opinion/edcrevald.php) JPG

**Should the U.S. strike at Iran - we are talking about a strike by cruise missiles and manned aircraft, not about an invasion for which Washington does not have the troops - then Iran will have no way to hit back**. Like Saddam Hussein's Iraq in 1991, **Iran's most important response may well be to attack Israel**, which probably explains why Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and his generals keep making threats in that direction. **Even so, they have few options. Iran's ground and naval forces are irrelevant to the mission at hand**. Iran may indeed have some Shihab III missiles with the necessary range, but their number is limited and their reliability uncertain. **Should the missiles carry conventional warheads, then, militarily speaking, the effect will probably be close to zero. Should they carry unconventional ones, then Iran, to quote former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir speaking not long before the first Gulf War, will open itself to "awesome and terrible" retaliation.**

\*\*\*I-LAW\*\*\*

I-Law – Doesn’t Solve

International law is too weak to prevent conflict

AEI 5 (American enterprise inst, april, book review, inst for public policy research, “The Limits of International Law” Jack L. Goldsmith and Eric A. Posner, <http://www.angelfire.com/jazz/sugimoto/law.pdf>) "As the twentieth century ended, optimism about international law...degradation and human rights abuses"

As the twentieth century ended, optimism about international law was as high as it had ever been—as high as it was at the end of World War I and World War II, for example. We can conveniently use 9/11 as the date on which this optimism ended, but there were undercurrents of pessimism even earlier. The UN played a relatively minor role in bringing the conflicts in the Balkans to the end. Members of the Security Council could not agree on the use of force in Kosovo, and the NATO intervention was thus a violation of international law. The various international criminal tribunals turned out to be cumbersome and expensive institutions, they brought relatively few people to justice, and they stirred up the ethnic tensions they were meant to quell. Aggressive international trade integration produced a violent backlash in many countries. Treaty mechanisms seemed too weak to solve the most serious global problems, including environmental degradation and human rights abuses.

I-Law – Fails

I-law fails—no one abides by it and countries don’t care about US accession

Paulsen 9 (Michael, Professor @ St. Thomas School of Law, 118 Yale L.J. 1762, lexis) jl

Thus, though treaties are part of the supreme law of the land under the U.S. Constitution, their legal force as they concern the international law obligations of the United States is, as a matter of U.S. law, always limited by (1) the Constitution's assignment of certain indefeasible constitutional powers to the President and to Congress with respect to foreign affairs and war; (2) the power of Congress to enact inconsistent, overriding or limiting legislation;  [\*1786]  (3) the fact that many treaty commitments do not create self-executing U.S. domestic law obligations; and (4) the President's foreign affairs executive power to interpret, apply, suspend (in whole or in part), or even terminate a U.S. treaty's international obligation as a matter of U.S. law. It is worth pausing to consider exactly what all of this means, for its implications are mildly stunning, especially with respect to U.S. war powers: it means that a treaty of the United States that is the law of the land under Article VI of the Constitution - be it the U.N. Charter, the Geneva Conventions or any other major agreement at the center of the contemporary regime of international law - may not constitutionally limit Congress's power to declare war or the President's Commander-in-Chief power to conduct war as he sees fit. It means that Congress always may act to displace, or disregard, a treaty obligation. It means that the President, too, always may act independently to displace, or disregard, a treaty obligation. It means that treaties, as a species of international law with the strongest claim to U.S. domestic constitutional law status, never meaningfully constrain U.S. governmental actors. Their force is utterly contingent on the prospective actions and decisions of U.S. constitutional actors. [n55](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278736347255&returnToKey=20_T9716563729&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.792782.3782356266" \l "n55) This conceptualization threatens all that the community of "international law" scholars hold most dear. For it seems to say that the United States may disregard the seemingly most sacred of international law treaty obligations almost at will. The answer to such a charge is yes, this analysis suggests precisely that. At least it does so as a matter of U.S. constitutional law. This does not mean, of course, that the United States must or should disregard important international law treaty obligations as a foreign policy matter. It certainly does not need to do so; other nations might validly regard such actions as a breach of international law; such nations might become very angry at the United States's actions (or they might not); and such breaches, and reactions, may have serious international political repercussions. These are very serious policy considerations. But as a matter of U.S. constitutional law, it remains the case that Congress, and the President, may lawfully take such actions, hugely undermining the force of such international treaties as binding national law for the United States. The conclusion is blunt, but inescapable: international law in the form of U.S. treaties is primarily a political constraint on U.S. conduct - a constraint of international politics - more than a true legal constraint. The "binding" international law character of a treaty obligation is, as a matter of U.S. law, largely illusory.

Citing international law doesn’t set precedent

NYT 8 (http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/18/us/18legal.html?\_r=2&hp=&adxnnlx=1221753717-8pdanTsDalyAfCQgzjrVvQ&pagewanted=print, AD: 7/10/10) jl

Judicial citation or discussion of a foreign ruling does not, moreover, convert it into binding precedent. Chief Justice John Marshall, sitting as a circuit court judge, discussed the question in 1811. “It has been said that the decisions of British courts, made since the Revolution, are not authority in this country,” he said. “I admit it — but they are entitled to that respect which is due to the opinions of wise men who have maturely studied the subject they decide.” Indeed, American judges cite all sorts of things in their decisions — law review articles, song lyrics, television programs. State supreme courts cite decisions from other states, though a decision from Wisconsin is no more binding in Oregon than is one from Italy. “Foreign opinions are not authoritative; they set no binding precedent for the U.S. judge,” Justice [Ruth Bader Ginsburg](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/g/ruth_bader_ginsburg/index.html?inline=nyt-per) said in a 2006 [address](http://supremecourtus.gov/publicinfo/speeches/sp_02-07b-06.html) to the Constitutional Court of South Africa. “But they can add to the story of knowledge relevant to the solution of trying questions.” But Professor Fried said the area was a minefield. “Courts have been citing foreign law forever, but sparingly, for very good reason,” he said. “It is an invitation to bolster conclusions reached on other grounds. It leads to more impressionistic, undisciplined adjudication.”

I-Law – Countries Fill In

Other countries fill in

Pederson 8 (Ole, Professor @ Newcastle, <http://internationallawobserver.eu/2008/09/18/fading-influence-of-the-us-supreme-court/>, AD: 7/10/10) jl

It appears that it is not only the [EU](http://internationallawobserver.eu/2008/09/18/a-year-for-europe-maybe-not/) whose authority is fading. Today’s [NY Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/18/us/18legal.html?_r=1&hp=&adxnnl=1&pagewanted=1&adxnnlx=1221753717-8pdanTsDalyAfCQgzjrVvQ) has a very interesting story on the influence of the US Supreme Court, which is well worth a read. The article states that the number of citations of US Supreme Court cases in other jurisdictions is in decline compared to just ten years ago. There are many reasons for this, according to, inter alia, Thomas Ginsburg of University of Chicago and Aharon Barak, former president of the Israeli Supreme Court. One reason is the rise in the numbers of constitutional courts elsewhere, which has, through time, created a rich jurisprudence on constitutional law rendering the need to cite US cases less essential. Additionally, US foreign policy may play a part in the diminishing influence of the oldest constitutional court in world. Finally, the reluctance of the US Supreme Court itself to cite foreign law when adjudicating may play a role. This final point is perhaps the most interesting. Whereas European (including the ECJ and the ECtHR), Australian and Canadian courts do not shy away from referring to foreign law, it has always been a sensitive topic in the US where many scholars favour leaving aside foreign law. This approach has its clear democratic justification but as Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg said in [2006 in an address](http://supremecourtus.gov/publicinfo/speeches/sp_02-07b-06.html) to the South African Constitutional Court:

“[F]oreign opinions are not authoritative; they set no binding precedent for the U.S. judge. But they can add to the store of knowledge relevant to the solution of trying questions. Yes, we should approach foreign legal materials with sensitivity to our differences, deficiencies, and imperfect understanding, but imperfection, I believe, should not lead us to abandon the effort to learn what we can from the experience and good thinking foreign sources may convey.”

Other countries support international law now

Benvenisti 8 (Eyal, Professor of Law, Tel Aviv University, 102 A.J.I.L. 241, lexis) jl

In recent years, courts in several democracies have begun to engage seriously in the interpretation and application of international law and to heed the constitutional jurisprudence of other national courts. Most recently, this new tendency has been demonstrated by the judicial [\*242] responses to the global counterterrorism effort since the events of September 11, 2001: national courts have been challenging executive unilateralism in what could perhaps be a globally coordinated move. In this article I describe and explain this shift, arguing that the chief motivation of the national courts is not to promote global justice, for they continue to regard themselves first and foremost as national agents. Rather, the new jurisprudence is part of a reaction to the forces of globalization, which are placing increasing pressure on the different domestic branches of government to conform to global standards. This reaction seeks to expand the space for domestic deliberation, to strengthen the ability of national governments to withstand the pressure brought to bear by interest groups and powerful foreign governments, and to insulate the national courts from intergovernmental pressures. For this strategy to succeed, courts need to forge a united judicial front, which entails coordinating their policies with equally positioned courts in other countries by developing common communication tools consisting of international law and comparative constitutional law. The analysis also explains why the U.S. Supreme Court, which does not need to protect the domestic political or judicial processes from external pressure, has still not joined this collective effort. 3 On the basis of this insight into the driving force behind reliance on foreign law, the article proposes another outlook for assessing the legitimacy of national courts' resort to foreign and international legal sources. It asserts that recourse to these sources is perfectly legitimate from a democratic theory perspective, as it aims at reclaiming democracy from the debilitating grip of globalization.

I-Law – Prominent Now

I-law prominent now—momentum

Scalia 9 (Antonin, “Outsourcing American Law: Foreign Law in Constitutional Interpretation,” http://www.aei.org/docLib/20090820-Chapter2.pdf) TBC 7/9/10

In many other cases, however, opinions for the Court have used foreign law for the purpose of interpreting the Constitution. The first such case I am familiar with was a 1958 decision involving the Eighth Amendment, the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause. In Trop v. Dulles, the Court held that the Eighth Amendment forbids the penalty of forfeiture of citizenship because inter alia, “The civilized nations of the world are in virtual unanimity that statelessness is not to be imposed as punishment for crime.”6 Reliance upon foreign law has been made with increasing frequency in Eighth Amendment cases. In Coker v. Georgia, a 1977 case, the Court noted that “out of 60 major nations in the world surveyed in 1965, only three retained the death penalty for rape where death did not ensue.”7 In Enmund v. Florida, a 1982 case, the Court noted that the doctrine of felony murder (murder that occurs in the course of a felony is made a capital crime under the laws of many states) “has been abolished in England and India, severely restricted in Canada and a number of other Commonwealth countries, and is unknown in continental Europe.”8 In a 1988 case, Thompson v. Oklahoma, the Court noted that “other nations that share our Anglo-American heritage” and “the leading members of the Western Europe community” opposed the death penalty for a person less than 16 years old at the time of the offense.9 (I must interject that almost all of those countries also opposed the death penalty when a person was more than 16 years old at the time of the offense — but never mind.) In Atkins v. Virginia, decided in 2002, the Court thought it relevant that, “within the world community, the imposition of the death penalty for crimes committed by mentally retarded offenders is overwhelmingly disapproved.”10 That was deemed relevant to the Court’s interpretation of our Eighth Amendment. Recently the Court has expanded the use of foreign law beyond the area of the Eighth Amendment. For example, in Lawrence v. Texas, decided in 2003, the Court relied upon action of the British Parliament and a decision of the European Court of Human Rights in declaring that laws punishing homosexual conduct were unconstitutional under the American Constitution.11 Individual Justices have urged the relevance of foreign law in other cases as well. I expect, or rather I fear, that the Court’s use of foreign law in the interpretation of the Constitution will continue at an accelerating pace. That is so for three reasons. First, because the “living Constitution” paradigm for the task of Constitutional interpretation prevails on the Court and indeed in the legal community generally. Under this view, it is the task of the Court to make sure that the current Constitution comports with, as we have put the point in the Eighth Amendment context, “the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.”12 Thus, a Constitutional right to abortion, which assuredly did not exist during the first few centuries of our country’s existence, does exist today. Likewise, a constitutional right to homosexual conduct.
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\*\*\*NATO\*\*\*

Collapsing Now

**Structural weaknesses prevent NATO from acting effectively**

Afghan Voice Agency 10 (February 24, http://www.avapress.com/vdcfxmdy.w6dvja7riw.txt?PHPSESSID=5092ea07059843556defb256f9b88html&PHPSESSID=8abbe5a888a8ab4a9e42bb4c3a3ddhtml&PHPSESSID=457ca2dbdd0cbc9f55b7aab2310292b0) LL

With the war in Afghanistan as his guide, Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Tuesday called for sweeping changes in the way NATO prepares for and fights nontraditional conflicts. (AP)\_ Citing a "crisis" in the alliance, Gates said Afghanistan has exposed fundamental NATO weaknesses — shortcomings that he said can undermine the viability of NATO as it faces future security threats. He cited a money shortage within NATO — a perennial problem that successive American administrations have tried and failed to fix. That, in turn, is a "symptom of deeper problems with the way NATO perceives threats," assesses its defense needs and sets spending priorities, Gates said. Gates tempered his stern message with words of praise for NATO allies, saying they had demonstrated in just the last three months an "unparalleled level of commitment" to the war effort by increasing their troop contributions from 30,000 last summer to 50,000 this year. "By any measure that is an extraordinary feat," he said. He did not mention, however, that even NATO members who have shared the combat burden in Afghanistan are finding it hard to sustain. In the Netherlands, for example, the coalition government collapsed this month over the issue of troop contributions; the 2,000-strong Dutch troop contingent is to begin withdrawing in August. Another stalwart, Canada, plans to remove 2,800 troops by next year, even as some other nations send more. NATO's budget squeeze reflects a larger cultural and political trend within an alliance, Gates said. After decades of success in preventing a catastrophic eruption of conflict on the European continent, NATO member countries have failed to modernize their militaries — instead relying on superior U.S. firepower. Afghanistan, however, has shown that a superpower cannot succeed alone in a conflict that requires not just traditional military strength but also civilian expertise and the clout of international support. "The demilitarization of Europe — where large swaths of the general public and political class are averse to military force and the risks that go with it — has gone from a blessing in the 20th century to an impediment to achieving real security and lasting peace in the 21st," he told a National Defense University audience filled with uniformed military officers from many of NATO's 28 member countries. The danger, he added, is that potential future adversaries may view NATO as a paper tiger. "Not only can real or perceived weakness be a temptation to miscalculation and aggression, but, on a more basic level, the resulting funding and capability shortfalls make it difficult to operate and fight together to confront shared threats," Gates told a forum on rewriting the basic mission plan of the NATO alliance. "All of this should be a wake-up call that NATO needs serious, far-reaching and immediate reforms to address a crisis that has been years in the making," Gates said. If NATO simply rewrites its basic agenda — officially known as its "strategic concept" — without changing the practices and the mindset of alliance members, the result "will not be worth the paper it is printed on," he added.

Collapsing Now

NATO is becoming increasing weak and ineffective in the 21st century

Sieff 9 (Martin, UPI Sr News Analyst, April 17, http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/) LL

[WASHINGTON](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), April 17 (UPI) -- The NATO alliance that confronted the collapse of the Soviet Union from 1989-91 really had teeth. Today, a far larger but also far weaker NATO resembles a 1930s airship -- huge, slow, unwieldy, vulnerable and filled with nothing more than hot gas. Many military analysts believed that as late as the early 1980s, the Soviet Union and its satellite allies in the Warsaw Pact still had an overwhelming superiority in conventional forces, particularly in artillery and main battle tanks, over the assembled forces of NATO, especially on the expected main battlefield area between them of the North European plain. However, the decision of NATO leaders to push ahead with the deployment of their small, highly mobile, nuclear-armed U.S.-built Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missiles changed the strategic equation. The Pershings gave deployed NATO forces in Western Europe a far more lethal and credible deterrent than anything they had previously fielded. Even at its time of greatest relative weakness in the face of the Red Army and its Soviet allies, there was no question during the Cold War that NATO was first and foremost a defensive military alliance. Its member states agreed that the military forces they put under the command of NATO at alliance headquarters outside Brussels were meant to defend their territories, not to project power outside them, however worthy the cause was. Therefore, the U.S. commitment in the 1950-53 Korean War, with allies such as Britain and Turkey sending military contingents to fight alongside U.S. forces, was never a NATO operation. Neither was the long U.S. military commitment in Vietnam. Nor was the 1991 Gulf War to liberate Kuwait from Iraq, although NATO allies, primarily Britain and France, sent significant forces to fight alongside U.S. troops. However, in the years following the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the nature of the alliance gradually changed. It eventually grew to its present size of 28 member states -- one more in number than the 27-nation European Union. All the former member states of the Warsaw Pact eventually joined NATO. So did even three former Soviet republics, the small Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia that had been swallowed by the Soviet Union against their will in 1940. Successive U.S. presidents, both Republican and Democratic, enthusiastically backed by [British governments](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), welcomed the new NATO member states one and all. There was a happy, almost universally shared agreement across the political spectrum in Washington that expanding the alliance was a good thing that would spread peace and security, as well as democracy and free markets, throughout Central and [Eastern Europe](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##). However, all the new member states were net consumers of NATO and U.S. security; they could not add to it themselves. This was dramatically demonstrated after the al-Qaida terrorist attacks on the United States of Sept. 11, 2001, that killed 3,000 Americans. To the astonishment of U.S. and European leaders alike, the first time the Article 5 clause for mutual defense in the alliance's founding 1949 North Atlantic Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Washington, was ever activated, it was for the Europeans to help America rather than the other way around. But this support, while emotionally important and welcome, was symbolic rather than practical. In the 21st century, the United States remained the single military giant on whom the defense of an ever-increasing number of much smaller and weaker NATO member states rested.

Unified Now

NATO unified – 60th anniversary proves

Welle 9 (Deutsche, Center for Global Research, March 28, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=12930) LL

US President Barack Obama said in a meeting with NATO's Secretary General that he wants to improve relations with Russia. Yet Obama said he also feels the alliance should not be afraid of expanding its borders. The future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's relationship with Russia was a big topic as Obama met with NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer on Wednesday, March 25. Obama said he wants to "reset" US-Russian relations, which have become increasingly strained. But Obama said that good relations with Moscow would not come at the expense of NATO expansion, something which Russia vehemently opposes. The United States has supported bringing countries such as Georgia and Ukraine into NATO, although Obama did not mention the countries by name. Obama said it was important to "send a clear signal throughout Europe that we are going to continue to abide by the central belief ... that countries who seek and aspire to join NATO are able to join NATO." Scheffer played down the alliance's disagreements with Russia after Wednesday's meeting. "We have many things on which we disagree, but NATO needs Russia and Russia needs NATO, so that's one of the things we agree on," he said after the meeting. But the alliance's top commander says NATO's relationship with Russia is more difficult than at any time since the end of the Cold War. General John Craddock pointed to Russia's war with Georgia in August of 2008 as well as disputes with Ukraine over gas supplies this year as contentious issues. He made the comments as part of written testimony before the US Senate Armed Services Committee. Russia is also unhappy with US plans to set up a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic. "We are in a time of uncertainty in the US-Russian relationship brought about by disagreements over European security, Russia's role in what it regards as its neighborhood, and Russia's decision to send forces into Georgia and to recognize the breakaway regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia," Craddock wrote. After the Cold War ended, many believed that Europe and Eurasia were no longer at threat of being invaded, an assumption which "has been now proven false," Craddock said, pointing to Russia's incursion into Georgia. Craddock also said he's like the United States to maintain the size of its military presence in Europe, despite plans to reduce the number of US soldiers stationed in countries such as Germany. NATO turning 60 While Russia was a main topic of discussion, Obama and Scheffer also discussed the alliance's stragegy in fighting militants in Afghanistan and plans for NATO's 60th anniversary summit. The meeting will be held in Germany and France on April 3-4. Obama said the 60th anniversary of the military alliance was "testimony to the effectiveness of NATO in creating stability and peace and prosperity, laying the groundwork for so much that has taken place over the last several years."

Unified Now

NATO is making efforts to adapt to current politics; the 2010 Strategic Concept proves

Atlantic Council 10 (April 27, <http://www.acus.org/publication/stratcon-2010-alliance-global-century>) LL

Strategic Concept 2010 must embody a set of principles that underpin the commitment to sustain political vision and military effectiveness and provide the narrative supporting modernization of NATO forces:

1. Restate the Alliance’s Political Mission. All members of the Atlantic Alliance retain a fundamental commitment to liberty, democracy, human rights and rule of law which underpin both the political mission and strategy of the Alliance.

2. Balance Solidarity, Strategy and Flexibility. In a fractured world, a complicated partnership is unlikely to generate unity of purpose and effort. Consensus, thus, will always be to an extent conditional with the need for flexibility paramount. To that end, a new contract is needed among and between all members of the Euro-Atlantic community that enshrines flexibility as the strategic method of the Alliance even as it spells out those core areas of defense where solidarity is both automatic and absolute. Only by balancing political and strategic realities will such a contract move NATO beyond a spurious rhetorical role to ensure each member gains security from all the rest in return for the equitable sharing of responsibilities. Such a goal will demand that NATO acts as the transatlantic security forum for political discussion given the challenges the allies face together.

3. Promote Political Flexibility. The world today is too complex for the Atlantic Alliance to manage critical security challenges alone. However, in such an environment, a strong Atlantic Alliance will be essential for the security and defense of the Euro-Atlantic area and beyond. Equally, there will be times when having a United Nations, European Union or OSCE flag on an operation, rather than a NATO flag, will afford a better chance of success. In such circumstances, NATO should be able and willing to play an enabling role.

4. Reestablish the Link between Strategy and Fighting Power. NATO is first and foremost a military security organization. Critical to both its purpose and role is the generation, organization and application of military effect. At the heart of Strategic Concept 2010 must be a commitment to enhance fighting power with capabilities and capacities designed to ensure the allies remain the world’s preeminent military group. Even the defense of members today requires advanced deployable armed forces with force modernization tailored to such an end.

5. Strike a Better Balance between Protection and Projection. For the Atlantic Alliance to play its wider military security role, the military stability and security of Europe (both members and partners) – and reassurance of all – remain central to NATO’s mission. Therefore, a better balance is required, based on assessed need, between protection of the home base against threats such as terrorism and the projection of stability.

6. Recommit to Success in Afghanistan. It is critical that NATO succeeds in the wars in which it engages. Therefore, the commitment to succeed in Afghanistan will need to be restated with conviction and demonstrated through action on the battlefield (in line with the Obama administration’s decision to push towards a stability breakthrough).

NATO Collapses Heg

NATO requires overstretch that collapses hegemony

Merry 3 (E. Wayne, The National Interest, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2751/is_74/ai_112411717/pg_8/?tag=content;col1>) LL

For better or worse, the United States has global responsibilities and unique global capabilities. At the same time, **Washington's** diplomatic and political **capacities are already overburdened**. While U.S. operational and logistical capabilities are today supreme, America's overall force structure is little more than half the size it was a generation ago, and its reserves are seriously overcommitted. The best forces can cover only limited tasks, especially for a democratic nation that employs only volunteers. Stated plainly, **NATO is a luxury the United States can no longer justify. This vast subsidy for Europe is in direct conflict with the procurement and development budgets required to maintain the American technological lead in an ever-competitive world. Today's precision weapons will be commonplace tomorrow, and even the Pentagon's immense budget cannot always keep up**.

NATO Not Key – Ineffective

NATO lacks cohesion and organization

Rupp 4 (Richard, International Studies Association, Mar 17, fromhttp://www.allacademic.com/meta/p73714\_index.html) LL

Despite substantial internal reform, collaborative missions, membership enlargement, and consistent public pronouncements of allied unity, NATO’s days as a coherent, effectively functioning, military alliance are drawing to a close. The states that established the Alliance in 1949 confronted a common threat to their survival. Though NATO’s member-states have made considerable efforts to identify new threats and missions since 1991, no unifying set of priorities has surfaced. Though many dangers to Western security have emerged in the post-Cold War period--the rise of the Al-Qaeda arguably the most significant--these issues have not unified the NATO members in significant common purpose. In the absence of a menace to their vital interests, and with fundamental political, economic, and environmental differences dividing the United States from Canada and Europe since the early 1990s, NATO will prove less and less valuable to its members with each passing year. This assertion is certainly provocative in light of the reforms and military operations that NATO has undertaken since the collapse of the Soviet Union. From the adoption of the Alliance’s 1991 Strategic Concept, to the design of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF), Partnership for Peace (PFP), membership enlargement, and military operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, NATO has consistently endeavored to adapt to the changing security and political terrain of the post-Cold War era. Scholars and policy makers who endorse NATO’s value and utility, acknowledge the array of challenges continuing to confront the Alliance. However, NATO advocates argue that those challenges are manageable and with the right set of reforms and policy initiatives, the Alliance will function effectively well into the future.

NATO Not Key – Politically Weak

**Empirically, NATO has failed to act on a variety of political issues**

Rupp 4 (Richard, International Studies Association, Mar 17, fromhttp://www.allacademic.com/meta/p73714\_index.html) LL

From their initial and prolonged failures to engage Bosnia in the 1990s, to the flawed military campaign in Kosovo in 1999, NATO has experienced considerable difficulty in coordinating and managing the membership’s “common interests” over the past ten years. Beyond the fundamental differences over how best to employ NATO, lie the significant range of divisive issues that have come to define post-Cold War relations between Washington, Ottawa, and the European capitals. On most major and even minor policy issues, a grand transatlantic rift has emerged. From the Kyoto Treaty to the establishment of the International Criminal Court, from the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the NATO members seem to have increasingly few issues uniting their governments and peoples. There are a variety of ways to define a military alliance, but certainly a common denominator must capture a group of states who pledge their military resources to deter and confront a mutual threat. Owing to substantial reductions in European defense spending since the end of the Cold War and the dramatic escalation in U.S. defense spending in recent years, NATO is comprised of eighteen states with modest defense resources and one state with vast military and power projection capabilities. NATO has reached a point in which the organization can entertain no significant military operations without the United States. Historically, military alliances do not feature perfect balance among their members, but they include states confronting a common threat with their combined military resources. NATO today faces no such threat, is defined by a vast military capabilities gap, and includes states with fundamentally clashing interests. The paper opens with selective survey of realism’s utility in explaining and predicting alliance politics and state behavior. Equipped with theoretical insights into the problems that plague NATO, the paper notes the Alliances post-Cold War transition from a collective defense alliance into its present configuration which approximates a Wilsonian collective security organization. The paper’s theoretical argumentation is buttressed by a limited survey of the clashing interests, military capabilities gap, and policy initiatives that have defined NATO over the past decade. Though by no means an exhaustive review, I will highlight the major divisions that have surfaced since September 11, 2001.

NATO Not Key – Ability Gap

**The ability gap within NATO member countries prevents effective handling or crisis situations**

Bardaji 8 (Rafael, GEES Strategic Studies Group, June 2008, http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:Dn6e1xQjd3cJ:se1.isn.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/96652/ipublicationdocument\_singledocument/59D3A784-2FCC-4BF0-8251 -51BC16D21826/en/eng284.pdf+NATO+dead+:+pdf&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGE) LL

This may be the area which has prompted the most negative opinions on the continued existence of NATO. In any case it should be said that the difference between the military capabilities of the United States and the rest of the allies has always been an issue. The main difference is that it has now become untenable. Above all due to its politico-strategic implications. What is more, it is also far more visible. For over four decades the asymmetric nature of the military capabilities was not as relevant as it is today because NATO was, in practical terms, a “virtual” defensive system, more theoretical than real. European states had no wish to improve their armies beyond a certain point in order to sustain rapid escalation, the transatlantic link and, paradoxically, with a view to reinforcing the deterrence policy. But as the Alliance abandoned its passive defence in favour of missions further and further away from its frontiers, the issue of military capabilities became increasingly important. Although it may be a very basic consideration, it is worthwhile remembering that capabilities and force levels are two very different things. On paper European armies exceed the U.S. army in size, but in practice the number of troops that are genuinely deployable are reduced to near sarcastic levels. NATO has done all it can to improve the Allies’ capabilities via various initiatives. But the result has been poor and, today, the gap between the United States and Europe is bigger than ever and, what is worse, the gap between European armed forces also gets deeper and deeper. In fact, the ultimate causes of the differences in capabilities are basically down to: - different levels of military spending; - differences in the composition of military spending; - disparity in military R+D spending; - different priorities in material acquisitions; - different structures of the armed forces, above all where conscription is still in force. A review of the amount spent on defence in the past few years leaves little scope for optimism. At least on this side of the Atlantic. The inability to make even the smallest amount of headway on this issue has led to many giving fairly negative opinions when discussing the future of the Alliance. The strategic implications are the gradual devaluation of the Alliance as the primary system for the defence of its members. In other words, if a future lack of capabilities were to become a lack of interoperability on the ground, this would lead to the U.S. having to assume a disproportionate burden. If there are casualties, domestic pressure would undoubtedly cause a repeat of what occurred in the 1999 campaign in Kosovo: refusal to wage a war via committee and an exacerbation of the unilateral tendencies of the United States. When the cost and the risk are very disproportionate, it is unfair that everyone should have the same weight at decision time. The situation is clear. NATO would stop serving as a decision-making forum among supposed equals and the coalitions of the willing would in turn grow to the extent possible.

NATO Not Key – Offensive Roles

NATO is ineffective in offensive military roles

Aznar 5 (Jose, AEI, The America Enterprise, Nov 17, <http://www.washingtonspeakers.com/prod_images/pdfs/AznarJose.NATOAnAllianceForFreedom.11.29.05.pdf>) LL

But to me, NATO is in a real and very deep crisis, despite its hyperactivity. The 90’s were years of strategic holidays, everyone celebrating the demise of the existential threat the USSR represented to all of us, and confident that we were so powerful that we could intervene and put an end to all civil and ethnic conflicts if we decided so. As Sir Winston Churchill said once, “they were all pigmy wars” compared to the most powerful military machinery of all times, NATO. The problems is, as we know now, that the 90’s were also the years in which a new enemy was preparing to strike a fatal blow against us. The attacks of September 11 were not the breaking out of hostilities, since we can trace day one to many years before, but it was a kind of revelation: we discovered that instead of living in a benign world, we were facing a new existential threat. Not only because terror became mass terror, but because Islamist terror had a clear strategic vision and plan which was- and is- incompatible with our way of life. September 11 was also a revolution for NATO. Traditional concepts like containment and deterrence were no longer viable, and relying just on defensive defense, like NATO had for more than four decades, meant putting at risk the lives of too many citizens. Going on the offensive, or taking preventive measures was something NATO was not prepared to deal with. It had never done so before. It never needed to. To change, nonetheless, takes time and usually involves a painful process. The Alliance activated for the first time in its History the provisions of article 5 by which an attack upon one of his members is considered an attack against all. Though NATO did little in practice, leaving to its members to cooperate bilaterally with the US in Operation Enduring Freedom. Some people say that it was impossible for NATO to do something tangible on a major scale since it did not have the assets and means; others point to US reluctance to repeat the war by committee we saw in Kosovo. The debate is open. In any case, as we witnessed during the whole Iraqi crisis, NATO’s lack of commitment was not always due to a lack of military capabilities, but to deep political and strategic divergences. Of course NATO members, particularly the Europeans, should do more on defense, but solving the capability gap won’t automatically solve the crisis within the Alliance. That’s my personal assessment, of course. NATO is in crisis because to some we are now living at war. We are supposedly facing an enemy who declared war upon us, and we must fight in a conflict in which a stalemate is not possible. Our enemy has such a determination that it is them or us, our victory or our defeat. The Global War On Terror being more than just a rhetorical expression, the dots that connect New York and Washington, with Bali, Madrid, London, Iraq or Amman.

NATO Not Key – Peacekeeping

NATO fails at peacekeeping

Davis 9 (Ian, founding director of NATO Watch and an independent human security and arms control consultant, Mar 2009, <http://www.basicint.org/pubs/natoshadow.pdf>) LL

In summary, NATO is not ideally suited to peacekeeping operations. If this is to become a core goal of the Alliance, it would need to adapt its doctrines to clearly separate peacekeeping from war-fighting. It also needs to adjust its approach to planning. Rather than seeking to make NATO operations ‘comprehensive’ by bringing a greater range of actors into its planning process, it needs to orient its planning towards implementation of core military peacekeeping tasks, as defined in a peace agreement or a commonly agreed peacebuilding/recovery strategy. While it must evidently strive to be networked with other civilian actors – and well informed of its operational context –it must relinquish its ambition to direct the entire international reconstruction effort. This is not only politically unrealistic, but is arguably unhelpful in so far as it limits the diversity and innovation in support of complex political stabilization or peacebuilding processes, and reduces the space for local leadership in the peacebuilding effort.

NATO Not Key – Terrorism

**Empirically, NATO is useless in efforts to combat terrorism**

Gordon 2 **(**Philip H.,Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy Foreign, The Brookings Institution, Summer of 2002, http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2002/summer\_globalgovernance\_gordon.aspx) LL

SUMMER 2002 — Less than 24 hours after the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, America's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came together to invoke the alliance's Article 5 defense guarantee—this "attack on one" was to be considered an "attack on all." When it came time to implement that guarantee, however, in the form of the American-led military campaign in Afghanistan, NATO remained on the sidelines—by U.S. choice. The Americans decided not to ask for a NATO operation for both military and political reasons—only the United States had the right sort of equipment to project military forces halfway around the world, and Washington did not want political interference from 18 allies in the campaign. In light of these decisions, some observers have begun to wonder whether NATO has any enduring role at all. And there are, in fact, serious reasons for concern about the future of the alliance if leaders on both sides of the Atlantic do not take the steps necessary to adapt it to changing circumstances. The Afghanistan campaign revealed large gaps between the war-fighting capabilities of the United States and its allies and reinforced the perception in some quarters in Washington that it is easier to conduct operations alone than with allies who have little to offer militarily and who might hamper efficient decisionmaking. Moreover, the U.S. decision to increase its defense budget by some $48 billion for 2003—an increase larger than any single European country's entire defense budget—will only make this capabilities gap worse. To the extent that the war on terrorism leads the United States to undertake military operations in other distant theaters, and to the extent that the Europeans are unwilling or unable to come along, NATO's centrality will be further diminished.

NATO Not Key – Afghanistan

**NATO suffers from insufficient troops, national caveats, and weak political will**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

ISAF was initially established with UN Security Council authorization under British command in October 2001, after the United States overthrew Afghanistan's Taliban government. NATO assumed control of ISAF in August 2003.53 Initially ISAF's mission was limited to patrolling Kabul, but since 2004, ISAF has undertaken a four-stage expansion of its mission into the northern and western provinces of Afghanistan, and later to the south and east. It has also deployed several provincial reconstruction teams, which are based on a [End Page 49] model developed by the U.S. military that combines security and reconstruction functions in an effort to help stabilize the countryside.54 ISAF assumed responsibility for security throughout Afghanistan in October 2006. At that point, it was NATO's largest operation, involving about 31,000 troops, including roughly 12,000 U.S. troops under ISAF command. ISAF represents a valuable contribution to the U.S. goal of denying terrorists sanctuary or allies, given al-Qaida's close ties with the previous Taliban regime and ongoing efforts to pursue al-Qaida members in the border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan. All twenty-six NATO members participate in ISAF, as do ten non-NATO partner countries. At the same time, ISAF has suffered from three significant problems. First, since 2003 the alliance has been unable to secure sufficient troop commitments to meet the target force size. When NATO took control of the southern and eastern regions of Afghanistan in August 2006, its 31,000-strong force represented about 85 percent of the troops and equipment that NATO commanders had requested for the mission. Since July 2006, NATO troops have confronted far more intense fighting than expected.55 The alliance appealed for more troops in September 2006, but only one member country, Poland, offered to send additional troops.56 At the November 2006 summit meeting in Riga, Latvia, new pledges from member states raised the troop and equipment totals to 90 percent of requirements.57 ISAF's commander at that time, Lt. Gen. David Richards, said that it can manage with the current troop strength, but additional troops would allow it to conduct major operations more rapidly and with less risk to NATO soldiers.58 [End Page 50] Second, many troops in Afghanistan operate under "national caveats," whereby governments place limits on what military activities their troops are allowed to do or where they are allowed to go in carrying out their missions. These caveats are problematic for two reasons: they hurt operational effectiveness; and alliance members do not share risks equally, which can cause friction.59 Germany's troops can be deployed only near Kabul, for example, and in 2006 Poland resisted sending additional troops to southern Afghanistan, where they are needed the most. Only six NATO members operate without caveats. The problem is not unique to ISAF; national caveats caused headaches during NATO's peacekeeping mission in Bosnia as well, and they have long been a problem in UN peacekeeping missions.60 Recognition of the operational problems such caveats pose has led to a marked decline in their use, but they have made both multinational cooperation and operations in general more difficult in Afghanistan.61 Caveats tend to creep back in, moreover, as is evident in repeated efforts to eliminate them. NATO leaders agreed to reduce caveats at the 2006 Riga summit, for example, with the result that 26,000 troops of the increased force of 32,000 had broader freedom to act.62 Third, the Afghan leadership fears that the United States will abandon it, and it is unsure what NATO's authority over both the security and counterterrorism mission will mean in the long run. Concern has also been raised about whether NATO has the political will and capabilities to fight a sustained counterinsurgency campaign.63 Since NATO forces assumed responsibility for security in southern Afghanistan, the frequency and intensity of Taliban attacks have increased.64 This renewed fighting forced the United States to reverse plans to reduce [End Page 51] its military commitment in Afghanistan and led the British to expand their troop contribution to ISAF.65 The United States decided in January 2007 to extend the tours of 3,200 troops in Afghanistan, and further troop increases were under consideration.66 Notably, U.S. forces, ISAF's largest contingent, will continue to conduct the bulk of counterterrorism activities aimed at al-Qaida. The U.S. military also retains 11,000 troops outside ISAF's command to sustain a separate counterinsurgency function in addition to peacekeeping.67

**NATO Not Key - Iraq**

National caveats, lack of funding, and lack of consensus have prevented effective NATO handling of Iraq

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

In 2004, at U.S. urging, NATO agreed to play a central role in training Iraqi security forces. NATO's training effort has several elements: mentoring of Iraqi military officers by NATO personnel; creation of an officer training facility in Iraq; and training of Iraqi officers in NATO facilities. NATO's target is to train 1,000 officers inside Iraq annually, and 500 outside the state; by September [End Page 52] 2006, NATO had trained 650 Iraqi officers in European facilities and roughly 2,000 officers overall.71 NATO has also donated military equipment to Iraq's security forces. This equipment comes primarily from former Warsaw Pact countries that have become NATO members, and it is compatible with Iraq's Soviet-supplied military hardware. NATO's training mission has faced significant difficulties, however. First, the need to gain consensus on all decisions hamstrung efforts to get the mission up and running and greatly slowed the process; residual bitterness over the U.S. decision to invade Iraq contributed to this problem. Some members objected to the precedent set by taking on the training mission, which also slowed decisionmaking.72 Second, as in Afghanistan, some troop contributions have operated under national caveats, which has hindered commanders' efforts to coordinate NATO's activities. Third, funding for the mission has been a serious problem. Countries contributing troops are expected to cover their own costs. NATO set up a "trust fund" to pay for the establishment of a defense university in Iraq, but contributions to the fund have thus far been insufficient. As a result, although the Iraqi government has stressed its preference for in-country training to help gain popular trust and support for the new security forces, more officers have been trained outside Iraq.73

NATO Peacekeeping in the West Bank fails – Caveats

Diker et. al 10 (Dan, Senior Foreign Policy Analyst, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs; Adjunct Fellow, Hudson Institute, <http://www.jcpa.org/text/security/fullstudy.pdf>) LL

Even in a robust NATO deployment in Afghanistan, which is not a peacekeeping mission, European states have insisted on “caveats” for the employment of their forces, restricting their use for only the safest missions. There were national caveats banning nighttime operations and restricting the geographic deployment of forces to specific areas which were known to be more secure. Some caveats required consultations between commanders in the field and national capitals in Europe before tactical decisions could be taken. Most importantly, there were national caveats that excluded the use of certain forces that were part of the NATO alliance in counterterrorism operations.1 General John Craddock, the former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO, admitted in 2009 that NATO forces were burdened with 83 national caveats, which were reduced to about 70.2 NATO remains a cumbersome organization. Given its track record in Afghanistan, it is difficult to imagine the efficacy of similar forces in the West Bank. NATO remains a cumbersome organization, especially when it comes to decisionmaking and processing urgent operational requirements from commanders. In counterterrorism operations, it is precisely the ability to act quickly and decisively that keeps the peace and prevents attacks. Given the track record of NATO in Afghanistan, it is difficult to imagine the efficacy of similar forces in the West Bank

NATO Not Key – Middle East

**NATO lacks the means and the motivation to make any impact on the Middle East**

International Relations and Security Network 5 (Academic Research Branch, June 5, http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?ots591=0C54E3B3-1E9C-BE1E-2C24-A6A8C7060233&lng=en&id=14415) LL

This group views a NATO role in the peace process from a more regional perspective. For them, there is a high risk pertaining to any involvement in the region at the moment. They base their argument on the following premises: 1. The Middle East is a region that has historically divided the EU and the US for far longer than any other region in the world, and this group feels that it will continue to do so. Hence, it is extremely difficult for 26 countries to reach a consensus on this specific issue. And, even if they agreed to achieve one goal, they would disagree on how to achieve it. 2. The unfeasibility of NATO being able to offer sufficient security guarantees given the formidable obstacles means that it would not even be prudent to raise expectations about what might be achieved in this conflict. 3. The political sensitivities associated with the dialogue and cooperation in the region. It would even be counterproductive to NATO’s main aim in the region at the moment, which is building trust and improving the Alliance’s image in the region. 4. Bearing in mind Iraq, some NATO countries may be reluctant to send troops to the conflict area, as they would not want to face an angry public should the mission fail and entail many losses. 5. This group challenges the optimists by confirming the difficulty of promoting sub-regional cooperation similar to the multilateral model pioneered under the Partnership for Peace in Europe. 6. The existing frameworks that bind NATO and the parties involved will not allow smooth coordination, especially with Palestine which is an incomplete international actor. In addition, with the absence of a national army, NATO will not be able to provide adequate arrangements for Palestine. 7. The problem of NATO’s credibility in the region and its distorted image as an organization under American influence. So, any international force or peacekeeping troops would become a target for terrorist attacks. 8. Peacekeeping operations would need Special Forces, vast intelligence resources, and capabilities strong enough to withstand the highly sophisticated Israeli army. 9. Any NATO deployment between Israel and Palestine is completely unpredictable at the moment, because in some respects this proposal would depend to a large extent on the outcome of some current operations, like Afghanistan and Iraq. 10. The deployment of additional forces in Israel and Palestine would necessitate enormous numbers of troops that would have to remain engaged for an indefinite period of time – troops which may not necessarily be available at the moment with the Alliance being engaged in Iraq, Afghanistan and the Balkans. In an interview with a NATO official, it was very clearly stated that some NATO countries would even oppose sending their troops to the conflict region. 11. Although NATO provides a natural divide between Europe that tends to be more sympathetic to the Palestinians and the US which is more sympathetic to Israel, this is reinforced by partisans on both sides that take an extreme view of the rights and wrongs in the conflict. Moreover, it also acts as a dilemma in the sense that, for the Israelis, NATO is too European while for the Arabs it is too American. 12. From a more practical point of view, this group maintains that the parties concerned have no direct interest in NATO’s involvement in the region, especially Israel. From a purely Israeli foreign policy perspective, with its strong relations with the USA, Israel already enjoys the status of an informal ally within the organization. Moreover, building stronger ties with NATO will not contribute to Israel’s deterrent capability. On the contrary, Israel would find it very unattractive to support any international presence in the Occupied Territories.

NATO Outdated

NATO is becoming increasing weak and ineffective in the 21st century

Sieff 9 (Martin, UPI Sr News Analyst, April 17, http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/) LL

[WASHINGTON](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), April 17 (UPI) -- The NATO alliance that confronted the collapse of the Soviet Union from 1989-91 really had teeth. Today, a far larger but also far weaker NATO resembles a 1930s airship -- huge, slow, unwieldy, vulnerable and filled with nothing more than hot gas. Many military analysts believed that as late as the early 1980s, the Soviet Union and its satellite allies in the Warsaw Pact still had an overwhelming superiority in conventional forces, particularly in artillery and main battle tanks, over the assembled forces of NATO, especially on the expected main battlefield area between them of the North European plain. However, the decision of NATO leaders to push ahead with the deployment of their small, highly mobile, nuclear-armed U.S.-built Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missiles changed the strategic equation. The Pershings gave deployed NATO forces in Western Europe a far more lethal and credible deterrent than anything they had previously fielded. Even at its time of greatest relative weakness in the face of the Red Army and its Soviet allies, there was no question during the Cold War that NATO was first and foremost a defensive military alliance. Its member states agreed that the military forces they put under the command of NATO at alliance headquarters outside Brussels were meant to defend their territories, not to project power outside them, however worthy the cause was. Therefore, the U.S. commitment in the 1950-53 Korean War, with allies such as Britain and Turkey sending military contingents to fight alongside U.S. forces, was never a NATO operation. Neither was the long U.S. military commitment in Vietnam. Nor was the 1991 Gulf War to liberate Kuwait from Iraq, although NATO allies, primarily Britain and France, sent significant forces to fight alongside U.S. troops. However, in the years following the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the nature of the alliance gradually changed. It eventually grew to its present size of 28 member states -- one more in number than the 27-nation European Union. All the former member states of the Warsaw Pact eventually joined NATO. So did even three former Soviet republics, the small Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia that had been swallowed by the Soviet Union against their will in 1940. Successive U.S. presidents, both Republican and Democratic, enthusiastically backed by [British governments](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), welcomed the new NATO member states one and all. There was a happy, almost universally shared agreement across the political spectrum in Washington that expanding the alliance was a good thing that would spread peace and security, as well as democracy and free markets, throughout Central and [Eastern Europe](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##). However, all the new member states were net consumers of NATO and U.S. security; they could not add to it themselves. This was dramatically demonstrated after the al-Qaida terrorist attacks on the United States of Sept. 11, 2001, that killed 3,000 Americans. To the astonishment of U.S. and European leaders alike, the first time the Article 5 clause for mutual defense in the alliance's founding 1949 North Atlantic Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Washington, was ever activated, it was for the Europeans to help America rather than the other way around. But this support, while emotionally important and welcome, was symbolic rather than practical. In the 21st century, the United States remained the single military giant on whom the defense of an ever-increasing number of much smaller and weaker NATO member states rested.

\*\*\*NUCLEAR WAR\*\*\*

No Nuclear War – Survivable

Nuclear war is survivable – no nuclear winter or fallout impacts.

Nyquist 99 ( J.R., renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations, May 20, “Is Nuclear war Survivable?”,http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=19722)KM

As I write about Russia's nuclear war preparations, I get some interesting mail in response. Some correspondents imagine I am totally ignorant. They point out that nuclear war would cause "nuclear winter," and everyone would die. Since nobody wants to die, nobody would ever start a nuclear war (and nobody would ever seriously prepare for one). Other correspondents suggest I am ignorant of the world-destroying effects of nuclear radiation. I patiently reply to these correspondents that nuclear war would not be the end of the world. I then point to studies showing that "nuclear winter" has no scientific basis, that fallout from a nuclear war would not kill all life on earth. Surprisingly, few of my correspondents are convinced. They prefer apocalyptic myths created by pop scientists, movie producers and journalists. If Dr. Carl Sagan once said "nuclear winter" would follow a nuclear war, then it must be true. If radiation wipes out mankind in a movie, then that's what we can expect in real life. But Carl Sagan was wrong about nuclear winter. And the movie "On the Beach" misled American filmgoers about the effects of fallout. It is time, once and for all, to lay these myths to rest. Nuclear war would not bring about the end of the world, though it would be horribly destructive. The truth is, many prominent physicists have condemned the nuclear winter hypothesis. Nobel laureate Freeman Dyson once said of nuclear winter research, "It's an absolutely atrocious piece of science, but I quite despair of setting the public record straight." Professor Michael McElroy, a Harvard physics professor, also criticized the nuclear winter hypothesis. McElroy said that nuclear winter researchers "stacked the deck" in their study, which was titled "Nuclear Winter: Global Consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions" (Science, December 1983). Nuclear winter is the theory that the mass use of nuclear weapons would create enough smoke and dust to blot out the sun, causing a catastrophic drop in global temperatures. According to Carl Sagan, in this situation the earth would freeze. No crops could be grown. Humanity would die of cold and starvation. In truth, natural disasters have frequently produced smoke and dust far greater than those expected from a nuclear war. In 1883 Krakatoa exploded with a blast equivalent to 10,000 one-megaton bombs, a detonation greater than the combined nuclear arsenals of planet earth. The Krakatoa explosion had negligible weather effects. Even more disastrous, going back many thousands of years, a meteor struck Quebec with the force of 17.5 million one-megaton bombs, creating a crater 63 kilometers in diameter. But the world did not freeze. Life on earth was not extinguished. Consider the views of Professor George Rathjens of MIT, a known antinuclear activist, who said, "Nuclear winter is the worst example of misrepresentation of science to the public in my memory." Also consider Professor Russell Seitz, at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs, who says that the nuclear winter hypothesis has been discredited. Two researchers, Starley Thompson and Stephen Schneider, debunked the nuclear winter hypothesis in the summer 1986 issue of Foreign Affairs. Thompson and Schneider stated: "the global apocalyptic conclusions of the initial nuclear winter hypothesis can now be relegated to a vanishingly low level of probability." OK, so nuclear winter isn't going to happen. What about nuclear fallout? Wouldn't the radiation from a nuclear war contaminate the whole earth, killing everyone? The short answer is: absolutely not. Nuclear fallout is a problem, but we should not exaggerate its effects. As it happens, there are two types of fallout produced by nuclear detonations. These are: 1) delayed fallout; and 2) short-term fallout. According to researcher Peter V. Pry, "Delayed fallout will not, contrary to popular belief, gradually kill billions of people everywhere in the world." Of course, delayed fallout would increase the number of people dying of lymphatic cancer, leukemia, and cancer of the thyroid. "However," says Pry, "these deaths would probably be far fewer than deaths now resulting from ... smoking, or from automobile accidents." The real hazard in a nuclear war is the short-term fallout. This is a type of fallout created when a nuclear weapon is detonated at ground level. This type of fallout could kill millions of people, depending on the targeting strategy of the attacking country. But short-term fallout rapidly subsides to safe levels in 13 to 18 days. It is not permanent. People who live outside of the affected areas will be fine. Those in affected areas can survive if they have access to underground shelters. In some areas, staying indoors may even suffice. Contrary to popular misconception, there were no documented deaths from short-term or delayed fallout at either Hiroshima or Nagasaki. These blasts were low airbursts, which produced minimal fallout effects. Today's thermonuclear weapons are even "cleaner." If used in airburst mode, these weapons would produce few (if any) fallout casualties. On their side, Russian military experts believe that the next world war will be a nuclear missile war. They know that nuclear weapons cannot cause the end of the world. According to the Russian military writer, A. S. Milovidov, "There is profound error and harm in the disoriented claims of bourgeois ideologues that there will be no victor in a thermonuclear world war." Milovidov explains that Western objections to the mass use of nuclear weapons are based on "a subjective judgment. It expresses mere protest against nuclear war." Another Russian theorist, Captain First Rank V. Kulakov, believes that a mass nuclear strike may not be enough to defeat "a strong enemy, with extensive territory enabling him to use space and time for the organizations of active and passive defense. ..."

No Nuclear War – Survivable

Nuclear War cannot cause Extinction

Nyquist 1 (List compiled by JP Nyquist “War Preps” http://www.jrnyquist.com/war\_preps.htm)KM

In spite of the many uncertainties of our study we do have a great deal of confidence in some partial conclusions -- such as, that a nation like the United States or the Soviet Union could handle each of the problems of radioactivity, physical destruction, or likely levels of casualties, if they occurred by themselves. That is, we believe if either nation were to be dusted with radioactivity in a wartime manner, and if nothing else happened, this radioactivity could, with minor preparations for a small attack and elaborate preparations for a large one, be handled. HERMAN KAHN: On Thermonuclear War Nuclear winter is the most recent attempt to prove that winning a nuclear war is impossible. A new apocalyptic theory was necessary from the viewpoint of the antinuclear activists who originated and publicized nuclear winter because other theories of apocalypse, such as the fallout theory, had been discredited by the scientific community. PETER VINCENT PRY: Nuclear Wars, Exchanges and Outcomes In modern warfare, nuclear weapons can be employed for various missions: strategic, operational, and tactical. From a purely military point of view, a nuclear weapon is incomparably more effective than a conventional weapon. It permits the execution of military missions in a considerably shorter time than was possible in past wars. For this reason, experts believe that the nuclear weapon is the most powerful and effective instrument by which to destroy an opponent in any type of operation, or in war as a whole. V.D. SOKOLOVSKII: Soviet Military Strategy The idea of killing millions of people to achieve a relative positional advantage is absurd from the point of view of liberal democracy. From the point of view of positional advantage, it is liberal democracy that proves absurd.

No extinction – the best studies assume the worst case scenario and leave extinction claims warrantless.

Martin 88 (Brian, *Science and Public Policy*, Vol. 15, No. 5, October 1988, pp. 321-334, “Nuclear winter: science and politics”, http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/88spp.html)KM

1. Targeting. The TTAPS paper uses a baseline case of 5000 megatonnes (MT), supplemented by a wide range of other scenarios which also lead to nuclear winter effects. Though in general terms some of the scenarios appear reasonable, no detailed strategic rationale is offered for any of them[22]. A cynic might say that the key characteristic of the scenarios is that they produce sufficient smoke or dust to produce nuclear winter. This is illustrated by the 100MT scenario, which is often misinterpreted as 100 bombs on 100 cities. Actually it involves 1000 bombs and the burning of a vast number of cities each of just the right size. It is easy to misinterpret the results for this scenario as showing that any 100MT war is enough to trigger nuclear winter, whereas any militarily realistic targeting of 100MT would cause relatively few cities to burn and probably produce little cooling according to present models. If the scenarios had been designed to produce a spread of soot injections rather than a fairly constant soot injection for different megatonnages, the result of nuclear winter would have seemed more sensitive to variations in targeting. Ehrlich et al. concentrate on a 10,000MT scenario which generates more severe environmental effects than either the Ambio scenario[23] or the TTAPS baseline case. They state that they take the TTAPS 10,000MT 'severe' case as their reference case because of policy implications[24]. (According to Michael MacCracken, TTAPS in their draft paper presented a 10,000MT baseline. After receiving comments, they corrected an error of a factor of 2 in the smoke density and also reset the baseline to 5000MT. These two changes counteracted each other, leaving the baseline consequences unchanged. Ehrlich et al. considered a maximum but to them plausible scenario which, after the factor of 2 adjustment, turned out to be the TTAPS 10,000MT scenario[25].) (2) The threshold. The TTAPS paper suggests the existence of a sharp threshold, above which severe nuclear winter effects are 'triggered'. The 100MT scenario is identified as above the threshold. The idea of a sharp threshold is convenient for policy purposes, since one can argue that arsenals should be reduced below the threshold level, as Sagan has done[26]. Later researchers have discounted or qualified the idea of a sharp threshold[27-28]. (3) One-dimensional model. TTAPS uses a one-dimensional model with annually averaged insolation and temperatures. The model shows dramatic temperature drops over land but little effect over the oceans. The authors comment on the moderating effect of the oceans in the text[29], but these qualifications have been lost on most readers and commentators who have concentrated on the tables and abstract, where the extreme land results are highlighted. Ehrlich et al. focussed on the land results from TTAPS and applied them over the whole globe in assessing the biological effects of nuclear winter. (4) Extinction. Ehrlich et al. itemise all sorts of disasters from nuclear war. For example, they raise the issue of decreases in stratospheric ozone and resulting increases in ultraviolet (after the smoke and dust clears), not noting that changes in the size of warheads have made this threat much less serious. They add up a set of hazards to conclude that human extinction may occur, without explaining precisely how everyone could die[30-31].

No Nuclear War – New Zealand

No extinction – New Zealand would survive.

Mydans 88 (SETH, the New York Times February 17, “New Zealand Ponders a 'Nuclear Survival Kit'”, http://www.nytimes.com/1988/02/17/world/new-zealand-ponders-a-nuclear-survival-kit.html?pagewanted=1?pagewanted=1)KM

Isolated in the distant South Pacific and stubbornly free of nuclear weapons and nuclear power, New Zealand has begun examining ways to survive a nuclear war. Using French reparations funds from the bombing of the anti-nuclear Greenpeace vessel Rainbow Warrior in 1985, the Government commissioned a six-month study last year titled ''After Nuclear War.'' The study said that with much of the rest of the world destroyed, New Zealand's worst problems would be its loss of trading partners and of imported products. It predicted that the radioactive fallout and climatic changes that would devastate the Northern Hemisphere would be minimal for New Zealand.

No Nuclear War – Exaggerated

Impacts to nuclear war are exaggerated to justify inaction and fuel our fear of death.

Martin 82 (Brian, Published in Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, pp. 287-300. “Critique of Nuclear Extinction”, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html)KM

Why do so many people have an exaggerated idea of the effects of nuclear war, or focus on the worst possible outcome? Many people tend to believe what they hear, but in the case of nuclear war there are both very pessimistic accounts and other accounts which minimise the dangers. Many people, though not all by any means, seem to assume the worst and not look into the technical details - as indeed I myself did until a few years ago. Why? Here I outline a number of possible reasons for exaggeration of the effects of nuclear war and emphasis on worst cases. While the importance of most of these reasons may be disputed, I feel it is necessary to raise them for discussion. The points raised are not meant to lay blame on anyone, but rather to help ensure that peace movement theory and strategy are founded on sound beliefs. By understanding our motivations and emotional responses, some insight may be gained into how better to struggle against nuclear war. (a) Exaggeration to justify inaction. For many people, nuclear war is seen as such a terrible event, and as something that people can do so little about, that they can see no point in taking action on peace issues and do not even think about the danger. For those who have never been concerned or taken action on the issue, accepting an extreme account of the effects of nuclear war can provide conscious or unconscious justification for this inaction. In short, one removes from one's awareness the upsetting topic of nuclear war, and justifies this psychological denial by believing the worst. This suggests two things. First, it may be more effective in mobilising people against nuclear war to describe the dangers in milder terms. Some experiments have shown that strong accounts of danger - for example, of smoking[17] - can be less effective than weaker accounts in changing behaviour. Second, the peace movement should devote less attention to the dangers of nuclear war and more attention to what people can do to oppose it in their day-to-day lives. (b) Fear of death. Although death receives a large amount of attention in the media, the consideration of one's own death has been one of the most taboo topics in western culture, at least until recently.[18] Nuclear war as an issue raises the topic insistently, and unconsciously many people may prefer to avoid the issue for this reason. The fear of and repression of conscious thoughts about personal death may also lead to an unconscious tendency to exaggerate the effects of nuclear war. One's own personal death - the end of consciousness - can be especially threatening in the context of others remaining alive and conscious. Somehow the death of everyone may be less threatening. Robert Lifton[19] argues that children who learn at roughly the same age about both personal death and nuclear holocaust may be unable to separate the two concepts, and as a result equate death with annihilation, with undesirable consequences for coping individually with life and working collectively against nuclear war.

No Nuclear War – Stays Limited

Nuclear war stays limited – military calculus would not prefer escalation.

Martin 82 (Brian, Published in Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, pp. 287-300. “Critique of Nuclear Extinction”, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html)KM

It often has been argued that the use of a few nuclear weapons could lead, gradually or suddenly, to an all-out nuclear war between the superpowers. But it is also at least possible that a nuclear exchange could occur without this leading to all-out war. A nuclear war might be waged solely in the Middle East; or an 'exchange' might occur consisting of nuclear attacks by the US on remote installations in southern Soviet Union and by the Soviet Union on remote US installations in Australia; or 'tactical' nuclear weapons might be used in a confrontation restricted to Europe, or to the border region between China and the Soviet Union. The likelihood of any such possibilities is a matter of some dispute. What should not be in dispute is the possibility - whatever assessment is made of its likelihood - that a nuclear war can occur which is less than all-out global nuclear war. Anti-war people - and others - spend a lot of time arguing that limited nuclear war is virtually impossible. Their main reason for arguing against military strategies for limited nuclear war seems to be that this possibility makes nuclear war seem more plausible. But plausible to whom? Military leaders and national security managers are not likely to be swayed by arguments advanced by the anti-war movement (though they may be swayed by its political strength). So the argument that limited nuclear war is impossible has impact mainly on the public, which is pushed into all-or-nothing thinking, leading to apathy and resignation. Much of the argumentation presented by anti-war people criticising the concept of limited nuclear war seems to be almost a reflex action against planning by militarists. It is important to realise that strategic planning about limited nuclear war is not automatically suspect just because such thinking is done by military planners. It is entirely possible for peace activists to think about and to prepare their own strategies to confront the political consequences of nuclear war, and furthermore to do this in a way which reduces the likelihood of nuclear war in the first place.[29] If the peace movement is to argue that nuclear war cannot be limited, then it should do so on the basis of a careful political analysis and in the context of an ongoing strategy for peace. It may be that the argument that nuclear war cannot be limited, like the view that nuclear war is the final catastrophe, is based on a limited political analysis and is in many ways counterproductive in its effects.

No Nuclear War – No Ozone Destruction

Nuclear war doesn’t destroy the ozone – most nukes are too small to have real affects, and some actually restore ozone.

Kearney 87 (Cresson H., Res. Engineer, Oak Ridge Nat. Lab., 1987, Nuclear War Survival Skills, www.oism.org/nwss/s73p912.htm)KM

Myth: Blindness and a disastrous increase of cancers would be the fate of survivors of a nuclear war, because the nuclear explosions would destroy so much of the protective ozone in the stratosphere that far too much ultraviolet light would reach the earth's surface. Even birds and insects would be blinded. People could not work outdoors in daytime for years without dark glasses, and would have to wear protective clothing to prevent incapacitating sunburn. Plants would be badly injured and food production greatly reduced. ° Facts: Large nuclear explosions do inject huge amounts of nitrogen oxides (gasses that destroy ozone) into the stratosphere. However, the percent of the stratospheric ozone destroyed by a given amount of nitrogen oxides has been greatly overestimated in almost all theoretical calculations and models. For example, the Soviet and U.S. atmospheric nuclear test explosions of large weapons in 1952-1962 were calculated by Foley and Ruderman to result in a reduction of more than 10 percent in total ozone. (See M. H. Foley and M. A. Ruderman, 'Stratospheric NO from Past Nuclear Explosions", Journal of Geophysics, Res. 78, 4441-4450.) Yet observations that they cited showed no reductions in ozone. Nor did ultraviolet increase. Other theoreticians calculated sizable reductions in total ozone, but interpreted the observational data to indicate either no reduction, or much smaller reductions than their calculated ones. A realistic simplified estimate of the increased ultraviolet light dangers to American survivors of a large nuclear war equates these hazards to moving from San Francisco to sea level at the equator, where the sea level incidence of skin cancers (seldom fatal) is highest- about 10 times higher than the incidence at San Francisco. Many additional thousands of American survivors might get skin cancer, but little or no increase in skin cancers might result if in the post-attack world deliberate sun tanning and going around hatless went out of fashion. Furthermore, almost all of today's warheads are smaller than those exploded in the large- weapons tests mentioned above; most would inject much smaller amounts of ozone-destroying gasses, or no gasses, into the stratosphere, where ozone deficiencies may persist for years. And nuclear weapons smaller than 500 kilotons result in increases (due to smog reactions) in upper tropospheric ozone. In a nuclear war, these increases would partially compensate for the upper-level tropospheric decreases-as explained by Julius S. Chang and Donald J. Wuebbles of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

No Nuclear War – Nuclear Winter Improbable

Stories of nuclear war have been hyped up for political purposes.

Martin 88(Brian Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, Australia, “Nuclear winter: science and politics” Science and Public Policy, Vol. 15, No. 5)AQB

Compared to the subtle and contentious processes by which politics has entered the science of nuclear winter, the processes by which the science of nuclear winter has entered the political or policy domain are open and transparent. Nuclear winter has been used as a political 'resource' or 'tool'. Particular individuals and groups have used claims about nuclear winter to pursue explicitly political agendas. The two main groupings are members or supporters of the peace movement, who have unreservedly taken up nuclear winter to argue for nuclear disarmament, and defenders of existing military policies who have minimised the impact of nuclear winter for policy-making. The promotion of nuclear winter for public and policy impact reached high peaks even before scientific publication of the theory. The major tool in this promotion has been the mass media, and the key figure at the interface between the researchers and the media has been Carl Sagan, a media personality in his own right. The promotion has included Sagan's article in Parade[78] (a Sunday newspaper supplement, circulation 30 million), well publicised scientific conferences, press releases and press conferences, meetings with members of Congress, and television appearances. A minimum of many tens of thousands of dollars have been devoted to public relations about nuclear winter[79]. Activist groups involving scientists have sent large amounts of nuclear winter material to politicians. According to one perspective on 'social problems', the reason nuclear winter is perceived as an important issue is precisely because there is a social movement promoting it as such[80]. The scientist publicisers of nuclear winter have had much sympathy from members of the media. Without support from journalists and tolerance from proprietors, the massive promotion might not have led to such worldwide coverage. The receptiveness of the media to nuclear winter can be understood at more than one level. Most directly, nuclear winter is a good story. Doom and destruction are staples of media coverage. The more extreme claims of freezing, darkness and extinction have received much more coverage than cautionary comments about the limitations of the models. More than this, the great strength of the peace movement in the 1980s has meant that peace concerns are much more acceptable. With a large fraction of the US public supporting a freeze on nuclear arsenals, reporting nuclear winter is not seen as stepping outside the bounds of public opinion.

Nuclear winter was made up by scientists backed by peace activists.

Martin 88(Brian Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, Australia, “Nuclear winter: science and politics” Science and Public Policy, Vol. 15, No. 5)AQB

In the case of nuclear winter, the proponents have held the scientific high ground. They have had the weight of numerous eminent recommendations, prestigious journal publications and scientific committee endorsements. Therefore they have everything to gain by portraying their favoured results as strictly scientific and as aloof from political squabbling. Most of the critics, on the other hand, have not been in the position of presenting alternative model results but have had to resort to raising methodological criticisms and pointing to outstanding uncertainties. By and large they have argued within the scientific context. But being in a much weaker position, they have more often raised overtly political criticisms. There are many routine processes by which science is socially constructed as being at a distance from politics. One is the alleged separation between motivation for doing research and the results of the work. As noted earlier, the 1980s peace movement provided the context for the discovery and promotion of nuclear winter. This background is normally assumed by all concerned not to affect the validity of the knowledge produced. This is the disjunction between the contexts of discovery and justification, a central feature of Popperian philosophy of science[104]. The relativist sociology of scientific knowledge, used in this paper, rejects this disjunction, noting that a selection of what problems to study and what questions to ask to some extent influences the sort of answers obtained. The routine separation between motivation and product is inherent in the normal way that scientific papers are written up, which avoids mention of real motivations, preconceptions, failures and reconstructions[105]. Furthermore, in technical journals, explicit treatment of policy issues is frowned upon. The image is maintained that what is being presented is objective scientific knowledge, unsullied by the political context. Although there are occasional statements against war found at the end of nuclear winter papers[106-107], the usual stance of nuclear winter scientists is to try "to refrain from political advocacy"[108].

Yes Nuclear War – Nuclear Winter

Nuclear Winter will result in human extinction.

**Sagan 85** (Carl Astrophysicist Prof “Nuclear War and Nuclear Winter,” Commonwealth Club)AQB

Now, if you imagine all of these put together: the infrastructure of the society utterly destroyed by the prompt effects, billions of people wiped out immediately, the civic and sanitary services, medical facilities, water, electricity, communication, transportation all wiped out. The sun, in effect, turned off. The temperatures dropping much more than they do in winter, although winter is enough. Water supplies frozen to a depth of meters. A deadly smog of poison gases spreading out over the countryside. Radioactive fallout in dangerous quantities, dangerous enough to compromise the human immune system, falling over most of the Northern Hemisphere. The destruction of agriculture and food supplies. The inability to grow a new harvest. With the effects, as I say, propagating into equatorial and Southern Hemisphere regions, you have a ghastly, grizzly picture of what is in store for us if we are so foolish as to permit a nuclear war, even a small one, to occur. Now, a group of distinguished biologists, some 20 of them, have examined the biological consequences of such a nuclear war, of such a nuclear winter with an eye towards the fragility of the global ecosystem, and conclude that under the circumstances that I've just described, massive species extinctions, not just deaths but extinctions, wiping out every last member of the given species, are likely. And, if you think of the interrelatedness of life on the planet, how dependent we are on plants and animals, to say nothing of industries that most of us never even see, you have some sense of how in the years, decades and centuries following such a nuclear war, the human community might dwindle first to a medieval kind of subsistence level and then back to still earlier levels with the human population falling to prehistoric values and the biologists emphasize that the extinction of the human species cannot be excluded under these circumstances. Now, this is serious stuff. Extinction is forever. Extinction undoes the lives, makes pointless the lives of all of our ancestors, of everyone who came before us, of all of those 40,000 generations of humans whose accomplishments we are the beneficiary of. And it also undoes the lives of all those humans who might come after us if we do not permit nuclear war to occur. I claim that there is a new set of stakes that nuclear winter has introduced. The stakes are simply much higher than was ever realized before. Now, how certain are these results?

Retaliation causes nuclear winter.

**Robock Oman, and  Stenchikov 7** (Alan, Luke and Georgiy L  Dep. of Env. Sciences @ Rutgers, “Nuclear Winter Revisited,” J. of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres,”)AQB

As first suggested by Crutzen and Birks [1982], climate model simulations by Turco et al. [1983] and Aleksandrov and Stenchikov [1983] showed that a full-scale nuclear war would produce surface temperature, precipitation, and insolation reductions so large that the climatic consequences were described as “nuclear winter.” Soon after the world was confronted with the prospect of potential indirect effects of nuclear war much larger than the direct effects, and starvation of billions of people from the collapse of world agriculture, the arms race and cold war ended. Since then, the global nuclear arsenal has been reduced by a factor of three. Prompted by the recent work of Toon et al. [2006] and Robock et al. [2006], who showed that a regional nuclear conflict using 100 Hiroshima-size (15 kt) nuclear weapons, only 0.03% of the explosive power of the current global arsenal, would produce climate change unprecedented in human history, we revisit the nuclear winter issue with a modern climate model. We ask the question of whether the current nuclear arsenal could still produce a nuclear winter.

Yes Nuclear War – Nuclear Winter

Cities targeted in the nuclear retaliation kick up dust blocking the sun.

**Robock 9** (Alan , climatology prof @ Rutgers,  “Nuclear Winter,” Earth Portal)AQB

A nuclear explosion is like bringing a piece of the Sun to the Earth’s surface for a fraction of a second. Like a giant match, it causes cities and industrial areas to burn. Megacities have developed in India and Pakistan and other developing countries, providing tremendous amounts of fuel for potential fires. The direct effects of the nuclear weapons, blast, radioactivity, fires, and extensive pollution, would kill millions of people, but only those near the targets. However, the fires would have another effect. The massive amounts of dark smoke from the fires would be lofted into the upper troposphere, 10-15 kilometers (6-9 miles) above the Earth’s surface, and then absorption of sunlight would further heat the smoke, lifting it into the stratosphere, a layer where the smoke would persist for years, with no rain to wash it out. The climatic effects of smoke from fires started by nuclear war depend on the amount of smoke. Our new calculations show that for 50 nuclear weapons dropped on two countries, on the targets that would produce the maximum amount of smoke, about 5 megatons (Tg) of black smoke would be produced, accounting for the amount emitted from the fires and the amount immediately washed out in rain. As the smoke is lofted into the stratosphere, it would be transported around the world by the prevailing winds. We also did calculations for two scenarios of war between the two superpowers who still maintain large nuclear arsenals, the United States and Russia. In one scenario, 50 Tg of black smoke would be produced and in another, 150 Tg of black smoke would be produced. How many nuclear weapons would be required to produce this much smoke? It depends on the targets, but there are enough weapons in the current arsenals to produce either amount. In fact, there are only so many targets. Once they are all hit by weapons, additional weapons would not produce much more smoke at all. Even after the current nuclear weapons reduction treaty between these superpowers is played out in 2012, with each having about 2,000 weapons, 150 Tg of smoke could still be produced.

Yes Nuclear War – Nuclear Winter

Assaults on cities stir up enough dust to cause nuclear winter.

**Starr 9** (Steven, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists and Moscow Inst. Of Physics, 2009, “Catastrophic Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict,” Int’l Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation)AQB

Nuclear detonations within urban and industrial areas would ignite immense mass fires which would burn everything imaginable and create millions of tons of thick, black smoke (soot). This soot would ultimately be lofted into the stratosphere. There it would absorb and block sunlight from reaching the lower atmosphere where greenhouse gases mainly reside, and thus act to reduce the natural greenhouse effect.4 The profound darkness and global cooling predicted to be result of this process (along with massive amounts of radioactive fallout and pyrotoxins,5 and ozone depletion) was first described in 1983 as nuclear winter.6 Joint research by Western and Soviet scientists led to the realization that the climatic and environmental consequences of nuclear war, in combination with the indirect effects of the collapse of society, could produce a nuclear winter which would cause famine for billions of people far from the war zones.7 These predictions led to extensive international research and peer review during the mid-1980s. A large body of work which essentially supported the initial findings of the 1983 studies was done by such groups as the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE),8 the World Meteorological Organization,9 and the U.S. National Research Council of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.10 The idea of nuclear winter, published and supported by prominent scientists, generated extensive public alarm and put political pressure on the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to terminate a runaway nuclear arms race which, by 1986, had created a global nuclear arsenal of more than 65,000 nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this was anathema to the nuclear weapons establishment and thus nuclear winter created a backlash among many powerful conservative groups, who undertook an extensive media campaign to brand it as “bad science” and the scientists who discovered it as “irresponsible.” Critics used various uncertainties in the studies and the first climate models (which are relatively primitive by current standards) as a basis to denigrate and reject the concept of nuclear winter. In 1986, the Council on Foreign Relations published an article by scientists from the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), who predicted drops in global cooling about half as large as those first predicted by the 1983 studies and described this as a ‘nuclear autumn.’ Subsequent widespread criticism, in such publications as the Wall Street Journal and Time Magazine, often used the term “nuclear autumn” to imply that no important climatic change would result from nuclear war. In 1987, the National Review called nuclear winter a “fraud.” In 2000, Discover Magazine published an article which described nuclear winter as one of “The Twenty Greatest Scientific Blunders in History.”11 Sadly enough, for almost two decades this smear campaign limited serious discussion and prevented further studies of nuclear winter – and such criticism will continue.12 Yet the basic findings of the nuclear winter research, that extreme climatic changes would result from nuclear war, were never scientifically disproved and have been strengthened by the latest studies.

\*\*\*OCEANS\*\*\*

Ocean Biodiversity Low

Cycle of biodiversity loss in the oceans is occurring now

Dybas 9 (Cheryl, National Science Foundation, Nov 6, <http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2006-11/nsf-alo110606.php>) LL

Current trends project collapse of currently fished seafoods by 2050 An international group of ecologists and economists has shown that the loss of biodiversity is profoundly reducing the ocean's ability to produce seafood, resist diseases, filter pollutants and rebound from stresses such as overfishiwng and climate change. Their results are published in this week's issue of the journal Science. The study reveals that every species lost causes a faster unraveling of the overall ecosystem. Conversely, every species recovered adds significantly to overall productivity and stability of the ecosystem and its ability to withstand stresses. "Whether we looked at tide pools or studies over the entire world's ocean, we saw the same picture emerging," said lead author Boris Worm of Dalhousie University. "In losing species we lose the productivity and stability of entire ecosystems. I was shocked and disturbed by how consistent these trends are--beyond anything we suspected." The 4-year analysis is the first to examine all existing data on ocean species and ecosystems, synthesizing historical, experimental, fisheries, and observational data sets to understand the importance of biodiversity at the global scale. "The findings show the power of synthesizing data for generating a scientific basis for important natural resource decisions," said Henry Gholz, program director in the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Division of Environmental Biology, which funded the research. The synthesis was done through the NSF-funded National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis in Santa Barbara, Calif. The results reveal global trends that mirror what scientists have observed at smaller scales, and they prove that progressive biodiversity loss not only impairs the ability of oceans to feed a growing human population, but also sabotages the stability of marine environments and their ability to recover from stresses.

Ocean biodiversity decline now – no tangible impact

Sala 8 (Enric, The Encyclopedia of Earth, Oct 30, <http://www.eoearth.org/article/Global_marine_biodiversity_trends>) LL

Humans have directly caused the global extinction of more than 20 described marine species, including seabirds, marine mammals, fishes, invertebrates, and algae. Probably the most dramatic example of human-driven extinction in the sea was the Steller’s sea cow (Hydrodamalis gigas), a huge herbivore of the nearshore northeast Pacific that was hunted to extinction within only 27 years of its discovery by Europeans. Another example of rapid hunting-related extinction of a species inhabiting a large ecosystem is the Caribbean monk seal (Monachus tropicalis), which was heavily hunted by Europeans beginning in 1492 and last seen in 1952. However, not all extinctions are caused by overharvesting; for example, the eelgrass limpet Lottia alveus disappeared following the catastrophic decline of its required eelgrass (Zostera marina) habitat because of disease in the northwest Atlantic in the early 1930s. Many species may have disappeared unnoticed. Losses of species that have not been described are difficult to estimate, but many small species with localized dispersal and limited geographic ranges have already probably gone extinct. Statistical methods can be used to make estimates of loss rates, much as they have been used for tropical rainforests. Assuming that we have already lost 5% of coral reef area, and using an area-species richness power law, it has been estimated that about 1% of coral reef species have already become extinct. Other unnoticed extinctions have undoubtedly occurred in habitats that are less known, such as in the deep sea. Seamounts, for example, harbor huge species richness and high levels of endemicity (from 30% to 50% of endemic invertebrates per seamount). Seamount biodiversity is threatened by large-scale commercial trawling, and repeated fishing of a single seamount could mean a large number of species extinctions. The diversity associated with deep-sea coral reefs is similarly threatened.

Reefs Dying Now

Coral reefs dying now

Mineta 0 (Norm, Secretary of Commerce, Dec 11, <http://www.onepaper.com/deals/?v=d&i=&s=Caribbean:Ecology&p=28368>) LL

It really is shocking that two-thirds of the world's reefs may be dying and that 30 percent of the world's reefs are already gone. Now this coral reef crisis is not just something happening far away. It is also happening right here at home. In Florida, for example, some reefs have lost over 95 percent of their coral since 1975. Even under ideal conditions, it would take more than a human lifetime for these reefs to recover. Now we cannot afford to continue to count on coral reefs to support billions of dollars in recreation and tourism while, at the same time, allowing them to be devastated, as Dr. Wilkinson has indicated, by pollution, coastal development, and overfishing. We cannot continue to count on jobs and food from coral reef fisheries while allowing destruction of the habitat that these fish need to feed and to reproduce. And we cannot continue to expect coral reefs to defend coastal communities from pounding waves and storms while allowing the living coral walls to be crushed by boats and anchors.

Global warming has devastated coral reefs

Global Australia Impacts Science 9 (Jan 3, <http://www.climateimc.org/en/breaking-news/2009/01/03/coral-reef-and-ocean-biodiversity-threatened-climate-change>) LL

Australian marine scientists have issued a warning on the increasing acidity of the world's oceans and its impact on coral reefs, and through the food web, the productivity and biodiversity of oceans. Scientists at the Australian Institute of Marine Science in Townsville claim that coral on Australia's Great Barrier Reef reached a tipping point in 1990 with coral growth having slowed by more than 14 percent since then. The unprecedented decline has been caused by a combination of rising sea surface temperatures and ocean acidification. At the current rate of decline, coral will be unable to grow by 2050. Reef corals create their hard skeletons from dissolved materials in seawater. As human induced climate change has injected growing amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, the worlds oceans have absorbed carbon dioxide making them more acidic which effectively reduces the ability of marine organisms to form skeletons. This will effect the whole food chain in the ocean. Dr Glenn De’ath said that the severe and sudden decline in calcification was an unprecedented occurrence in the last 400 years. "The causes of this sharp decline remain unknown, but our study suggests that the combination of increasing temperature stress and ocean acidification may be diminishing the ability of GBR corals to deposit calcium carbonate," he said. "Prior to about 1990 coral growth was fairly consistent but round about 1990 things have change and we're suggesting this is the tipping point. What's happened basically coral calcification, that's a measure of how corals grow, has decreased by about 14 per cent since then. Now we're experiencing growth which is now consistently declining. We estimate roughly, if this rate continues, which is accelerating, then the coral growth will hit zero round about 2050." Dr Glenn De’ath told Australian Broadcasting Corporation radio. The scientists, Dr Glenn De’ath, Dr Janice Lough and Dr Katharina Fabriciu, have published their research in the international journal Science. It is the most comprehensive study to date on calcification rates for corals and include rigorous statistical analyses of annual growth bands from 328 Porites corals from 69 reefs across the length and breadth of the Great Barrier Reef, and extending back in time up to 400 years. "It is cause for extreme concern that such changes are already evident, with the relatively modest climate changes observed to date, in the world’s best protected and managed coral reef ecosystem," said AIMS scientist and co-author Dr Janice Lough. "Coral skeletons form the backbone of reef ecosystems. Their complexity provides the habitat for the tens of thousands of plant and animal species associated with the reef," co-author Dr Katharina Fabricius said. "Skeleton formation also offsets natural erosion and breakage. Previous laboratory experiments and models have predicted that calcification will decline in response to acidification, but here we have shown for the first time that corals are already affected in their natural environment throughout the GBR," Dr Fabricius said. According to the scientists, oceanic pH, the measure of acidity of the ocean, has already dropped by 0.1 and could decrease by 0.4 by the end of this century, due to the oceans absorbing about a third of the extra carbon dioxide (the main greenhouse gas) that humans have put into the atmosphere. If the projected 0.4 decline in pH is correct, this would be "well outside the realms of anything organisms have experienced over hundreds of thousands of years," Dr Lough said. Increased ocean acidity will affect all marine life through food webs leading to precipitous changes in the biodiversity and productivity of the world's oceans, the scientists warn.

Reefs Resilient to Warming

Multiple factors allow reefs to recover from stress

International Union for Conservation of Nature 9 (Jan 9, <http://www.iucn.org/cccr/resilience_to_climate_change/>) LL

Resilience - A promising paradigm Even though climate change and coral bleaching pose a serious threat to the future survival of coral reefs, there is still hope that these ecosystems will be able to survive increased SSTs. Some coral reefs are able to withstand stresses to a greater degree (are more resistant) while other coral reefs are able to recover from bleaching events more rapidly (are more resilient) depending on a number of oceanographic, ecological and physiological factors. The principles of resistance and resilience are emerging as a promising paradigm to aid the management of coral reefs in the face of climate change, and give hope in the face of adversity. The figure below illustrates the stages in the coral bleaching process where it is possible for a coral or coral reef to survive the disturbance. It illustrates four main processes that can allow a coral reef to survive: protection, resistance, tolerance and resilience. Protection Oceanographic and other environmental factors that create pockets of reduced or non-stressful conditions where ecosystems are protected from disturbances (Salm et al, 2001). A coral reef can be protected against increased SSTs or light levels and therefore against bleaching by local upwelling, fast water flow, shading and screening. Resistance The ability of an organism or ecosystem to withstand disturbance without undergoing a phase shift or losing neither structure nor function (Odum, 1989). For example a coral reef’s ability to withstand bleaching and mortality. Coral morphology, different zooxanthellae clades and coral acclimatisation can all influence a coral reef's resistance to bleaching. Tolerance The ability of an organism to absorb a disturbance and not suffer mortality (Obura, 2006). For example, a coral’s ability to bleach, and then recover its zooxanthellae to become healthy again. Resilience The ability of a system to absorb or recover from disturbance and change, while maintaining its functions and services (Adapted from Carpenter et al, 2001). For example a coral reef’s ability to recover from a bleaching event. Factors that can improve a coral reef's resilience to a mass bleaching event include good species and functional diversity, good connectivity to larval sources, appropriate substrates for larval settlement and protection from other anthropogenic impacts.

**Alt Causes**

Alt causes to oceanic biodiversity loss

Shao 9 (Kwang-Tsai, Jul 23, Biodiversity Research Center, Taiwan, <http://apjcn.nhri.org.tw/server/APJCN/Volume18/vol18.4/Finished/10_1626_527-531.pdf>) LL

Increase in the number of species has not led to a corresponding increase in fishery resources. In fact, the abundance of most species has declined drastically. Many species that were common 20 years ago have now become occasional or rare. Decreasing biodiversity leads to the degradation of marine ecosystems and a decline in fishery productions. The main causes include: (1) overfishing and bycatches, (2) habitat destruction, (3) pollution, (4) introduced species, and (5) natural perturbation.11 The first four causes are related to fisheries and are considered anthropogenic perturbations. Overfishing and bycatch Fishing obviously has direct effects on fish stocks. It can alter the abundance, age and size structures, sex ratio, and the genetic structure of the target fish population. The species composition of marine communities is also affected. Non-commercial species (those species that are smaller, less abundant, and less valuable) are discarded. The waste associated with this bycatch problem can reach 9/10 of all harvests, as in prawn (shrimp) trawling.12 This is the main cause of commercial extinction. Although incidental catches of IUCN-protected species of marine mammals, sea turtles, and sea birds have received much attention, many long-lived marine species with low fecundity, large pelagic species such as tuna, swordfish, dolphinfish, ocean sunfish, and sharks, and some demersal species such as groupers are still not adequately protected. Habitat destruction Species cannot survive and resources cannot be sustained without the habitats necessary for reproduction, feeding, and sheltering during each stage of their life cycles. Unfortunately, Taiwan’s natural coastal wetlands are gradually being destroyed by urbanization and the construction of shore-based or near-shore facilities, such as fishing harbors, industrial or recreational, parks, and wavebreaks. The natural coastline of Isla Formosa is going to become “Isla Artificial,” surrounded by a man-made concrete coastline if the progress isn’t halted. Eventually, the allimportant nursery grounds for many economic and noneconomic species of marine organisms will be destroyed. Fishing can also affect habitats, most notably by destroying and disturbing benthic topography and associated communities.12 Bottom trawlers in Taiwan—nearly 2000 boats in 2001—have damaged the benthic ecosystem seriously. This damage extends to coral reefs. Largescale mariculture activities (farming of fish, shrimp, and other marine organisms)—especially if they are poorly managed—can also negatively impact marine ecosystems through damage to coastal wetlands and near-shore ecosystems. 13 Pollution Marine pollution is caused by organic and inorganic pollutants, including heavy metals, oil, and other toxic substances. Sewage stemming from industry, agriculture, and urbanization, and soil run-offs due to deforestation and unplanned agriculture can also damage marine ecosystems by increasing suspension particles and turbidity in seawater, especially in coral reef areas. Fishery activities can also be a source of pollution. In mariculture areas, the marine ecosystem can be changed through eutrification and the contamination of the water by food, antibiotics, and waste, and through the introduction of diseases and exotic genotypes.13 Introduced species Taiwanese researchers have yet to conduct a survey of alien marine species introduced from ballast waters, but one introduced species, red drum (Sciaenops ocellatus), for cage-net harvesting, has been discovered off Western Taiwan. Natural Perturbation The source of natural perturbation can be summed up as follows: (1) Strong typhoons can destroy fragile coral species in shallow waters, and consequently impact fish species living in close association with the coral. (2) Cold water masses, which occasionally enter the coastal region in the winter season, can kill marine fishes. This has occurred frequently in Penghu (Pescadores Islands), and occasionally in Kenting, in Southern Taiwan. One recent massive kill of fishes by cold water intrusion happened in 2008.

\*\*\*OIL DEPENDENCE\*\*\*

Oil Dependence – Oil Prices Low

Oil prices down because of market fears and declining China demand.

The Wall Street Journal 10 (JUNE 29, “OIL FUTURES: Crude Falls 3%; 2-Week Low On Growth Slowdown Fear” http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20100629-712622.html)KM

Crude-oil futures fell to a two-week low Tuesday in a rout across many commodities and equities markets as fears of a slowdown in global growth hit prospects for increased oil demand. Light, sweet crude for August delivery settled $2.31, or 3%, lower at $75.94 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. That is the lowest level since June 14 and the biggest single-day decline since June 4. Prices hit a high of $78.32 a barrel in early trade, but spent much of the day trading lower. Crude prices have dropped more than 9% in the second quarter and front-month futures are down 6.8% from the start of the year. August North Sea Brent crude on the ICE futures exchange settled $2.15, or 2.8%, lower at $75.44 a barrel. Crude futures continued to track moves in equities markets and the dollar as investors gauge the viability of the economic recovery, said Walter Zimmermann, senior technical analyst at United-ICAP. "If the economy continues to deflate, there's no hope for increased demand in energy," he said. Growth-sensitive commodities and equities plunged Tuesday after a report raised doubts about the speed of economic expansion in China, an important driver of global growth.

Oil prices low because of fear of double dip recession.

Gibbons 10 (Robert, Jul 2, Reuters “Oil falls to 3-week low as recovery fears mount” http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE65D3YT20100702)KM

U.S. crude oil prices fell a fifth straight day to a three-week low on Friday as bearish U.S. job data fanned fears of a double dip recession. U.S. crude oil futures slipped 81 cents, or 1.11 percent, to settle at $72.14 a barrel, the weakest close since June 8. The $71.62 intraday low was the weakest since prices fell to $70.75 on June 8. U.S. crude prices fell $6.72, or 8.52 percent, for the week the steepest decline since the week ending May 7, when prices sank more than $11, or nearly 13 percent as Europe's debt crisis put markets in a swoon. ICE Brent crude oil futures fell 69 cents, or 0.95 percent, to settle at $71.65, the weakest close since May 25. Oil prices initially seesawed after the Labor Department reported U.S. nonfarm payrolls fell 125,000 in June, more than expected and the first 2010 decline.

Gasoline prices are dropping now – lower demand in the US.

Malik 10 (NAUREEN S., WSJ, JULY 2, “Gasoline Falls for Fifth Day in a Row” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704699604575343192275785962.html)km

NEW YORK—Gasoline futures fell Friday for the fifth consecutive session, good news for U.S. drivers heading into the busy July 4 travel weekend. But even with the expectation that prices at the pump will fall in the days and weeks ahead, it's unclear if consumers will take the bait. Falling retail gasoline prices should be a cause for some celebration, especially since gasoline doesn't appear to be marching toward $3 a gallon as it was this spring. But even though demand has picked up in part of the country, consumers continue to demonstrate uneasiness as employment and housing numbers remain worrisome, evident most recently in the weaker-than-expected June employment report. "We are starting to see a bit of a pick-up (in demand) and the Fourth of July weekend will determine if that pick up continues" as long as prices remain low, said John Gamel, director of economic analysis for MasterCard Advisors SpendingPulse. Gasoline consumption is weak on the West Coast, the Gulf Coast and the Southeast while the Midwest is showing signs of stabilizing demand, Mr. Gamel said.

Oil Dependence – Oil Prices High

Oil prices rising now – they follow economic growth.

Associated Press 10 (“Oil rises as stock market rallies”, 7-8, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5i5TtajgUpSm7KY5jf-lCJGHBB-tAD9GQE6SO0)KM

NEW YORK — Oil prices climbed above $74 a barrel on Wednesday, as crude followed the stock market higher on encouraging earnings news. Drivers got another break at the pump. The national average for a gallon of unleaded regular slipped to $2.721, down 0.3 cent from Tuesday, according to AAA, Wright Express and Oil Price Information Service. That's 3.4 cents lower than a week ago and 11.7 cents higher than a year ago. Benchmark crude rose $2.09 to settle at $74.07 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. In recent months oil prices have been influenced by the stock market as an indicator of economic recovery and potential demand for oil and gas. The Dow Jones Industrial Average rose almost 275 points, or 2.8 percent, to close at 10,018.28. The NASDAQ and S&P 500 were each up more than 3 percent. Financial stocks led the way just ahead of earnings season, as State Street Corp. issued a second-quarter profit forecast that was better than analysts expected. Crude also got a boost from a forecast of lower inventories when the Energy Department's Energy Information Administration issues its weekly report on Thursday. Analysts expect crude supplies to shrink by 3.5 million barrels, according to a survey by Platts, the energy information arm of McGraw-Hill Cos.

Oil prices are rising – stockpile drop and equity markets.

Bloomberg 10 (“Commodities Head for Biggest Weekly Gain Since April on Growth” July 8, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2010/07/08/bloomberg1376-L5ANGV1A74E901-5SJSML8VOL0OE0B17QJ9LOEM1F.DTL#ixzz0tCY0oqJh)KM

Crude oil for August delivery rose as much as 60 cents, or 0.8 percent, to $76.04 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. It recently traded at $76, ahead 5.4 percent for the week, which would be the most since May if prices were to close at that level. Prices climbed after a U.S. government report yesterday showed stockpiles dropped 4.96 million barrels last week, the most since September. "Oil is moving extremely closely with equity markets," Maziar Amiri, an energy trader at E&T Energie Handelsgesellschaft mbH, said from Vienna. "The fall in inventories was also positive for the market."

Oil prices are rising – traders are following economic gains.

MarketWatch 10 (“Oil tops $77 a barrel, settles at multi-week high”, June 16, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/oil-prices-meander-around-77-a-barrel-2010-06-16?dist=afterbell)KM

Oil prices settled higher Wednesday as investors discounted an unexpected rise in crude inventories and futures ran higher with U.S. stocks. The front-month July oil contract gained 73 cents, or 1%, to $77.67 a barrel on the Comex division of the New York Mercantile Exchange. The more active August contract added 81 cents, or 1%, to $78.72 a barrel. Natural-gas futures fell 4.1%, leaving behind the hefty gains of the past couple of sessions. "There's parts of the global economy that are improving, and [oil] traders are taking that and running with it," said James Cordier, a portfolio manager at Optionsellers.com in Tampa, Fla.

Oil Dependence – Alt. Cause: Asia

China and Asian demand is driving oil demand.

BBC 10 (“China's oil demand increase 'astonishing', says IEA”, 12 March 2010, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/8563985.stm)KM

China's demand for oil jumped by an "astonishing" 28% in January compared with the same month a year earlier, the International Energy Agency (IEA) says. The body added that demand for oil in 2010 would be underpinned by rising demand from emerging markets, with half of all growth coming from Asia. But the IEA predicted demand in developed countries would fall by 0.3%. The IEA has increased its global oil demand forecast for 2010 by 1.8% to 86.6 million barrels a day.

Emerging Asian economies are driving all future oil demand.

Asia Briefing 10 (“Growth in China, India to Escalate Oil Demand: IEA”, Jun 25, http://www.2point6billion.com/news/2010/06/25/oil-demand-to-rise-faster-than-expected-due-to-growth-in-china-india-6158.html)KM

Jun. 25 – The International Energy Agency more than doubled its forecast for global oil demand over the next five years on Wednesday, citing stronger than expected growth in emerging economies like China and India. The IEA expects oil demand to grow 1.4 percent annually through 2015, up from the 0.6 percent annual growth forecast set last year. The agency also projects oil consumption to reach 94 million barrels a day, contingent on the global economy maintaining a steady 4.5 percent growth rate. The oil markets in China, India, and the Middle East are likely to see the largest jump in demand as they lead the world out of the recession with strong economic performances. Meanwhile, some European nations are likely to see their oil demand slow significantly in the next few years as they deal with sovereign debt issues. “Oil and gas markets are starting to show signs of recovery, but the impact of the recession differs across regions, and the outlook remains very uncertain,” said IEA Executive Director Nobuo Tanaka in a statement. The IEA also stated that global oil demand should return to pre-crisis levels by the end of the year.

China demand will inevitably continue to increase.

Asia Pulse 10 (June 15, “China Faces Mounting Dependency on Imported Energy”, Asia Pulse Pte Ltd, http://www.downstreamtoday.com/news/article.aspx?a\_id=22990&AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1)KM

China's energy imports have increased month after month at an increasing pace, raising the dependency on imported energy resources. Experts believe that the fast growing energy consumption in China will inevitably increase energy imports, and that China's dependency on imported energy will continue to grow. ENERGY IMPORTS SURGE SINCE JANUARY 2010 According to figures from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), China's imports of traditional energy like coal, oil, and natural gas kept growing in the first four months of 2010. The dependency on imported crude oil grew higher each month after it surpassed the 50 percent mark in 2009. In the first four months of this year, China imported 77.85 million metric tons (tonnes) of crude oil, up 36.7 percent year on year. Market Analyst C1 Energy calculated that crude imports were 55 percent of apparent consumption in the same period, up 6.2 percent, which resulted in a 54.45 percent of dependency on imported crude. According to latest statistics from the General Administration of Customs, China's crude imports totaled 95.69 million tonnes in the first five months of 2010, up 29.3 percent year on year.

China’s economy will drive oil demand for the next five years

Carlisle 10 (June 10, “China to power the rebound in oil”, Tamsin, http://www.thenational.ae/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100610/BUSINESS/706109902/1005/rss)KM

China may account for 40 per cent of this year’s expected rebound in oil consumption and nearly 45 per cent of oil demand growth in the next five years, the latest monthly oil market report of the International Energy Agency (IEA) suggests. Total oil demand in China, the world’s fastest-growing major economy, could reach 9.2 million barrels per day (bpd) this year, an 8.5 per cent increase from last year’s level, predicted the IEA, which advises 28 industrialised countries on energy issues. In its report, the IEA touched on three potentially “game-changing” events and trends that could have lasting effects on global oil markets: the robust rise in Chinese oil consumption, the European debt crisis and the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Of those, Chinese oil consumption was the most likely to have a profound effect on the future balance of supply and demand. The IEA said it would compare two scenarios for global GDP growth that could have “very different” implications for oil market balances in its coming medium-term outlook. But a “common thread” would be the strength of oil demand in developing countries and the “predominance” of China. “China’s urgent need for energy supply to sustain economic growth and raise the well-being of its people has become a global market issue,” the IEA said.

Oil Dependence – Impact Inevitable

Societal collapse from oil dependence is inevitable – it’s now only a question of how nations will react.

Chambers 10 (June 4th, “Societal Collapse Due to Peak Oil ‘Inevitable,’ According to Researcher”, Nick, Gas 2.0 contributor, http://gas2.org/2010/06/04/societal-collapse-due-to-peak-oil-inevitable-according-to-researcher/)KM

In a new article, an Oxford researcher has examined what will happen when peak oil hits. According to Jörg Friedrichs, the outlook is not good. In his article Friedrichs doesn’t attempt to answer the question when peak oil will happen (or if it already has). Instead he imagines that it has happened and the world has to deal with it. His conclusions: the world will have a “slow and painful” adjustment to peak oil lasting a century or more with the inevitable collapse of industrial society and the disintegration of free trade. How cheerful. In his research, Friedrichs used three historical examples to guide his thought process of how the world’s different governments will deal with being energy constrained: North Korea, Cuba and Japan. North Korea and Totalitarian Retrenchment In the 1990’s North Korea entered a period of time that is akin to what the world might face when confronted with peak oil. As the Soviets stopped delivering subsidized oil to its comrades, North Korea was faced with a severe oil shortage. To deal with the catastrophe, the North Korean government “basically screwed its own population,” said Friedrichs in an interview with Miller McCune. “Elite privileges were preserved, while hundreds of thousands of ordinary people starved.” Friedrichs has labeled this type of governmental response to an oil shortage as “totalitarian retrenchment.” Cuba and Mobilization of Local Resilience Due to the same pullback that North Korea faced from the Soviets, Cuba also entered a period of severe oil shortages in the 1990’s. But, instead of enacting more totalitarian control tactics, Cuba — with its history of grassroots communist organization and reliance on friends and family — fell back into what Friedrichs calls “mobilization of local resilience.” In other words, people being a community. “People helped each other at the neighbourhood level, and the wastelands of Havana and other cities were utilized for urban gardening,” said Friedrichs. “As a result, Cuba did not experience mass starvation despite considerable hardship in the 1990s.” Japan and Predatory Militarism For decades before WWII Japan had sought to expand its influence in China and secure energy resources — long considered its major growth restraint, having virtually none of its own. At the time World War II broke out, Japan was almost completely dependent on oil imports from California to fuel its growth. Given that Japan had its sights on a pre-emptory invasion of Pearl Harbor, they decided to invade the East Indies to secure their oil supply. This kind of response to an oil shortage Friedrichs calls “predatory militarism” — that is, using military might to steal resources from other areas. How will the Various Governments of the World React to Peak Oil? According to Friedrichs, all countries of the world that are wholly dependent on an oil economy will react to peak oil in one of the above 3 methods. “Countries prone to military solutions may follow a Japanese-style strategy of predatory militarism,” he said. “Countries with a strong authoritarian tradition may follow a North Korean path of totalitarian retrenchment. Countries with a strong community ethos may embark on a Cuban-style mobilization of local resilience, relying on their people to mitigate the effects of peak oil.” Friedrichs thinks the U.S. will resort to predatory militarism because that is our one biggest strength. He says that liberal democracies (the U.S. being one, regardless of what the conservatives are currently spouting) will have a hard time keeping democracy viable and maintaining open free markets. If he were to guess which countries would be the most stable during the collapse, Friedrichs concludes that “Countries with a recoverable authoritarian tradition are likely to work better than liberal democracies.”

The impact is inevitable – new technology takes too long to solve.

Chambers 10 (June 4th, “Societal Collapse Due to Peak Oil ‘Inevitable,’ According to Researcher”, Nick, Gas 2.0 contributor, http://gas2.org/2010/06/04/societal-collapse-due-to-peak-oil-inevitable-according-to-researcher/)KM

Can’t Technology Save Us? Not likely. Using the example of how the deep south — known as Dixieland — recovered after the Civil War, Friedrichs concludes: “Dixieland is a cautionary tale for those who believe that social and technological innovation will take care of all problems. After Southern elites lost slavery as the backbone of their way of life [during the U.S. Civil War], it took them at least a century to adjust to the new reality.” “Why did they not simply embrace industrial capitalism and liberal democracy? Well, I guess it is not so easy to give up one’s lifestyle. Now, imagine that people were to face an energetic downgrade, rather than the upgrade available to Dixieland after the Civil War. While the “challenge” for Dixieland was lifting its socioeconomic fabric to industrial capitalism and liberal democracy, after peak oil the opposite would be the case. Do you really think people would have an easier time adjusting to peak oil? The world would sorely miss cheap and abundant energy, and liberal democracy would become more and more difficult to sustain. The example of Dixieland shows that it takes a lot of time for the ”new consciousness” to emerge that is necessary for radical social change.”

Oil Dependence – Resilient

We’re resilient to oil price spikes

Gillis 2 (Malcom, Engines of the World Economy, Offshore Technology Conference, Reliant Center, May, http://www.professor.rice.edu/professor/05082002.asp?SnID=2)KM

III. The U.S. Economic Engine: Resiliency in Diversity Except for Morgan Stanley, most forecasters are seeing "V"s, not "W"s in our economic future, with the economy growing at an annual rate of 3.0 percent to 3.5 percent over the next twelve months. The implicit assumption underlying this rosy scenario must be that there will be no severe economic shocks from any geo-political disturbances. The recent recession was one of the mildest and shortest on record. Before 1940, recessions averaged about a year and a half in length. Since 1960, their average length has been eleven months. The downturn of 2001 lasted only nine months. Several factors were responsible for the apparent shallowness of the recession. Consumer spending held up surprisingly well, aided by a big lift from motor vehicle sales and a housing market vibrant enough to offset much of the decline in household wealth from a weak stock market. Strong consumer spending was needed to counter the drag in spending coming from business, exacerbated by a very sharp increase in liquidation of business inventories. In the Conan Doyle's "Silver Blaze," Holmes solved the case by finding a dog that did not bark. In our tenth postwar recession, the oil price was the dog that did not bark. Higher oil prices have figured in every recession since 1970, except the current one. Nominal oil prices remained relatively stable, below $20 bbl. until early this year. Per barrel prices rose above $21 only after the recovery was underway. Oil price spikes matter much less in today's $10 trillion economy than in the smaller and less diversified U.S. economy of 1973, or even 1978. And, surprising to some, the real inflation-adjusted price of oil in February 2002 was only 40 percent of its level in 1980. And even at oil prices of May 1, the real price was less than half its 1980 level. In fact, relative prices of oil appear rather puny when contrasted with the prices of other life-supporting liquids. In late April, the price of one important refined petroleum product, gasoline, was only about $1.50 per gallon, including gasoline taxes. Other fluids prices spiked much higher. Orange juice was more than $5.00 a gallon, and in late April, Perrier and other high-end water was running about $6.50 to $7.00 per gallon. There were other reasons for the relative mildness of the recession of 2001. Two factors under-girded consumer spending and soothed investor expectations during the recession: 1) monetary policy, 2) fiscal policy. Never before in our nation's history has the Federal Reserve deployed such aggressive monetary policy against recession: By the end of calendar year 2001, the federal funds rate had been reduced to less than one-third its level on New Year's Day, in an unprecedented series of twelve reductions in eleven months. Fiscal policy reinforced the tonic effect of adroit and timely monetary policy: while the tax cut enacted in June was not planned as an anti-recessionary device, it served that purpose admirably, largely because it was enacted just after the recession began.

US is resilient to oil price fluctuations – reserves and new technology solve.

Luft 7 (Gal, Phd, executive director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security, inFocus, Summer, “Iran's Oil Industry: A House of Cards?” http://www.iags.org/n050707.htm)KM

Considering the long-term risks associated with a nuclear Iran, higher prices at the gas pump should not drive any Western country's Iran policy. No doubt, if Iran's production falls, due to investors' departure or a calculated decision by Iran to use the oil weapon and cut its production, there will be economic fallout. However, Iran will be the main casualty of any disruption. Additionally, in recent years, the U.S. economy has shown remarkable resiliency in the face of mounting oil prices and can withstand even higher prices. There is also a safety net in place. Most major oil consuming countries maintain massive strategic petroleum reserves in the event of a drop in supply. The U.S. alone has some 700 million barrels of oil in reserve – two years worth of Iranian exports. To insulate the U.S. further, President Bush seeks to double the size of the American oil reserve in the coming years. The President also seeks to reduce America's oil dependence through increased efficiency and to shift to alternative fuels. Applied in unison, these tactics advance the strategic goals of reducing global energy prices, protecting the West against supply disruptions, and limiting the flow of petrodollars to Tehran. This increased pressure on the Iranian regime could, over time, generate a much desired regime change. If Washington executes this strategy with expediency and determination, this outcome could be achieved before Iran becomes a nuclear power.

Oil Dependence – Infinite

Oil catastrophe is a myth – we have infinite oil to sustain ourselves.

Eidson 10 (17 March, “Debunking the Myth of Peak Oil - Why the Age of Cheap Oil is Far From Over (Part 1)” Dennis, Chief Executive Officer of A&P, http://oilprice.com/Energy/Crude-Oil/Debunking-the-Myth-of-Peak-Oil-Why-the-Age-of-Cheap-Oil-is-Far-From-Over-Part-1.html)KM

If I may, I would like to rebut or add a little objectivity to the flood of “Peak Oil” articles circulating around. When I see another crisis looming in the balance, and dramatized articles that warn of the “Dangers of Peak Oil,” I must question the validity or how this will effect the world, the USA, and you and I personally, and if indeed a crisis is at hand. As for world oil, if you ask the right questions, there are several new technologies/methods/alternatives and new finds that can easily supply enough hydrocarbon fuel for the next century or more. The latest new find in the news today, Petroleo Brasileiro SA, Brazil's state-controlled oil company, said its Tupi field may contain as much as 8 billion barrels of oil and natural gas, an amount that could boost the country's reserves by 62 percent. But you ask, how can one or two new oil fields make a difference? Wrong question, because the finding of new oil is continuous. Over the past 33 years mankind has consumed more than three times the world’s known oil reserves in 1976 – and today proven oil reserves are nearly double what they were before we started. The story with natural gas is even better – here and around the world enormous amounts of natural gas have been found. More will be found. But if you had asked in 1976 what the supply of oil would be like given the demand of 2010, you would have come up with the “Peak Oil” theory then, and we would have supposedly run out of oil decades ago; an ongoing impending crisis. I think the key to the argument of Peak Oil, is that it not only ignores the huge amounts of oil yet to be found, but other hydrocarbon fuels as well. Even if the “theory” holds water, which I argue on its face (or in your face, as some so delightedly pointed out), we will not be out of hydrocarbons and our cars stranded on the side of the road during this century. This is the perceived “crisis” of Peak Oil that tells us that declining production and increasing demand will cause a disruption in supply. But if we are to be limited in our driving, because of gasoline shortages, we can simply switch over to other alternatives and install a methane tank to convert over to natural gas, right now, today. Or switch to electric. How about fuel cells? Carry a kite or put up a sail. Limited driving due to shortages is the same as higher prices, and are not a crisis, unless the majority can no longer afford it. There will never be "no oil" in your lifetime, so relax, and discern the truth for yourself when you get the facts. If you are old enough to read this, your shiny car will have plenty of gasoline for your lifetime. You may not be able to afford it, but the world cannot possibly run out. Allow me to explain. Whenever there is GREAT change, there is also GREAT opportunity. It is impossible to be otherwise. Instead of worrying about the black hole right now, look for new opportunities... it won't take long, they're EVERYWHERE. Now that oil is $80/bbl, it opens the door to production of different grades of oil and different kinds of oil, and new places that oil was never thought to exist. America has developed new technologies to develop oil production from the many known shale oil fields containing a trillion barrels of oil, that has never been tapped until two years ago, because it was too expensive to extract, and the technology has not yet been improved enough to tackle it before then. But money solves a lot of problems, and $100/bbl oil would certainly do it. You will have to be surprised how fast the technology will ramp up when there's a profit to be made. Just type in “shale oil reserves” into your little Search Bar, and you’ll come up with hundreds of new projects that have never before been thought possible. And these are primarily domestic, where the oil in America was thought to be depleted!

\*\*\*PROLIFERATION\*\*\*

No – NPT Credibility

Alt Causes:  
A. Israel

Daley 8 [Tad Daley is Writing Fellow with International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, winner of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize. He has served as a foreign policy advisor to Congresswoman Diane Watson, Congressman Dennis Kucinich, and the late U.S. Senator Alan Cranston. “Radioactive Hypocrisy: American Hubris Threatens Perpetual Nuclear Proliferation” May 15, 2008.http://www.alternet.org/world/85375/radioactive\_hypocrisy:\_american\_hubris\_threatens\_perpetual\_nuclear\_proliferation/

Moreover, Soltanieh continued, "Israel, with huge nuclear weapons activities, has not concluded" any kind of agreement with the IAEA to allow for inspections of its own nuclear facilities. Now Israel, it must be said, has never signed the NPT, so it is under no international legal obligation to conclude such an agreement. (Nor are the NPT's nuclear weapon states for that matter -- under the NPT, only the non-nuclear weapon states must open themselves to international inspections.) Still, the aspiration for the NPT has always been that it would eventually apply universally. (It is, at present, the most nearly universal treaty in history, as all but four states on the planet -- Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea after its withdrawal -- are members.) Israel's failure to join the regime can hardly be expected to diminish the simmering antipathies -- and not just in Iran -- about the perception that in the nuclear realm, there are different rules for different actors

B. North Korea

Prashad 5 [VIJAY PRASHAD, writer for the Hindu, “NUCLEAR ISSUES: The great nuclear divide” Volume 22 - Issue 11, May 21 - Jun. 03, 2005,http://74.125.155.132/search?q=cache:T0Ehe68vN00J:www.hindu.com/fline/fl2211/stories/20050603002404400.htm+npt+credibility+India+threatens&cd=10&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us

Although it is the most important pillar of the global disarmament regime, the NPT suffers from a severe credibility problem. The majority of the world's states negotiated and adopted the NPT at a time when NAM had a robust energy and when it had been able to place the demand for total disarmament into the core of the NPT. Institutional weaknesses within the regime, contempt or inaction by the main nuclear powers and disarray among the non-aligned states have led to the erosion of confidence in the NPT. Chun Yung-Woo, the South Korean delegate, raised this problem in the first few minutes of his address. "The integrity and credibility of the Treaty have suffered an irreparable blow," he pointed out, "as a result of North Korea's complete disregard for and defiance of all nuclear non-proliferation norms." Because the NPT could not do anything in response, it demonstrated the "inherent limitations" in the regime. For the South Koreans, the NPT had been tarnished by its inability to act against the proliferation of nuclear weapons

Numerous alt causalities to nonproliferation leadership  
Wellen 9 (Russ, Foreign Policy in Focus Contributor, “http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/5781 Jan 12 09)  
Traditionally, the United States has, however sporadically, … never stop generating strategies and networking.

Traditionally, the United States has, however sporadically, led the way on nonproliferation — from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, to the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (SALT) I and II, to the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT). Yet, by enabling India's proliferation and ignoring its nonparticipation in the NPT, we abdicate our leadership.  This is merely the last item in a list of leadership failures. Under the Bush administration, the United States has maintained much of its nuclear arsenal on hair-trigger alert, refused to renounce first-use, and sought to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons. Also, we've signed a preliminary deal to station interceptor missiles in Poland. Ostensibly intended as a defense against Iranian missiles, it's perceived as a threat by Russia, which reacted by moving missiles of its own to its border with Poland. It's natural to assume that the momentum behind these policies will decline with the Bush administration. But in reality, the engine of nuclear proliferation is a perpetual motion machine: Militaristic think tanks never stop generating strategies and networking.

No – Proliferation

Even if capabilities for quick prolif exist, actual prolif will be slow

Waltz 0 (Kenneth, Pro, Professor of Political Science at UC Berkeley, Winter/Spring , Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, online: http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, accessed March 9, 2007)

It is now estimated that about twenty–five countries are in a position to make nuclear weapons rather quickly. Most countries that could have acquired nuclear military capability have refrained from doing so. Most countries do not need them. Consider Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa. Argentina and Brazil were in the process of moving toward nuclear military capability, and both decided against it–wisely I believe–because neither country needs nuclear weapons. South Africa had about half a dozen warheads and decided to destroy them. You have to have an adversary against whom you think you might have to threaten retaliation, but most countries are not in this position. Germany does not face any security threats–certainly not any in which a nuclear force would be relevant. I would expect the pattern of the past to be the same as the pattern in the future, in which one or two states per decade gradually develop nuclear weapons.

No arms races. Nuclear weapons make force comparisons irrelevant

Waltz 95 (Kenneth Waltz, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate, 1995, p. 29-30)

One may believe that old American and Soviet military doctrines set the pattern that new nuclear states will fol­low. One may also believe that they will suffer the fate of the United States and the former Soviet Union, that they will compete in building larger and larger nuclear arse­nals while continuing to accumulate conventional weap­ons. These are doubtful beliefs. One can infer the future from the past only insofar as future situations may be like past ones for the actors involved. For three main rea­sons, new nuclear states are likely to decrease, rather than to increase, their military spending. First, nuclear weapons alter the dynamics of arms races. In a competition of two or more parties, it may be hard to say who is pushing and who is being pushed, who is leading and who is following. If one party seeks to increase its capabilities, it may seem that others must too. The dynamic may be built into the competition and may unfold despite a mutual wish to resist it. But need this be the case in a strategic competition among nuclear countries? It need not be if the conditions of competition make deterrent logic dominant. Deterrent logic dominates if the conditions of competition make it nearly impossible for any of the competing parties to achieve a first-strike capability. Early in the nuclear age, the implications of deterrent strategy were clearly seen. “When dealing with the absolute weapon,” as William T. R. Fox put it, “arguments based on relative advantage lose their point.” The United States has sometimes designed its forces according to that logic. Donald A. Quarles, when he was President Eisenhower’s secretary of the Air Force, argued that “sufficiency of air power” is deter­mined by “the force required to accomplish the mission assigned.” Avoidance of total war then does not depend on the “relative strength of the two opposed forces.” In­stead, it depends on the “absolute power in the hands of each, and in the substantial invulnerability of this power to interdiction.” To repeat: If no state can launch a dis­arming attack with high confidence, force comparisons are irrelevant. Strategic arms races are then pointless. Deterrent strategies offer this great advantage: Within ‘wide ranges neither side need respond to increases in the other side’s military capabilities.

No – Proliferation

Slow proliferation doesn’t open the floodgates

Waltz 3 (Kenneth, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, 2003, p. 42-43

Countries have to take care of their own security, if countries feel insecure and believe that nuclear weapons would make them more secure, America’s policy of opposing the spread of nuclear weapons will not prevail. Any slight chance of bringing the spread of nuclear weapons to a halt exists only if the United States strenuously tries to achieve that end. To do so carries costs measured in terms of other interests. The strongest way for the United States to persuade other countries to forego nuclear weapons is to guarantee their security. How many states’ security do we want to guarantee? Wisely, we are reluctant to make promises, but then we should not expect to decide how other countries provide for their security. Some have feared that weakening opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons will lead numerous states to obtain them because it may seem that “everyone is doing it.” Why should we think that if we relax, numerous states will begin to make nuclear weapons? Both the United States and the Soviet Union were relaxed in the past, and those effects did not follow. The Soviet Union initially supported China’s nuclear program. The United States helped both Britain and France to produce nuclear weapons. By 1968 the CIA had informed President Johnson of the existence of Israeli nuclear weapons, and in July of 1970, Richard Helms, director of the CIA, gave this information to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These and later disclosures were not followed by censure of Israel or by reductions of economic assistance. And in September of 1980, the executive branch, against the will of the House of Representatives but with the approval of the Senate, continued to do nuclear business with India despite its explosion of a nuclear device and despite its unwillingness to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Many more countries can make nuclear weapons than do. One can believe that American opposition to nuclear arming stays the deluge only by overlooking the complications of international life. Any state has to examine many conditions before deciding whether or not to develop nuclear weapons. Our opposition is only one factor and is not likely to be the decisive one. Many states feel fairly secure living with their neighbors. Why should they want nuclear weapons? Some countries, feeling threatened, have found security through their own strenuous efforts and through arrangements made with others. South Korea is an outstanding example. Many officials believe that South Korea would lose more in terms of American support if it acquired nuclear weapons than it would gain by having them. Further, on occasion we might slow the spread of nuclear weapons by not opposing the nuclear weapons programs of some countries. When we opposed Pakistan’s nuclear program, we were saying that we disapprove of countries developing nuclear weapons no matter what their neighbors do. The gradual spread of nuclear weapons has not opened the nuclear floodgates. Nations attend to their security in the ways they think best. The fact that so many more countries can make nuclear weapons than do says more about the hesi­tation of countries to enter the nuclear military business than about the effectiveness of American nonproliferation policy. We should suit our policy to individual cases, sometimes bringing pressure against a country moving toward nuclear weapons capability and sometimes quietly acquiescing: No one policy is right in all cases. We should ask what the inter­ests of other countries require before putting pressure on them. Some countries are likely to suffer more in cost and pain if they remain conventional states than if they become nuclear ones. The measured spread of nuclear weapons does not run against our interests and can increase the security of some states at a price they can afford to pay.

Proliferation is slow

Gray 0 (Colin, Professor of International Politics at the University of Hull, “To Confuse Ourselves: Nuclear Fallacies,” Alternative Nuclear Futures, ed. Baylis and O’Neil, p. 5-6)

The numbers of nuclear-weapon, and nuclear-threshold, states, remain much lower than proliferation pessimists were predicting in the 1950s and 1960s. There is no question but that the pace of proliferation has been slow and at present shows no thoroughly convincing signs of a prospect for other than a distinctly steady acceleration. But, this trend, if that is what it is, of a deliberate pace in proliferation, is vulnerable to nuclear learning from any crisis, anywhere that seems to demonstrate a strategic necessity for nuclear arms. The trend that has produced only five NPT-’licensed’ nuclear-weapon states—which happen to be the Five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council—three unlicensed nuclear-weapon states (Israel, India, Pakistan), at least one near-nuclear-weapon threshold state (North Korea), and three would-be nuclear-weapon states (Iraq, Iran, Libya), is indeed impressive. Also it is impressive that, inter alia, Sweden, Switzerland, Japan, Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, and Taiwan, have stepped back from active pursuit of the military nuclear option. More noteworthy still was the renunciation in 1990 of actual, as opposed to virtual, nuclear weapons by a South Africa whose internal and external security condition has been transformed by and large for the better, and by the distinctly insecure extra-Russian legatees of part of the erstwhile Soviet nuclear arsenal.

No – Proliferation

Every nuclear state will develop a similar safe posture – political and technical constraints overwhelm organizational concerns

Wirtz 98 (James, Associate Professor of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval Post-graduate School, “Beyond Bipolarity: Prospects for Nuclear Stability After the Cold War,” The Absolute Weapon Revisited, ed. Paul, Harknett, and Wirtz, p. 146-147)

At the moment, it is impossible to determine the sources of this nuclear learning. A process of convergence could have been at work: dur­ing the Cold War, phenomena at several levels of analysis were identified as responsible for a growing similarity in the nuclear policies embraced by the United States and the USSR. At the systemic level, for example, Ken­neth Waltz suggested that “market forces” drove both sides to imitate the more successful or useful policies of their adversary, leading to a growing similarity in both nuclear outlooks and arsenals over time. In terms of unit-level attributes, Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington sug­gested that the exigencies of technology, economics, and bureaucracy would eventually overwhelm ideological differences, producing conver­gence. And in terms of human behavior, Robert O’Connell has recently observed that throughout history, sociological factors have led to conver­gence in the field of armaments. One might thus expect that just as long as international relations remains anarchical, or modern technology or bureaucracy continues to proliferate, or human nature does not change, one of these factors will force nascent nuclear powers to imitate successful nuclear states. In a sense, nuclear proliferation itself suggests that some form of convergence is taking place. Alternatively, both sides might have found themselves in a situation described by game theorists as prisoner’s dilemma. By following tit-for-tat strategies, the superpowers might have modified each other’s behavior until implicitly accepted rules of the game developed between them. But it might be difficult to replicate the conditions necessary for this kind of learning—an iterated, bilateral prisoner’s dilemma—as the number of nuclear-armed states increases. Indeed, as Scott Sagan has noted, instant nuclear powers have already acquired substantial nuclear arsenals without the benefit of nuclear learning; the secrecy that surrounds the efforts of current proliferators also hinders noncrisis interaction that might foster nuclear learning.Conversely, the objective physical and strategic reality of nuclear weapons, compared to other military instrumentalities, might be relatively accessible; this observation is at the heart of Bernard Brodie’s initial analysis of the impact of nuclear weapons on war and international politics. In other words, given sustained scientific or strategic study, peo­ple, regardless of ideological predispositions, will reach similar conclu­sions about the political and military utility, or disutility, of nuclear weapons. This “Brodie effect” might occur because individuals can easily recognize the obvious limitations of nuclear technology, or because a general understanding of the physics underlying nuclear weapons will spread among policymakers.This hypothesis also would generally fit the tenets of learning theory, which suggest that when technical considerations limit policy alternatives or, for that matter, when threats to security are high, political factors are unlikely to interfere in the learning process.”

The risk of escalation forces intense scrutiny, preventing accidental war

Kenneth Waltz, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate, 1995, p. 111

Deterrence is also a considerable guarantee against accidents, since it causes countries to take good care of their weapons, and against anonymous use, since those firing the weapons can neither know that they will be undetected nor what form of punishment detection might bring. In life, uncertainties abound. In a conven­tional world, they more easily lead to war because less is at stake. Even so, it is difficult to think of wars that have started by accident even before nuclear weapons were invented. It is hard to believe that nuclear war may begin accidentally, when less frightening conventional wars have rarely done so.

No – Proliferation – Alt Causalities

Altered US stance doesn’t change Iran or North Korea’s strategic incentives to proliferate

Feith and Shulsky 9 (Douglas Feith, former under secretary of defense for policy, and Shulsky, former Defense Department official who dealt with arms control issues; both fellows @ Hudson Institute, 8/3/2009, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204313604574328430978849134.html#mod=rss\_opinion\_main

Mr. Obama here is mixing up pretext and policy. When criticized for pursuing nuclear weapons, proliferators like North Korea and Iran make diplomatic talking points out of the size of the great powers' arsenals. They try to shift the focus away from themselves by complaining that the Americans and Russians aren't working hard enough to reach disarmament goals envisioned in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. But depriving proliferators of such talking points won't affect their incentives to acquire nuclear weapons—or the world's incentives to counter the dangers that the North Korean and Iranian nuclear programs pose to international peace.

\*\*\*READINESS\*\*\*

No Impact to Low Readiness

No impact – we’ve survived periods of low readiness

National Security Network 8 (May 13, <http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/850>) LL

Our military is second to none, but eight years of negligence, lack of accountability, and a reckless war in Iraq have left our ground forces facing shortfalls in both recruitment and readiness. Every service is out of balance and ill-prepared. We need a new strategy to give the military the tools it needs for the challenges we face today. And we need leadership that meets our obligations to the men and women who put their lives on the line. Overview The U.S. military is a fighting force second to none. It didn’t get that way by accident – it took decades of careful stewardship by civilian as well as military leaders in the Pentagon, the White House, and on Capitol Hill. But eight years of Administration recklessness, and a lack of oversight from conservatives on Capitol Hill, have put the military under enormous strain. Active-duty generals at the highest levels have said that “the current demand for our forces is not sustainable… We can’t sustain the all-volunteer force at the pace that we are going on right now” (Army Chief of Staff George Casey, April 2008); that in terms of readiness, many brigades being sent back to Afghanistan and Iraq were “not where they need to be” (Army Vice-Chief of Staff Richard Cody, SASC subcommittee hearing, April 14, 2008); and that “we cannot now meet extra force requirements in places like Afghanistan” (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mullen on National Public Radio, April 2008). Readiness and Response: Two-thirds of the Army – virtually all of the brigades not currently deployed to Afghanistan or Iraq – are rated “not combat ready.” The dramatic equipment shortages of a few years ago have been improved but not completely remedied. Recruitment and Retention: These conditions of service, and the strains they place on military family members, have hindered Army efforts (and to a lesser extent those of the Marine Corps) to recruit and retain the requisite number and quantity of service members. The Army has been forced to lower its educational and moral standards and allow an increasing number of felons into its ranks. It is also struggling to keep junior officers, the brains of the force, who represent the height of the military’s investment in its people – and whose willingness to stay on represents a crucial judgment on Administration policies. The Marine Corps, America’s emergency 911 force, is under similar strain. The Commandant of the Marine Corps said in February 2008 that the Marines will not be able to maintain a long term presence in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The National Guard and Reserve are already suffering from severe shortages of equipment and available combat personnel. In many states, the Army National Guard would struggle to respond to a natural or man-made disaster – just as the Kansas National Guard struggled to respond to the severe tornados last year. How, and whether, we rebuild our military in the wake of the fiasco in Iraq will likely shape it for the next generation. Too much of our military posture is left over from the Cold War. Our forces are being ground down by low-tech insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the most immediate threat confronting the U.S. is a terrorist network that possesses no tanks or aircraft. We must learn the lessons of Iraq and dramatically transform our military into a 21st century fighting force ready to confront the threats of today and tomorrow.

No Impact to Low Readiness

No terminal impact to low readiness – empirics prove

The Huffington Post 8 (Mar 8, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/04/01/senior-army-officials-us_n_94571.html>) LL

Senior Army and Marine Corps leaders said yesterday that the increase of more than 30,000 troops in Iraq and Afghanistan has put unsustainable levels of stress on U.S. ground forces and has put their readiness to fight other conflicts at the lowest level in years.

In a stark assessment a week before Gen. David H. Petraeus, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, is to testify on the war's progress, Gen. Richard A. Cody, the Army's vice chief of staff, said that the heavy deployments are inflicting "incredible stress" on soldiers and families and that they pose "a significant risk" to the nation's all-volunteer military.

Impact empirically denied by three years of readiness shortfalls

AP 9 (Feb 20, <http://www.lubbockonline.com/stories/022009/nat_395947018.shtml>) LL

For the third consecutive year, a classified Pentagon assessment has concluded there's a significant risk that the U.S. military could not respond quickly and fully to any new crisis, Associated Press has learned. The latest risk assessment, drawn up by Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, comes despite recent security gains in [Iraq](http://www.washingtontimes.com/themes/?Theme=Iraq) and plans for troop cuts there. The assessment finds that the U.S. continues to face persistent terrorist threats and the military is still stretched and strained from long and repeated tours to the war front. Senior military officials spoke about the report on condition of anonymity because it is a classified document. Prepared every year and routinely delivered to Congress with the budget, the risk assessment paints a broad picture of security threats and hot spots around the world and the U.S. military's ability to deal with them. Adm. Mullen has delivered it to [Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates](http://www.washingtontimes.com/themes/?Theme=Robert+Gates). Because the threat is rated as significant, Mr. Gates will send an accompanying report to Congress outlining what the military is doing to address the risks. That report has not yet been finished. This year's assessment finds many of the same global security issues as in previous years - ranging from terrorist organizations and unstable governments to the potential for high-tech cyberattacks. It also reflects [the Pentagon](http://www.washingtontimes.com/themes/?Theme=The+Pentagon)'s ongoing struggle to maintain a military that can respond to threats from other countries while honing newer counterinsurgency techniques to battle more unconventional dangers such as suicide bombers and lethal roadside bombs. Daniel Goure, vice president of the Lexington Institute, a military-policy research group in Arlington, said the assessment would take into account the strains on the force, the wear and tear on aircraft and other military equipment, and a host of global flashpoints. "This is a chairman who looks around the world and sees - right now, today - immediate, near-term problems like North Korea; the larger questions of Pakistan and its future; Iran and what is going on there; Russia and Georgia; Venezuela, which has a close relationship with Russia and is buying arms all over the place; and Cuba," Mr. Goure said. While officials are preparing to reduce troop levels in Iraq, they are increasing forces in [Afghanistan](http://www.washingtontimes.com/themes/?Theme=Afghanistan) - giving troops little break from their battlefield tours. The Pentagon has repeatedly stressed ongoing efforts to increase the size of the Army and Marine Corps, but that growth is only now starting to have an impact.

Troops Not Key to Readiness

Man power is not important in the military

Spencer 3 (Jack, Sr Policy Analyst for Defense and National Security in the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies at The Heritage Foundation, Aug 1, <http://www.heritage.org/research/nationalsecurity/em895.cfm>) LL

While U.S. forces are not adequate to sustain the current rate of deployment, simply adding manpower is notnecessarily **the answer**. Clearly**, the U.S. needs more capabilities**. However, while adding manpower may seem like the quickest way to fill the capabilities gap, it is not the best way to solve the problem**. People are expensive** The most effective weapons in the U.S. armed forces are soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines. They are also, understandably, the most expensive. Only about a third of the defense budget is spent on developing and buying weapons. Most of the rest goes to personnel and operational costs. **Maintaining personnel beyond the number needed to fulfill U.S. national security requirements takes resources away from important efforts such as modernization and transformation**. The result can be inappropriate deployments A perceived excess of manpower tempts political leaders to deploy forces on operations that have little or nothing to do with U.S. national security. After the Cold War, this perception arguably contributed to heavy U.S. involvement in peacekeeping efforts in places like Haiti, Somalia, and the Balkans. It is not the only measure of capability Although **manpower** end-strength is important, **it does not** by itself **determine capabilities**. For example, **a force trained and equipped for the Cold War, regardless of size, would be inappropriate for the war on terrorism.** Similarly, **a military unit using old technology may not be as capable as a unit half its size using new technology.** Structuring the force to reflect modern national security requirements accurately is more important than investing resources in outdated and wasteful organizations.

Readiness Inevitable

No country poses a challenge to US readiness – military spending, weapon systems, and empirics prove

Cohen 4 (Eliot, Prof/Director, Philip Merrill Center for Strategic Studies at John Hopkins University, Foreign Affairs, History and the Hyperpower) LL

U.S. military power is of a different order entirely. The United States now accounts for between 40 and 50 percent of global defense spending, more than double the total spending of its European allies (whose budgets are so riddled with inefficiencies that, aside from territorial defense, peacekeeping, and some niche capabilities, the European pillar of NATO is militarily irrelevant). In virtually every sphere of warfare, the United States dominates, an unprecedented phenomenon in military history. On and above the earth and on and below the sea, U.S. military technology far surpasses that of any potential opponent. No other power has the ability to move large and sophisticated forces around the globe; to coordinate and direct its own forces and those of its allies; to keep troops equipped, fed, and healthy; and to support those troops with precision firepower and unsurpassed amounts of information and intelligence. Viewed from within, of course, the picture looks very different. U.S. soldiers know all too well their own deficiencies and vulnerabilities: they grouse about aging trucks, jammed rifles, and intermittent data links. Viewed from the outside, however, the world has seen nothing like the U.S. military. British infantrymen in 1900 shot more accurately than their continental European counterparts but did not differ all that much from them in terms of equipment and unit skills (and the Tommies found themselves inferior to Boer citizen-soldiers equipped with German-made rifles). Today, an average U.S. battalion has better kit -- from body armor to night vision devices -- than any comparable unit in the world; with a few exceptions (mostly allies of the United States), it trains more effectively in the field; and it has officers and sergeants groomed by a military schooling system more thorough than any in history. This qualitative advantage looms even larger at the higher levels of the armed forces. No other military has the B-2 bombers or the satellite constellation, the aircraft carriers or the long-range unmanned aircraft of the U.S. Navy and Air Force. No other country is remotely close to having the resources afforded by a $400 billion defense budget or the accumulated military-industrial capital of years of spending on construction and infrastructure. No other research establishment can match that of the United States, which receives more money than the entire defense budget of its largest European ally. Put thus, U.S. military power seems to invite hubris. But again, viewed from within the picture appears different. Generals and admirals fret over forces stretched too thin, anticipate threats from unconventional and irregular opponents who will avoid U.S. strengths and seek out weaknesses, and worry that their political masters will succumb to the intoxication of great power or their fellow citizens will fail to understand the commitment of money and blood that any war requires. Such leaders understand better than their civilian superiors the fragility of great military strength. But that does not undermine the basic fact of U.S. predominance. Augustus lost his legions in the Teutoburger Wald, Disraeli his regiments at Isandhlwana -- in both cases, succumbing to primitive opponents inferior in weaponry and, according to the imperial powers, culture as well. Not even in Vietnam, where the odds of such a debacle's occurring were highest, did U.S. forces suffer a similar defeat. Today, the legions of the United States have no match, and the gap between them and other militaries is only growing.

**Readiness Decline Inevitable**

Asymmetric warfare undermines readiness

Black 2 (Prof of History, University of Exeter, Winter 2002, <http://www.fpri.org/ww/0304.200202.black.warandstrategy21stcentury.html>) LL

Current debates over America's place in the world often move uneasily between military and diplomatic factors. It is misleading, however, to abstract security issues from the wider context of foreign policy. Events in the twenty-first century will test the limits to American strength but not its fundamentals. These tests will underscore, however, the inability of technology to overcome all challenges and the risk that excess militarization of foreign policy would discourage what America needs most: acute and ongoing assessments of its capability and limitations. To emphasize the limitations of military power may be surprising given the current conventional wisdom that the United States is the sole superpower. According to the generally established view, the so-called Revolution in Military Affairs based on information warfare capability and other factors will enable the most technologically advanced powers, especially the United States, to overcome both distance and resistance to secure victory with minimal casualties. In many respects, this is another version of the mechanization of the military imagination that has been so potent ever since the advent of the airplane and tank. It is obviously important to seize and develop every advantage new weaponry can bring, but it is mistaken to imagine that a technological edge guarantees victory at low cost. To be sure, advantages in weaponry are valuable in symmetrical warfare between opposing forces that operate in a similar fashion, but even then a host of other factors intrude, including strategy, tactics, leadership, unit cohesion, morale, and contextual issues such as the respective determination of the powers engaged. In asymmetrical warfare, by contrast, the advantages conferred by superior weaponry are severely curtailed. Compare, for instance, the frustration of American forces in the asymmetrical Vietnam War with Israeli success in the Six-Day War. Finally, technological advantage in both types of conflict inevitably inspire the development of countermeasures involving weapons, tactics, or strategy. Thus the impact of air power has been lessened by the development of antiaircraft weapons whose cost-benefit payoff is immense compared to that of a state-of-the-art bomber. There is no reason to imagine that this process will cease. Thus, there will remain military limits to effective force projection, and skillful policymaking will continue to require a shrewd understanding of capability and limits.

Alt Cause to Low Readiness

Multiple causes for low readiness – overstretch, administration error, funding constraints, and equipment shortages prove

Murtha 6 (John, Congressman, PN 12th Congressional District, Global Security, Sept 13, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2006_rpt/060913-murtha-obey_army-readiness.htm>) LL

Washington D.C. - The U.S. Army’s preparedness for war has eroded to levels not witnessed by our country in decades. As deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan continue unabated, there is a very real prospect that Army readiness will continue to erode, undermining its ability to meet the theater commanders’ needs and foreclosing any option for the U.S. to respond to conflicts elsewhere around the globe. The degradation of Army readiness is primarily a function of unanticipated high troop deployment levels to Iraq, chronic equipment and personnel shortages, funding constraints, and Pentagon civilian mismanagement. These factors have resulted in: The likelihood that many Army combat and support units scheduled to deploy to Iraq in 2007 will have less than the required one year period for rest and re-training. This is one of the key indicators that lead many Army officials to conclude that current deployment rates cannot be sustained without breaking the force. The lowest readiness levels for the vast majority of non-deployed active-duty combat units. The situation for the Army Guard and Reserves is worse. Thousands of key Army weapons platforms – such as tanks, Humvees, Bradley Fighting Vehicles – sitting in disuse at Army maintenance depots for lack of funding. Indications of growing drug and discipline problems among the newest Army recruits. Many Army units here at home have been forced to spend much of their time and energy on managing equipment and personnel shortfalls, instead of training or spending time with their families. Commanders at all levels reporting that Army families are becoming increasingly anxious, even angry, about current and future deployments. In effect, the Army has become a “hand-to-mouth” organization. Its inability to get ahead of the deployment and training curves is rooted in the Administration’s miscalculations and blind optimism about troop and industrial surge requirements for the U.S. occupation of Iraq. The consequent failure to plan has forced the Army to play catch-up ever since the fall of Baghdad. Though senior Army leaders contend that equipment and personnel shortages thus far have not prevented the service from meeting the theater commanders’ needs, they allude to a widespread concern that the Army will emerge from the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts as a weakened and worn-out force. Addressing the Army’s short- and long-term needs will require: Robust funding increases for rehabilitating and replacing equipment. A national commitment to improve Army readiness and focus attention on military service. A reduction in U.S. deployments to Iraq. Current Deployment Requirements In June of 2003, the Pentagon’s planners assumed that the U.S. would withdraw all of its combat brigades from Iraq roughly 20 months after the end of major combat operations. Those plans were revised in September of that year, and assumed a complete withdrawal about one year later than had previously been expected. Today, there are 16 U.S. combat brigades in Iraq (including 2 Marine Corps regiments), and there is little prospect that the deployment rate will decrease in the near future. In fact, reports indicate that theatre commanders will request a higher number of combat brigades than currently deployed. The expectation that high deployment rates will continue is bolstered by a palpable skepticism among some in the Army about the Iraqi security forces and ministries. For example, Army commanders who recently returned from Iraq indicated that corruption and incompetence are rampant within the Iraqi Defense and Interior Ministries. Key Facts: The Army currently has 39 active-duty combat brigades, as it builds to a total of 42 under the restructuring plan known as “modularity.” Over the coming months, roughly 19.5 combat brigades will be committed to Iraq and Afghanistan. Army doctrine calls for 2 units to be held in reserve (for rest and training) for every unit deployed. As of today, the Army has only one unit in reserve for every unit deployed – a ratio that history shows cannot be sustained for any length of time without serious adverse consequences to the force. Moreover, the Army’s Force Generation Model calls for a three-year cycle in which Army active-duty units would deploy for one-year, return and reset over another year, and train and prepare for deployment over the third year. Given current deployment rates and the insufficient number of Army combat brigades, the Army model is conceptually sound but in practice remains little more than a figment of the Army’s imagination. In fact it’s quite likely that Army combat units preparing for the next rotation (07-09) will be “short-cycled”; that is, units will be forced to return to battle with less than one year’s time to recuperate, reset, and train. For example, the 3rd brigade of the 3rd Infantry Division returned from Iraq in February of this year. Prior to the last deployment it had a 16-month preparation period. The brigade now expects to receive its “prepare to deploy” orders within roughly the next 3 months, which would force the brigade to curtail training and eliminate leave for its soldiers. The situation for the Army’s combat support and combat service support units (CS/CSS), such as military police and civil affairs, is worse. Manned mostly by the Guard and Reserve, the Army has been forced to cobble together CS/CSS units in order to meet theater deployment requirements. Since January of 2005, roughly three-quarters of all CS/CSS units deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan were augmented with Army personnel pulled from other units, personnel trained for other jobs, personnel from other military services or, increasingly, private contractors. For rotation 07-09, even though roughly 1/5th of the CS/CSS units scheduled to deploy will be composed of personnel from other services, the Army is still short of the units needed to meet the theater commanders’ requirements. The Army’s ability to meet CS/CSS unit requirements is constrained by the lack of Guard and Reserve soldiers available to meet future missions. Of the 341,000 Army National Guard soldiers in uniform, only roughly 50,000 remain available for mobilization. For the Army Reserve, only about 56,000 of the 190,000 in uniform are available. Thus, Army leaders expressed strong concern about the need to re-examine the Administration’s current policy of not extending the reserve mobilization period beyond two years. Current Army Readiness Army military readiness rates have declined to levels not seen since the end of the Vietnam War. Roughly one-half of all Army units (deployed and non-deployed, active and reserves) received the lowest readiness rating any fully formed unit can receive. Prior to 9/11, only about 20 percent of the Army received this lowest rating – a fact driven almost exclusively by shortfalls in the reserves. Army units in either Iraq or Afghanistan generally are at peak readiness levels, as they should be. At issue are the non-deployed units – those based in the United States and Europe. It is these units that are critically short of equipment and personnel, <CONTINUED>

Alt Cause to Low Readiness

<CONTINUED>

causing the vast majority of them to be rated at the lowest readiness levels. Equipment and personnel shortfalls in non-deployed units limit their ability to fully train for combat. Army units spend the time between combat deployments undertaking a series of progressively larger and more complex training exercises. It is the larger, more complex training exercises that are adversely affected by shortfalls. As a result, Army leaders have witnessed a marked decline in Army heavy combat brigade performance at its National Training Center exercises – the key test for any Army unit prior to deployment. Ultimately, under-trained units are likely to experience higher casualty and accident rates in theater. Moreover, the Army’s non-deployed units make up its strategic reserve. These are the units that would be called on to go to war in North Korea, Iran, or elsewhere. The degradation of Army readiness here at home has effectively eliminated the United States ground force strategic reserve. Key Facts: Of the 16 active-duty, non-deployed combat brigades in the United States managed by the Army’s Forces Command, the vast majority of them are rated at the lowest readiness ratings. These ratings are caused by severe equipment shortages. Of particular concern is the readiness rates of the units scheduled to deploy later this year, particularly the 1st Cavalry Division. This division and its 4 brigades will deploy to Iraq in October at the lowest level of readiness because of equipment shortfalls. To meet its needs, this unit – like virtually all other units that have recently deployed or will soon deploy to Iraq – must fall-in on equipment in theater. Operating unfamiliar, battle weary equipment increases the potential for casualties and accidents.

Alt Cause to Low Readiness

Iraq and Afghanistan tank readiness

AP 8 (Feb 9, <http://www.military.com/NewsContent/0,13319,161717,00.html>) LL

WASHINGTON - A classified Pentagon assessment concludes that long battlefield tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with persistent terrorist activity and other threats, have prevented the U.S. military from improving its ability to respond to any new crisis, The Associated Press has learned. Despite security gains in Iraq, there is still a "significant" risk that the strained U.S. military cannot quickly and fully respond to another outbreak elsewhere in the world, according to the report. Last year the Pentagon raised that threat risk from "moderate" to "significant." This year, the report will maintain that "significant" risk level - pointing to the U.S. military's ongoing struggle against a stubborn insurgency in Iraq and its lead role in the NATO-led war in Afghanistan. The Pentagon, however, will say that efforts to increase the size of the military, replace equipment and bolster partnerships overseas will help lower the risk over time, defense officials said Friday. They spoke on condition of anonymity to discuss the classified report.

\*\*\*RUSSIA\*\*\*

No – US-Russia War

Russia won’t try to counter United States primacy

Sauer 7(Tom Lecturer in International Politics – University of Antwerp 2007)

The U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal is, as Keir Lieber and Daryl Press's recent article notes, the most powerful in the world, a situation that is unlikely to change in the coming years.[1](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v031/31.3lantis.html" \l "FOOT1b) Despite this gross imbalance, I argue that neither Russia nor China is likely to undertake significant countermeasures to help close this gap, for three reasons. First, neither country feels directly threatened by U.S. nuclear primacy. Second, leaders in Moscow and Beijing do not believe that the United States will use nuclear weapons again. Third, Russia and China need only a minimum deterrent capability. In the conclusion of this letter, I suggest an alternative explanation for the United States' pursuit of nuclear primacy following the end of the Cold War

Distrust will not spill-over into open conflict

Sakwa 8 (Richard, h ead of the department of Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent, International Afairs 8, March 2008 http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/119391506/PDFSTART)

The end of the Cold Warhas been repeatedly announced, yet the beast stubbornly lives on.97 Nearly two decades after the fall of communism we have once again entered a period of self-reinforcing suspicion and distrust between the major nuclear powers. This does not necessarily mean that the world will enter a period of sustained and institutionalized rivalry between two powers that act as magnetic poles in global affairs. The conditions for a replay of the old Cold War in its classic form are simply not present. Russia and America do not lead rival ideological projects on a global scale; although disagreements over such issues as the appropriate role of multilateral mechanisms do exist, they exist also between NATO allies. Nor are there sustained and entrenched policy differences over such issues as nuclear proliferation, global warming or any number of other fundamental issues facing the world. Russia is just one among a number of potential great powers, and therefore old-fashioned bipolarism is a thing of the past, and Russian–American relations are no longer the axis on which world politics turns. Even the issue that has much exercised the policy community in Washington, Russia’s alleged ‘democratic backsliding’, is a matter of interpretation, and in any case new leaderships in both countries may provide an opportunity for the regime question to become less sharp.98 The term ‘Cold War’, therefore, is a contemporary international relations metaphor for a fundamentally strained relationship that cannot be resolved within the framework of the world views of either party but requires a rethinking of both.

No US Russia tensions or confrontations.

Nichols 2 (World Policy Jouurnal, chairman of the department of strategy and policy at the US Naval War college. http://www.allbusiness.com/legal/international-law-foreign-investment-finance/938980-1.html)

The price of failing to seize the opportunity before us to forge a stronger U.S.-Russian relationship could be considerable, particularly at a time when America is at war, and facing enemies against whom we could make common cause with Moscow. We should be encouraged by the realization that Russia is unlikely to return to a policy of confrontation with the West. There are no plausible issues over which the United States and Russia could come to regard each other actively as enemies, and certainly not to the brink of nuclear war. There is no issue between Russia and the United States that compares to the tension between China and the United States over Taiwan, or between the United States and Iran and Iraq over nuclear proliferation, or with other states over their support of terrorism. Perhaps most important, there is no foreseeable situation, either at home or abroad, that is likely to convince most Russians and their government that Russia is somehow more like China or Iran than it is like Germany, France, or the United States. In short, it is difficult to see what would impel the new generation of Russians to tear apart everything, at home and abroad, that so many of them have striven to create since 1991

No – US-Russia War

Russia poses no threat to the US.

Perkovich 3( Vice President for Studies at the Carnegie Endowment, Foreign Affairs, March/April, 2003)

As for Russia, a full-scale war between it and the United States now seems inconceivable. Given the desires for larger cuts in nuclear forces that Russia displayed in negotiating the 2002 Moscow Treaty, Russia hardly seems enough of a threat to justify the size and forward-leaning posture of America's present arsenal.

No risk of US-Russian nuclear war

Manning 0 ( Robert A senior fellow and director of Asian studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 3/10/2000)

We don't want to go any lower because we need these weapons for nuclear deterrence, according to State Department spokesman James Rubin. But how many nukes do we need for deterrence to be credible? China, which President Clinton has talked of as a "strategic partner," has a grand total of 20 - count them - strategic warheads that could hit the United States. Nuclear wannabes like North Korea, Iran, and Iraq would have only a handful if they did manage to succeed in joining the nuclear club. Russia, which has 6,000 strategic warheads, is no longer an adversary. During the Cold War, it was not hard to envision a conventional war in Europe escalating into nuclear conflict. But today it is difficult to spin a plausible scenario in which the United States and Russia escalate hostilities into a nuclear exchange. Russia has no Warsaw Pact, and not much of a conventional force to speak of. Yet U.S. nuclear planners still base their targeting plans on prospective Russian targets, though no one will say so.

No – US-Russia War

There is zero threat of war with Russia

Perkovich 3 (George, VP for Studies @ Carnegie, *Foreign Affairs*, Mar/Apr 3) ET

As for Russia, a full-scale war between it and the United States now seems inconceivable. Given the desires for larger cuts in nuclear forces that Russia displayed in negotiating the 2002 Moscow Treaty, Russia hardly seems enough of a threat to justify the size and forward-leaning posture of America's present arsenal.

No risk of US-Russian nuclear war

Manning 2k (Robert, sr fellow director of Asian studies @ council of foreign rel, 3.10.2k) ET

We don't want to go any lower because we need these weapons for nuclear deterrence, according to State Department spokesman James Rubin. But how many nukes do we need for deterrence to be credible? China, which President Clinton has talked of as a "strategic partner," has a grand total of 20 - count them - strategic warheads that could hit the United States. Nuclear wannabes like North Korea, Iran, and Iraq would have only a handful if they did manage to succeed in joining the nuclear club. Russia, which has 6,000 strategic warheads, is no longer an adversary. During the Cold War, it was not hard to envision a conventional war in Europe escalating into nuclear conflict. But today it is difficult to spin a plausible scenario in which the United States and Russia escalate hostilities into a nuclear exchange. Russia has no Warsaw Pact, and not much of a conventional force to speak of. Yet U.S. nuclear planners still base their targeting plans on prospective Russian targets, though no one will say so.

No – US-Russia Relations

US Russia Rel does nothing productive- no impact

Rumer 3 (Eugene B, sr fellow @ Institute for National Strategic Studies @ Nat’l Defense U, *Washington Quarterly*) ET

A look beneath the veneer of upbeat aggregate statistics and diplomatic photo-ops suggests that a large gap exists between Russian aspirations and images, on one hand, and the Russian ability to be one of the major pillars of the international system, on the other. Despite several years of economic growth and a new dynamic leader, Russia remains a power in decline. Neither its recent economic success nor its vigorous leadership is sufficient to make up for the long-term losses the country has suffered or to compensate for the contemporary shortcomings that belie key elements of Russian power. These shortcomings will inevitably taint Russia's ability to help solve the most crucial global problems, to cooperate with other great powers, to improve global security and economic well-being, and to prove a reliable partner.

Russia can’t be a great power in the short term, which precludes it having a large role in international problem-solving

Rumer & Wallander 3 (Eugene B. sr fellow @ Institute for Nat’l Strategic Studies @ Nat’l defense U, *Washington Quarterly*, winter 3) ET

The internal political, economic, societal, and defense challenges with which the Russian leadership continues to struggle will preclude Russia from achieving great-power status in the near future. This reality has profound implications for U.S. policy and expectations that Russia can be a partner that can and will help the United States shoulder the burdens of the international system. Russia's internal trends suggest that it is unlikely to bring to the international table the kind of resources and reliability needed to take a leading role in solving complex global problems and threats.

Russia won’t break relations with the US- no impact

Rumer & Wallander 3 (Eugene B. sr fellow @ Institute for Nat’l Strategic Studies @ Nat’l defense U, *Washington Quarterly*, winter 3) ET

Given Russia's geopolitical predicament, it is difficult to imagine how a rational, even selfish, assessment of Russian interests would lead Russia to conclude that it would be best served by undermining the United States. The fallout from a weaker and diminished U.S. role in global security affairs would carry with it a number of serious challenges to Russian security interests, ranging from a strong Russian stake in partnership with the United States on geopolitically balancing China to the immediate threat to Russian security in the event of U.S. abandonment of its security assistance to Central Asia to the prospect of Iran armed with nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles with Moscow well within range. Thus, although Russia apparently has a strong interest in making clear to the United States that it is not to be taken for granted and that its interests and sensitivities are not to be brushed aside, Russia has no compelling rational interest in undermining or geopolitically balancing the United States' international position.

No – Russia-China War

No risk of Sino-Russian escalation—it’s empirically denied and all border disputes have been settled

Chicago Tribune, 10/15/04

China and Russia settled the last of their decades-old border disputes Thursday during a visit to Beijing by President Vladimir Putin, signing an agreement fixing their 2,700-mile-long border for the first time. The struggle over border areas resulted in violent clashes in the 1960s and 1970s, when strained Sino-Soviet relations were at their most acrimonious, feeding fears abroad that the conflict could erupt into nuclear war. Beijing and Moscow had reached agreements on individual border sections as relations warmed in the past decade. But a stretch of river and islands along China's northeastern border with Russia's Far East had remained in dispute.

Fear of escalation deters Russia-China conflict—empirics prove

Moriarty (Tom, military analyst for the US air force, 9.22.4, *World Affairs*) ET

However, the Soviet Union ultimately chose to forgo a preemptive attack and attempted to defuse tensions through diplomatic channels. Numerous reasons led Soviet leaders to decide against preemptive attack. The main reason was the Soviet Union's fear that even if they could destroy all of China's nuclear weapons capability (which, in itself, was a big assumption), they feared a conventional attack by China. Like the United States during the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviet Union understood that they would lose the ability to prevent the crisis from escalating into a full-blown war. Soviet leaders grew concerned that China would respond with a prolonged people's war against the Soviet Union. Knowing that a prolonged war against a country with more than one billion people and a proven resiliency would exhaust the Soviet Union and would require forces to be withdrawn from Eastern Europe, Soviet leaders chose to ignore the Chinese provocations and let the confrontation defuse naturally. (12)

No – Russian Expansion

Russia’s foreign policy is restrained and pragmatic

Rumer & Wallander 3 (Eugene B. sr fellow @ Institute for Nat’l Strategic Studies @ Nat’l defense U, *Washington Quarterly*, winter 3) ET

Russian diplomacy has undergone an equally impressive change. Putin moved decisively to clear a decade's worth of stagnant issues off Russia's foreign policy agenda, including withdrawal from Soviet-era military bases in Vietnam and Cuba as well as establishment of the NATO-Russia Council, and put Russia's key international relationships back on track. Russian foreign policy under Putin has had a far more pragmatic bent than that of his predecessors. The blustery rhetoric of the previous decade has been replaced by a strategic approach to costs, benefits, and the realm of the possible. When presented with a fait accompli, Putin has opted to put a positive spin on potentially difficult situations in a number of instances, including U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the invitation to the three Baltic states to join NATO, and a stepped-up U.S. security assistance program to Georgia, where long-declared Russian red lines were crossed without damaging U.S.-Russian relations. Because of Russia's regional presence and weight -- bordering, as it does, just about every country and region that the United States cares about in Eurasia, from the Baltics to China -- the prospect of partnership with Russia has caught the attention both of U.S. policymakers and of experts outside the U.S. government. n2 Coupled with the firm public stance in support of the U.S. war on terrorism since September 11, 2001, Putin's pragmatism in foreign policy has led to speculation that the emerging U.S.-Russian global partnership could become even more important than the partnerships between the United States and many of its traditional European allies.

Russia has no in undermining U.S. interests – threats to its own security are too great.

Rumer & Wallander 3 (Eugene B. sr fellow @ Institute for Nat’l Strategic Studies @ Nat’l defense U, *Washington Quarterly*, winter 3) ET

Given Russia's geopolitical predicament, it is difficult to imagine how a rational, even selfish, assessment of Russian interests would lead Russia to conclude that it would be best served by undermining the United States. The fallout from a weaker and diminished U.S. role in global security affairs would carry with it a number of serious challenges to Russian security interests, ranging from a strong Russian stake in partnership with the United States on geopolitically balancing China to the immediate threat to Russian security in the event of U.S. abandonment of its security assistance to Central Asia to the prospect of Iran armed with nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles with Moscow well within range. Thus, although Russia apparently has a strong interest in making clear to the United States that it is not to be taken for granted and that its interests and sensitivities are not to be brushed aside, Russia has no compelling rational interest in undermining or geopolitically balancing the United States' international position.

Russian military doesn’t even have basic numbers, budget, or resources- no chance of conflict

Rumer & Wallander 3 (Eugene B. sr fellow @ Institute for Nat’l Strategic Studies @ Nat’l defense U, *Washington Quarterly*, winter 3) ET

Russia entered the new millennium with its capacity to project military power beyond its borders vastly reduced and its ability to defend its territorial integrity and sovereignty severely tested by the war in Chechnya. n6 After 15 years of attempts at reform, Russian defense forces are essentially a shrunken version of the Soviet military. Neither financial nor political resources were made available for its fundamental transformation. The number of personnel in uniform has decreased from 4 million to about 1.2 million, but even those reduced numbers strain the defense budget, and the forces are still organized for war against NATO in Europe, the United States, and U.S. allies in Asia. As wages fell (or went unpaid), Russia's best officers retired, and fewer young men signed up for military careers. Russia's 2003 defense budget of $ 11 billion falls far short of what is needed to recruit, train, equip, and sustain a modern military. A planned increase in the 2004 budget to 412 billion rubles (about $ 13.5 billion) is only a very small step toward addressing the problem. A military starved for resources has eliminated essentials such as training, leading to an increasing number of fatal accidents, such as the sinking of the *Kursk* submarine in 2001 and the loss of a nuclear-powered submarine being towed to port in August 2003. That same month, during military exercises in Russia's Far East attended by Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov, two MI-24 helicopters collided. The incident sparked a debate in the Russian press about whether the cause was lack of sufficient training or the age and poor condition of the aircraft, which were more than 20 years old and kept functioning by scavenging parts from even older helicopters. Military bases have faced electricity cutoffs because they have not been provided funds to pay their bills, and Russian newspapers have reported cases of malnutrition and even starvation among conscripts.

No – Russian Civil War

Empirically denied- economic collapse and instability proves would have already happened

World Policy Journal 3 (*World Policy Journal,* 12.22.3) ET

Using extensive interviews with participants in all three administrations, and memoirs by former officials, they paint a compelling picture of officials often over-whelmed by the challenge of an entirely new reality. The unexpected collapse of communism and of the Soviet Union, coming just after the GulfWar, left them with no road map to understand how Russia and other post-Soviet states might develop. Nightmare scenarios suggested themselves: nuclear war between Russia and Ukraine; weapons proliferation on a terrifying scale; Yugoslav-type ethnically based civil war on the territory of the former Soviet Union; mass starvation; economic collapse--the ominous possibilities were endless. That these "dogs did not bark" is testimony to the unwillingness of people in the post-Soviet space to engage in armed conflict and to Western assistance that staved off famine and economic collapse. The failure of catastrophic scenarios to come about is one indicator of success--but if one were to measure America's contribution to transforming Russia in more positive ways, the evidence is more mixed. If a minimalist definition of success was the absence of catastrophe, the maximalist definition was the creation of a fully functioning democracy in Russia with a transparent market economy and the rule of law. That has not happened yet, and it is unclear when it will. So far, there is no consensus about what would constitute a realistic timetable for Russia's democratic development.

Non unique- civil war with Chechnya right now

Moscotw Times 2k (*Moscow Times,* newspaper featuring objective, reliable news on business, politics, sports and culture11.25.2) ET

Cohen takes a distinctly harsh view of Yeltsin, and notes that no Soviet leader was ever able to appoint their successor the way that Yeltsin named Vladimir Putin. (Putin's first official act, prohibiting the prosecution of his predecessor, brings to mind not a Soviet parallel, but an American one - Gerald Ford pardoning Richard Nixon for whatever he might be charged with after Nixon had left the White House to him.) Above all, Cohen would have Americans confront the stark results of the vaunted "shock therapy" that U.S. doctors of economics prescribed for their Russian patients: Total capital flight estimated in the range of $ 150 billion -$ 350 billion; the number living in poverty in the former Soviet Union up from 14 million in 1989 to 147 million nine years later and a male life expectancy that fell below the age of 60. In short, "the literal de -modernization of a 20th-century country." In the hopes of finding something that might strike a more sympathetic chord among U.S. policy-makers than massive human suffering, Cohen continually hammers on the dangers inherent in the fact of the "destabilization of a fully nuclearized society." Already, in Chechnya, Russia has experienced the first civil war in a country with nuclear weapons. It lacks the funds to pay the security and maintenance personnel responsible for those weapons adequately and, in some cases, even regularly. A situation in which a nuclear arsenal was under tight control has devolved into a murky one. Yet the attention paid to it in the United States is minor, Cohen argues, compared to "the campaign against Iraq's infinitely lesser weapons of mass destruction." He suggests that American foreign aid payments targeted at helping Russia pay the costs of maintaining an adequate nuclear security system would prove a far better and cheaper investment than building ever more complex and expensive defense and weapons systems. But, unfortunately, the recent American presidential campaign displayed a bipartisan consensus for just such systems.

No – Russian Prolif/Nukes

And nukes used by rogue groups won’t cause big damage- no impact

Mueller 99 (John, prof of poli sci @ U of Rochester, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 99) ET

Nuclear weapons clearly deserve the "weapons of mass destruction" designation because they can indeed destroy masses of people in a single blow. Even so, it is worth noting that any nuclear weapons acquired by terrorist groups or rogue states, at least initially, are likely to be small. Contrary to exaggerated Indian and Pakistani claims, for example, independent analyses of their May 1998 nuclear tests have concluded that the yields were Hiroshima-sized or smaller. Such bombs can cause horrible though not apocalyptic damage. Some 70,000 people died in Hiroshima and 40,000 in Nagasaki. People three miles away from the blast sites received only superficial wounds even when fully exposed, and those inside bomb shelters at Nagasaki were uninjured even though they were close to ground zero. Some buildings of steel and concrete survived, even when they were close to the blast centers, and most municipal services were restored within days. A Hiroshima-sized bomb exploded in a more fire-resistant modern city would likely be considerably less devastating. Used against well-prepared, dug-in, and dispersed troops, a small bomb might actually cause only limited damage.If a single such bomb or even a few of them were to fall into dangerous hands, therefore, it would be terrible, though it would hardly threaten the end of civilization**.**

Their scenario assumes loose nuclear weapons but US is tightening

San Francisco Chronicle 2 (*San Francisco Chronicle*, San Francisco area. Includes global news, regional information, classifieds, and entertainment.mar 7.2) ET

Their scenario assumes loose nukes, which the US is solving now San Francisco Chronicle, March 7, 2002 The United States maintains a multilayered defense against the terrorists' nuclear threat, said Harry Vantine, a counterterrorism and incident response expert at Lawrence Livermore National Lab. In addition to the radiation detectors and the Geiger counters carried by the Border Patrol, these include a program to assess the credibility of nuclear threats and helping Russia's border patrol look out for illicit nuclear material. Meserve said his commission had stepped up contacts with the thousands of companies and medical centers around the country that use radioactive substances to bring the material under tighter control.

Any Prolif will be slow- long term impact

Waltz 2k (Kenneth, prof of poli sci @ berk, *Georgetown Journal of International affairs* vol 1 #1, Winter/Spring 2K, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html) ET

It is now estimated that about twenty–five countries are in a position to make nuclear weapons rather quickly. Most countries that could have acquired nuclear military capability have refrained from doing so. Most countries do not need them. Consider Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa. Argentina and Brazil were in the process of moving toward nuclear military capability, and both decided against it–wisely I believe–because neither country needs nuclear weapons. South Africa had about half a dozen warheads and decided to destroy them. You have to have an adversary against whom you think you might have to threaten retaliation, but most countries are not in this position. Germany does not face any security threats–certainly not any in which a nuclear force would be relevant. I would expect the pattern of the past to be the same as the pattern in the future, in which one or two states per decade gradually develop nuclear weapons.

No – Russian Prolif- Generic

Nuclear prolif won’t happen- programs destroyed and high cost of prolif solves

Riecke 2k (Henning, Post-Doctoral Fellow @ Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 2k, “preventing use of weapons of mass destruction, p. 46) ET

Nuclear weapons proliferation has slowed down. Some possible candidates for proliferation have been either forced to destroy their program, like Iraq, or have dropped the nuclear option. This is a sign, that the non-use of nuclear weapons, the ‘nuclear taboo’ is gaining ground. This finding is in contradiction to the signal sketched out above, that the use of atomic weapons in certain cases has a legitimate character. The high costs in each case, however, might weigh heavier than the idea of appropriateness. Chemical and biological weapons programs are still pursued by a small number of states that remain unimpressed by the NATO campaign. They show no sign of entering the relevant non-proliferation regimes (or, as in the case of Iran, they do with obvious qualification).

No Loose Nukes -- US solving now

San Francisco Chronicle 2 (March 7 2002 , http://articles.sfgate.com/2002-03-07/news/17537993\_1\_nuclear-weapon-radiological-weapons-dirty-bombs

The United States maintains a multilayered defense against the terrorists' nuclear threat, said Harry Vantine, a counterterrorism and incident response expert at Lawrence Livermore National Lab. In addition to the radiation detectors and the Geiger counters carried by the Border Patrol, these include a program to assess the credibility of nuclear threats and helping Russia's border patrol look out for illicit nuclear material. Meserve said his commission had stepped up contacts with the thousands of companies and medical centers around the country that use radioactive substances to bring the material under tighter control.

No – Russian Prolif- Generic Can’t Solve

Can’t solve prolif- NPT is ineffective and security dilemmas ensure

Kapur 98 (Ashok, prof of poli sci @ U of Waterloo, *The absolute weapon revisited*, 98, p.247) ET

The new nuclear states also adopted a political view of proliferation. What they say and do is tied to their interests. They do not believe that the NPT is capable of dealing with political conflicts, especially in the Middle East and South Asia. NPT advocates see the proliferation problem as a result of nuclear aspirations of the new nuclear states. This is not the way the new nuclear states define the problem. Countries go nuclear because they have regional and international security dilemmas. The old nuclear states see themselves as part of the solution of regional conflicts, but, in the views of the new nuclear states, they become a part of the problem when the interests of the old and the new nuclear states clash. Figure 1 shows why the interests of the new nuclear states are served by proliferation. For them, nonproliferation is costly if it leads to national insecurity. The indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 and the conclusion of the CTBT in 1996 indicate that the nonproliferation constituency is strong, but can it prevail in the Middle East and South Asia? Since the 1970s, the constituency has gained institutional strength by developing nuclear sup­ply controls and full-scope safeguards. In addition, a post-NPT antinu­clear and antimissile orientation has emerged in the thinking and policies of the old Western nuclear powers. Adherence to the NPT is not enough; now the non-nuclear pledge requires a rollback of delivery capabilities, including dual-use space capabilities that have military and commercial applications. The Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) is meant to slow missile proliferation. The orientation of the Western nuclear pow­ers is to combine the NPT and the MTCR philosophies, along with post­-COCOM (Coordinating Committee on Export Controls) arrangements, to curb horizontal proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Despite its support among an overwhelming majority of states, the NPT lacks universal legitimacy.

No – Russia Economic Decline

Demographic shifts make Russian economic decline inevitable

Banking and stock exchange 5 ( Finance. Economics (Russia), 2/3/2005)

However, by the time it is going to happen, it can prove that there is no one in Russia to double GDP. According to Russian Statistics, beginning with 2007, number of economically active people will start shrinking by 1 million people a year. According to Mr. Sokolin, head of the Russian Statistics, demography "will be a serious economic limitation of our growth." "Then doubling of GDP will be out of the question," agrees Mr. Klepach.

The impact should have already happened – Russia already experienced a massive economic crisis.

Kotz 98( David teaches economics at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Nov/Dec 1998, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Economics/CapitalistCollapse\_Russia.html)

Despite the unprecedented economic depression, until recently Russian bankers kept getting richer and the stock market soared, buoyed by the lucrative trade in Russia's valuable oil, gas, and metals. Western banks helped to finance the speculative binge that drove up Russian stock prices, making it one of the world's best-performing stock markets in 1997. Then in the late spring of this year, Russia's stock market began to fall and investors started to pull their money out of the country. The Clinton administration, fearing that Yeltsin's government would not survive a looming financial crisis, pressed a reluctant IMF to approve a $22.6 billion emergency loan on July 13. This bailout proved unsuccessful. Four weeks later the financial crisis resumed as investors fled and Russia's government had to pay as much as 300% interest to attract buyers for its bonds. After Washington rejected Yeltsin's desperate plea for still more money, Russia did the unthinkable: it was forced to suspend payment on its foreign debt for 90 days, restructure its entire debt, and devalue the ruble. Panic followed, as Russia's high-flying banks teetered on the edge of collapse, depositors were unable to withdraw their money, and store shelves were rapidly emptied of goods. The financial collapse produced a political crisis, as President Yeltsin, his domestic support evaporating, had to contend with an emboldened opposition in the parliament.

Empirics prove no doomsday risk from Russian instability or economic decline

World Policy Journal 3 (12/22/03, http://www.worldpolicy.newschool.edu/journal/articles/wpj03-4/stent.html)

Using extensive interviews with participants in all three administrations, and memoirs by former officials, they paint a compelling picture of officials often over-whelmed by the challenge of an entirely new reality. The unexpected collapse of communism and of the Soviet Union, coming just after the GulfWar, left them with no road map to understand how Russia and other post-Soviet states might develop. Nightmare scenarios suggested themselves: nuclear war between Russia and Ukraine; weapons proliferation on a terrifying scale; Yugoslav-type ethnically based civil war on the territory of the former Soviet Union; mass starvation; economic collapse--the ominous possibilities were endless. That these "dogs did not bark" is testimony to the unwillingness of people in the post-Soviet space to engage in armed conflict and to Western assistance that staved off famine and economic collapse. The failure of catastrophic scenarios to come about is one indicator of success--but if one were to measure America's contribution to transforming Russia in more positive ways, the evidence is more mixed. If a minimalist definition of success was the absence of catastrophe, the maximalist definition was the creation of a fully functioning democracy in Russia with a transparent market economy and the rule of law. That has not happened yet, and it is unclear when it will. So far, there is no consensus about what would constitute a realistic timetable for Russia's democratic development.

\*\*\*TERRORISM\*\*\*

Yes – Nuclear Terrorism

A nuclear terror attack is coming before 2014 – it collapses the economy

Allison 8 (Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, is a former U.S. assistant secretary of defense, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18230/nuclear\_attack\_a\_worstcase\_reality.html, AD: 6/27/10) jl

In "Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe," published in 2004, I present the evidence for the proposition that on the current trajectory, a successful terrorist nuclear attack devastating one of the great cities of the world is inevitable. I offer my own considered judgment that if all the governments stay on autopilot, doing no more and no less than they are doing today, a nuclear 9/11 is more likely than not within a decade — that is, by 2014.  
Richard Garwin, a designer of the hydrogen bomb, was called by Nobel laureate Enrico Fermi "the only true genius I had ever met." Testifying to Congress in March 2007, Mr. Garwin estimated a "20 percent per year probability of a nuclear explosion with American cities and European cities included."  
My Harvard colleague, Matthew Bunn, created a model that estimates the probability of a terrorist nuclear attack over a 10-year period to be 29 percent — identical to the average estimate from a poll of security experts commissioned by Sen. Richard G. Lugar, Indiana Republican, in 2005.  
Former Defense Secretary William J. Perry has expressed that my work underestimates the risk. Warren Buffet, the world's most successful investor and legendary odds-maker in pricing insurance policies for unlikely but catastrophic events, concluded that nuclear terrorism is "inevitable." As he has stated: "I don't see any way that it won't happen." Are there real and serious adversaries of the United States intent on conducting a terrorist nuclear attack on the homeland? Yes.  
Al Qaeda remains a formidable enemy with clear nuclear ambitions. In 1998, Osama bin Laden declared that obtaining weapons of mass destruction was "a religious duty" for al Qaeda. According to the final report of the 9/11 commission, "Al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least 10 years ... and continues to pursue its strategic goal of obtaining a nuclear capability." Al Qaeda spokesman Sulaiman Abu Ghaith announced the group's objective — "to kill 4 million Americans — 2 million of them children," in retaliation for the deaths the group thinks the United States and Israel have inflicted on Muslims.  
As former CIA Director George J. Tenet reveals in his memoir, "the most senior leaders of al Qaeda are still singularly focused on acquiring [weapons of mass destruction]... . The main threat is the nuclear one. I am convinced that this is where Osama bin Laden and his operatives desperately want to go."  
Homeland Security Undersecretary Charles Allen confirmed Mr. Tenet's view in his Senate testimony earlier this month. He told lawmakers: "Our post-9/11 successes against the Taliban in Afghanistan yielded volumes of information that completely changed our view of al Qaeda's nuclear program. We learned that al Qaeda wants a weapon to use, not a weapon to sustain and build a stockpile. ... A terrorist group needs only to produce a nuclear yield once to change history." Would a nuclear 9/11 be a game-changer? You bet.  
Consider the consequences of even a single nuclear bomb exploding in just one U.S. city. Researchers at the Rand Corp., a U.S. government-funded think tank, estimated that a nuclear explosion at the Port of Long Beach, Calif., would cause immediate indirect costs worldwide of more than $3 trillion and that shutting down U.S. ports would cut world trade by 10 percent.  
The negative economic repercussions would reverberate well beyond the developed world. As former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned, "Were a nuclear terrorist attack to occur, it would cause not only widespread death and destruction, but would stagger the world economy and thrust tens of millions of people into dire poverty," creating "a second death toll throughout the developing world."

Nuclear terrorist attacks are imminent and probable

Wilson 10 (Valerie, Staff Writer, http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/04/08/plame.wilson.nuclear.danger/index.html, AD: 6/28/10) jl

We know that terrorist groups have been trying to buy, build or steal a bomb.

In the past two decades, there have been at least 25 instances of nuclear explosive materials being lost or stolen. There is enough highly enriched uranium, or HEU, in the world today to build more than 100,000 bombs.

Terrorists looking to buy or steal HEU could look to the approximately 40 countries with nuclear weapons materials. And then there are rogue individuals out there who are running black markets selling nuclear materials and technology.

Pakistan's Dr. A. Q. Khan did it for years before my group at the CIA brought him down in December 2003 after catching him red-handed selling a full-scale nuclear bomb to Moammar Gadhafi's regime in Libya.

If terrorists manage to get their hands on enough HEU, they could smuggle it into a target city, build a bomb and explode it. A hundred pounds of highly enriched uranium could fit in a shoebox, and 100,000 shipping containers come into the United States every day.

Yes – Nuclear Terrorism

Terrorists can get the bomb

Cohen 5 (Ariel, Research Fellow at Heritage Foundation, http://hirc.house.gov/archives/109/20649.PDF, AD: 7/9/10) jl

Experts believe that terrorists are willing to inflict massive casualties using WMD, that they are capable doing so despite technical difficulties that may be encountered in execution of such an undertaking, and that they are capable of either stealing or building a nuclear bomb, even of a technologically crude variety. Cases of stealing HEU were documented by IAEA.10 Nuclear terrorism presents at least four distinct kinds of threats: • Radiation dispersion devices (also known as ‘‘dirty bombs,’’ powered by conventional explosives); • Attacks on nuclear installations, such as reactors; • Seizure and detonation of intact nuclear weapons; and • Stealing or buying of nuclear materials to build a nuclear bomb.11

Yes – Bioterrorism

A bioterror attack will happen before 2013 – terrorists have access to infectious diseases that will kill exponentially more people than a conventional attack

AP 8 (http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,459927,00.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Terrorists are likely to attack the United States using nuclear or biological weapons before 2013, according to a report released by a bipartisan commission. Vice President-elect Joe Biden was briefed on the panel's study on Tuesday. Among other things, the report suggests that the incoming Obama administration shore up its counterterrorism efforts to fight against germ warfare. "Our margin of safety is shrinking, not growing," states the report, a copy of which was obtained by FOX News. It is scheduled to be publicly released Wednesday. [Click here for the report.](http://www.foxnews.com/projects/pdf/WMDReport.pdf) The commission is also encouraging the new White House to appoint one official on the National Security Council to exclusively coordinate U.S. intelligence and foreign policy on combatting the spread of nuclear and biological weapons. The report of the Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism, led by former Sens. Bob Graham of Florida and Jim Talent of Missouri, acknowledges that terrorist groups still lack the needed scientific and technical ability to make weapons out of pathogens or nuclear bombs. But it warns that gap can be easily overcome, if terrorists find scientists willing to share or sell their know-how. "The United States should be less concerned that terrorists will become biologists and far more concerned that biologists will become terrorists," the report states. The commission believes biological weapons are more likely to be obtained and used before nuclear or radioactive weapons because nuclear facilities are more carefully guarded. Civilian laboratories with potentially dangerous pathogens abound, however, and could easily be compromised. "The biological threat is greater than the nuclear; the acquisition of deadly pathogens, and their weaponization and dissemination in aerosol form, would entail fewer technical hurdles than the theft or production of weapons-grade uranium or plutonium and its assembly into an improvised nuclear device," states the report. It notes that the U.S. government's counterproliferation activities have been geared toward preventing nuclear terrorism. The commission recommends the prevention of biological terrorism be made a higher priority. President Bush will meet with the commission on Wednesday, a White House spokesman told FOX News. Democratic Rep. Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts, a senior member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and co-chair of the House Bipartisan Task Force on Nonproliferation, called the report "an urgent call to action." The report "should trigger strong, coordinated steps to improve our country's ability to prevent proliferation and thwart terrorist attacks using nuclear and biological weapons," Markey said in a written statement. Study chairman Graham said anthrax remains the most likely biological weapon. However, he told the AP that contagious diseases — like the flu strain that killed 40 million at the beginning of the 20th century — are looming threats. That virus has been recreated in scientific labs, and there remains no inoculation to protect against it if is stolen and released. Graham said the threat of a terrorist attack using nuclear or biological weapons is growing "not because we have not done positive things but because adversaries are moving at an even faster pace to increase their access" to those materials. He noted last week's rampage by a small group of gunmen in Mumbai. "If those people had had access to a biological or nuclear weapon they would have multiplied by orders of magnitude the deaths they could have inflicted," he said.

Yes – Bioterrorism

An attack using bioweapons is possible and imminent – their defense doesn’t apply

O'Toole 2k7 (Tara, MD, MPH, Director and CEO, Center for Biosecurity of UPMC before the Congress of the United States, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, "Hearing on Bioterrorism Preparedness and the Role of DHS Chief Medical Officer," March 29, http://www.upmc-biosecurity.org/website/resources/hearings/2007/20070329-btprepanddhscmo.html, AD: 7/2/09) jl

A covert bioterror attack on U.S. civilians or, even worse, a campaign of such attacks, is within the capability of terrorist groups today and could potentially cause tens of thousands of casualties and immense social and economic disruption. The scope and seriousness of the bioterror threat has been emphasized and verified by multiple U.S. government agencies and analyses. DHS’ own Probabilistic Threat Assessment of Biological Agents is a well-done technical analysis of the biothreat. I urge every member of this committee to be briefed on this assessment and to be familiar with the national security implications of this analysis. The Lethality of Biological and Nuclear Weapons are Comparable **The lethality of biological weapons mirrors that of nuclear weapons**. Nothing else—not large conventional explosions, not chemical weapons, and not radiation devices—is in the same class. In 1993, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment determined that **100 kilograms of aerosolized anthrax released upwind of Washington, DC, under favorable weather conditions would cause 1 to 3 million deaths**—approximately **the same number of casualties that would result from a one** megaton **hydrogen bomb** dropped on the city. A subsequent analysis by the World Health Organization posited similar death tolls from a biological attack Biological weapons have been proven to work on a large scale by U.S. testing in the South Pacific in the 1960s and 70s. We know now that the former Soviet Union had a massive bioweapons program that employed 40,000 people at its height and manufactured hundreds of tons of powdered anthrax and smallpox annually. This secret program was largely invisible until defectors detailed its existence. It is important to recognize that the technical barriers to building bioweapons that faced the superpowers in the 1970s have been overtaken by the rapid advancements in bioscience. **There are today no significant technical barriers to terrorists seeking to conduct large-scale bioattacks.** As the Defense Science Board wrote in June 2001: …**major impediments to the development of biological weapons—strain availability, weaponization technology, and delivery technology—have been largely eliminated in the last decade by the rapid global spread of biotechnology.** - Report of the Defense Science Board/Threat Reduction Advisory Committee Task Force on Biological Defense. Washington, DC: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. June 2001.  Biological Terrorism is the National Intelligence Council’s “Greatest Concern” **Al Qaeda is known to be seeking biological weapons, and** according to the Robb-Silverman Commission's report on WMD IntelligenceCapabilities, **evidence gathered in Afghanistan demonstrated that Al Qaeda’s  efforts to develop bioweapons were more advanced than had been expected**.1 In 2004, the U.S. National Intelligence Council declared: Our greatest concern is that terrorists might acquire biological agents, or less likely,  a nuclear device, either of which could cause mass casualties.  - Mapping the Global Future. Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project, December 2004. **The ease with which bioweapons programs can be hidden and the lack of any definitive intelligence “signatures” indicative of illicit bioweapons activity are** some of the reasons **why these** “asymmetric” **weapons are attractive to terrorists**. **The materials and know-how** needed to build a powerful bioweapon have legitimate, “dual-use” applications, **making it very difficult to identify or track bioterrorist plans and preparations.** **We cannot count on identifying and interdicting would-be bioterrorists before they strike, and, as the 2001 anthrax attacks demonstrated**, it is extremely difficult to assign attribution for such attacks once they occur. **This means** that **traditional deterrence**, which rests on certain and severe retribution, **might be less effective against bioterrorist threats**. Biodefense Rests on Capacity to Mitigate Consequences of Attack **The extreme difficulty of detecting** or interdicting **bioterrorist efforts means that defense against covert bioterror attacks must rest on the nation’s ability to diminish the death, suffering, and economic and social disruption that could result from bioattacks.** This harsh truth is presumably the insight behind the dramatic increase in biodefense spending that began in 2002—federal spending on civilian biodefense went from approximately $250 million in FY2002 to nearly $4 billion in FY2003; funding levels overall have remained more or less constant since. These sums are significant when measured against other spending programs in the Department of Health and Human Services, which presides over most “biodefense” initiatives. Four billion dollars per year does not seem like so much money if one compares this amount to sums routinely spent on national security programs in the Department of Defense. The important questions, of course, are: **Is the country getting the defense against bioattacks that we need with the programs we have? Could we do better?**

No – Terrorism – No Impact

No impact to terrorism

Milholin 2 (Gary, Director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, AD: 6/27/10) jl

Despite the reports, and despite the attendant warnings, the risk that a terrorist group like al Qaeda could get the bomb (or a "dirty" substitute) is much lower than most people think. That is the good news. There is also bad news: the risk is not zero. THERE ARE essentially two ways for a terrorist group to lay its hands on a nuclear weapon: either build one from scratch or somehow procure an already manufactured one or its key components. Neither of these is likely. Building a bomb from scratch would confer the most power: a group that could build one bomb could build several, and a nuclear arsenal would put it front and center on the world stage. But of all the possibilities, this is the unlikeliest--"so remote," in the words of a senior nuclear scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, "that it can be essentially ruled out." The chief obstacle lies in producing the nuclear fuel--either bomb-grade uranium or plutonium--that actually explodes in a chain reaction. More than 80 percent of the effort that went into making America's first bombs was devoted to producing this fuel, and it is no easy task. To make bomb-grade uranium, a terrorist group would need thousands of high-speed gas centrifuges, machined to exact dimensions, arranged in series, and capable of operating under the most demanding conditions. If they wanted to produce the uranium by a diffusion process, they would need an even greater number of other machines, equally difficult to manufacture and operate. If they followed Saddam Hussein's example, they could try building a series of giant electromagnets, capable of bending a stream of electrically charged particles--a no less daunting challenge. For any of these, they would also need a steady supply of natural uranium and a specialized plant to convert it to a gaseous form for processing. Who would sell these things to would-be nuclear terrorists? The answer is: nobody. The world's nuclear-equipment makers are organized into a cooperative group that exists precisely to stop items like these from getting into unauthorized hands. Nor could a buyer disguise the destination and send materials through obliging places like Dubai (as Iran does with its hot cargoes) or Malta (favored by Libya's smugglers). The equipment is so specialized, and the suppliers so few, that a forest of red flags would go up. And even if the equipment could be bought, it would have to be operated in a place that the United States could not find. If manufacturing bomb-grade uranium is out of the picture, what about making plutonium, a much smaller quantity of which is required to form a critical mass (less than fourteen pounds was needed to destroy Nagasaki in 1945)? There is, however, an inconvenient fact about plutonium, which is that you need a reactor to make enough of it for a workable bomb. Could terrorists buy one? The Russians are selling a reactor to Iran, but Moscow tends to put terrorist groups in the same category as Chechens. The Chinese are selling reactors to Pakistan, but Beijing, too, is not fond of terrorists. India and Pakistan can both build reactors on their own, but, for now, these countries are lined up with the U.S. Finally, smuggling a reactor would be no easier than buying one. Reactor parts are unique, so manufacturers would not be fooled by phony purchase orders. Even if terrorists somehow got hold of a reactor, they would need a special, shielded chemical plant to chop up its radioactive fuel, dissolve it in acid, and then extract the plutonium from the acid. No one would sell them a plutonium extraction plant, either. It is worth remembering that Saddam Hussein tried the reactor road in the 1970's. He bought one from France--Jacques Chirac, in his younger days, was a key facilitator of the deal--hoping it would propel Iraq into the nuclear club. But the reactor's fuel was sabotaged in a French warehouse, the person who was supposed to certify its quality was murdered in a Paris hotel, and when the reactor was finally ready to operate, a squadron of Israeli fighter-bombers blew it apart. A similar fate would undoubtedly await any group that tried to follow Saddam's method today. IF MAKING nuclear-bomb fuel is a no-go, why not just steal it, or buy it on the black market? Consider plutonium. There are hundreds of reactors in the world, and they crank out tons of the stuff every year. Surely a dedicated band of terrorists could get their hands on some. This too is not so simple. Plutonium is only created inside reactor fuel rods, and the rods, after being irradiated, become so hot that they melt unless kept under water. They are also radioactive, which is why they have to travel submerged from the reactor to storage ponds, with the water acting as both coolant and radiation shield. And in most power reactors, the rods are welded together into long assemblies that can be lifted only by crane. True, after the rods cool down they can be stored dry, but their radioactivity is still lethal. To prevent spent fuel rods from killing the people who come near them, they are transported in giant radiation-shielding casks that are not supposed to break open even in head-on collisions. The casks are also guarded. If terrorists managed to hijack one from a country that had reactors they would still have to take it to a plant in another country that could extract the plutonium from the rods. They would be hunted at every step of the way. Instead of fuel rods, they would be better advised to go after pure plutonium, already removed from the reactor fuel and infinitely easier to handle. This kind of plutonium is a threat only if you ingest or inhale it. Human skin blocks its radiation: a terrorist could walk around with a lump of it in his front trouser pocket and still have children. But where to get hold of it? Russia is the best bet: it has tons of plutonium in weapon-ready form, and the Russian nuclear-accounting system is weak. Russia also has underpaid scientists, and there is unquestionably some truth behind all the stories one hears about the smuggling that goes on in that country. But very little Russian plutonium has been in circulation, with not a single reported case of anything more than gram quantities showing up on the black market. This makes sense. Pure plutonium is used primarily for making nuclear warheads, it is in military hands, and military forces are not exactly keen to see it come back at them in somebody else's bombs. One source of pure plutonium that is not military is a new kind of reactor fuel called "mixed oxide." It is very different from the present generation of fuel because it contains weapon-ready material. But precisely because it is weapon-ready, it is guarded and accounted for, and a terrorist group would have to win a gun battle to get close to it. Then they would probably need a crane to move it, and would have to elude or fight off their pursuers. If terrorists did procure some weapon-ready plutonium, would their problems be over? Far from it: plutonium works only in an "implosion"-type bomb,
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No – Terrorism – No Impact
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which is about ten times more difficult to build than the simple uranium bomb used at Hiroshima. In such a device, a spherical shock wave "implodes" inward and squeezes a ball of plutonium at the bomb's center so that it explodes in a chain reaction. To accomplish all this, one needs precision machine tools to build the parts, special furnaces to melt and cast the plutonium in a vacuum (liquid plutonium oxidizes rapidly in air), and high-precision switches and capacitors for the firing circuit. Also required are a qualified designer, a number of other specialists, and a testing program. Considering who the participating scientists are likely to be, the chances of getting an implosion bomb to work are rather small. THE ALTERNATIVE to plutonium is bomb-grade uranium--and here things would be easier. This is the fuel used in the Hiroshima bomb. Unlike the implosion bomb dropped on Nagasaki, this one did not have to be tested: the U.S. knew it would work. The South Africans built six uranium bombs without testing; they knew their bombs would work, too. All these devices used a simple "gun" design in which one slug of uranium was shot down a barrel into another. The problem with buying bomb-grade uranium is that one would need a great deal of it--around 120 pounds for a gun-type bomb--and nothing near that amount has turned up in the black market.

No – Nuclear Terrorism – Fails

Terrorist can’t obtain material – Smuggling is caught because of information sharing and raids on imports.

Goodby, Coffey, and Loeb 7 (James, chief negotiator for Nunn-Lugar agreements with Russia,Timothy - Research Associate at the Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473225&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Most seizures along these identified routes involve amateur smugglers with relatively small amounts of material. In some cases, small quantities of high-grade material have been seized, which usually indicates a major trafficker providing a small sample of a much larger supply to a potential customer for testing. There are very few cases involving large shipments of material, as these incidents involve international criminal organizations or nation-states, both with the resources to conduct counterintelligence and counter-surveillance operations.11 Airports, borders, and ports in countries identified as having nuclear materials where theft has occurred or where facilities are least secure. Such locations include Russia and former Soviet States, such as Georgia and Uzbekistan. Intelligence organizations around the world will have to cooperate to achieve the quickest possible sharing of information and resources if we are to interdict nuclear materials before they reach their intended destination. Agencies involved in counter-terrorism intelligence, as well as those specializing in smuggling and interdiction operations will need to freely share information. An international coordinating body, operating under UNSCR 1540, would provide the platform for closer collaboration among law enforcement and intelligence organizations and the management of international nuclear detection activities. Fortunately, many police and law enforcement agencies, as well as international organizations like Interpol and the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime, already provide a platform for information sharing. One good example of effective multilateral cooperation is the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). Countries participating in PSI agreements and exercises help build relationships and operational cooperation and provide information aimed at improving targeted interdiction, cooperation, and intelligence sharing. Law enforcement agencies around the world generally have longstanding working relationships in the area of combating organized criminal activity and are able to cooperate closely and quickly on the interdiction and apprehension of smugglers and traffickers. “Indeed, [prior to September 11] transatlantic law enforcement collaboration already had ironed out any barriers to concluding agreements on evidence sharing, cooperation in law enforcement, intelligence gathering, rendition of fugitives, joint training, harmonized standards, port security, and financial regulation.”12

No – Nuclear Terrorism – Fails

Even if they attempted a nuclear terror attack, it has too a high a probably of failure

Levi 7 (Michael, CFR Fellow for Science and Technology, http://www.cfr.org/publication/13097/how\_likely\_is\_a\_nuclear\_terrorist\_attack\_on\_the\_united\_states.html, AD: 6/27/10) jl

We should not, however, underestimate the odds of terrorist failure. There isn’t enough space here to make that point comprehensively, but I’ll try to convince you that simple arguments for why failure is highly unlikely may be weaker than they seem.

The case for the ease of building a gun-type weapon provides a good example of how we often overestimate how easy a terrorist task may be. I certainly won’t debate the fact that Manhattan Project scientists “were so confident about this design that they persuaded military authorities to drop the bomb, untested, on Hiroshima.” But we should parse the word “untested” carefully.

During the Manhattan Project, scientists and engineers spent years testing the gun itself; testing their casting and machining of the uranium metal to avoid fires and criticality accidents during production, and impurities in the product; testing the initiator that would trigger the chain reaction; and testing how different configurations of materials would behave, a project that led to the death of one physicist. No one conducted a full-scale test explosion, but that hardly means that building the weapon was trivial.

A terrorist group would have to do many of the same things (though technological progress would make some steps easier) all while attempting to hide from law enforcement and intelligence. This doesn’t mean that terrorists couldn’t build a gun-type bomb, but it suggests that their chances of failure aren’t negligible.

This takes on special importance in the context of a broader defense. Imagine a terrorist group faces only a twenty percent chance of failure while building a bomb. But imagine it also faces a similarly small chance of failure while attempting to purchase nuclear materials, while attempting to recruit scientists and engineers, while raising money for its plot, while smuggling materials into the United States, while purchasing non-nuclear components for its weapon, while assembling the bomb in a safehouse, and in other elements of its plot. If we combine, for example, ten such hurdles, we get a ninety percent chance of failure. We can debate the numbers, but this suggests that we shouldn’t be too quick to ignore small chances of terrorist failure.

A final note on the question of failure-aversion, a quality most terrorism analysts still, even after 9/11, attribute to most terrorist groups. I agree that al-Qaeda is patient and plans carefully. But that does not mean that after careful and methodical consideration, and facing a properly designed defense, al-Qaeda might not decide that a nuclear plot is too much of a stretch to seriously try.

No – Nuclear Terrorism – AT: Stolen Materials

SLD solves stolen materials – US-Russia cooperation

Goodby, Coffey, and Loeb 7 (James, chief negotiator for Nunn-Lugar agreements with Russia,Timothy - Research Associate at the Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473225&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf, AD: 7/7/10) jl

The SLD-Core Program was initially created to assist Russia in its efforts to safeguard against nuclear and fissile materials smuggling and trafficking. The U.S. officially began working with the Russian Customs Service in 1998 in an effort to equip Russian border crossings, airports, and other strategic feeder ports with handheld and fixed radiation detection equipment and the specialized training required to use the detectors. Since it began working with the Russian Customs Service in 1998, the SLD-Core program has equipped 88 sites with detection related technologies.17 To ramp up nuclear detection activities in Russia, DOE recently announced that the United States and Russia have agreed to emplace radiation detection monitors at all of Russia’s 350 international border crossings by 2011, which is 6 years earlier than originally planned.18 The NNSA SLD-Core program has expanded its focus since 1998 and has installed monitoring equipment in Former Soviet Union (FSU) states and Greece and is currently working with countries in Eastern Europe and the Caucasus, Baltic, and Mediterranean regions. The SLD-Core program is also responsible for the repair and upkeep of radiation detection equipment installed by other U.S. Government agencies at the end of the Cold War.1

Stealing and striking a city with stolen nuclear material would be next to impossible – constant maintenance and the ability for material to be tracked make an attack unlikely.

Choong 9 (William, Senior Writer at The Straits Times, Lexis, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Since 1946, however, no attack as conceived by Oppenheimer has occurred. In addition, experts point out that none of these so-called 'suitcase bombs' - which were built in the former Soviet Union before 1991 - have been lost. And since they require constant maintenance, their effectiveness by now would also be very low.

Essentially, terrorists have two major routes to a nuclear device: getting or buying it from a nuclear-armed state or building one themselves. Getting a bomb from a nuclear-state is a formidable task, since such states know that the source of a nuclear weapon can be easily tracked. Mr Stephen Younger, the former head of the US Defence Threat Reduction Agency, says that regardless of what is reported in the media, 'all nuclear nations take the security of their nuclear weapons very seriously'.

No – Nuclear Terrorism – AT: Precautionary Principle

Precautionary Principle is asinine – any impact “could” happen – We shouldn’t evaluate low probability impacts.

Choong 9 (William, Senior Writer at The Straits Times, Lexis, AD: 7/7/10) jl

He takes issue with alarmists who argue that an act of nuclear terror is 'not impossible'. Somewhat cynically, he writes: 'It is entirely 'not impossible' that a colliding meteor or comet could destroy the earth, that Vladimir Putin or the British could decide one morning to launch a few nuclear weapons at Massachusetts, (or that) George Bush could decide to bomb Hollywood.'

He is not alone in his scepticism about the purported nuclear terrorist threat. Mr Michael Levi, author of On Nuclear Terrorism, argues that in the cascade of warnings about nuclear terrorism, less emphasis has been placed on the power of a multi-layered defence.

He writes: 'It has often been said that defence against terrorism must succeed every time, but that terrorists must succeed only once. This is true from plot to plot, but within each plot, the logic is reversed. Terrorists must succeed at every stage, but the defence needs to succeed only once.'

No – Nuclear Terrorism – AT: Terrorists Build Weapons

Having instructions does not guarantee success – the odds of actually constructing and detonating a nuclear weapon is one in over three billion

Choong 9 (William, Senior Writer at The Straits Times, Lexis, AD: 7/7/10) jl

This leaves the second route: terrorists building a nuclear device themselves. And arguably, nuclear terrorists can find do-it-yourself instructions for a nuclear weapon, albeit crude ones, on the Internet.

Having the blueprint for a weapon, however, does not guarantee the production of that weapon. In the estimation of Professor John Mueller, a political scientist at Ohio University, terrorists will have to successfully navigate about 20 steps to build an improvised nuclear device - and all the steps must be achieved. These include processes centred on producing, transporting and detonating the device.

If the terrorist group has a 50 per cent chance of success for each step, the odds of the group pulling off all the steps would be one in a million. If each step involves a 33 per cent chance of success, the odds of pulling off all of them would drop to one in over three billion, Prof Mueller says in an e-mail in reply to questions by this newspaper.

No – Nuclear Terrorism – AT: Retaliation

Zero chance of a lashout—multiple reasons

Bremmer 4 (Ian, President of Eurasia Group and Senior Fellow at the World Policy Institute, http://www.newstatesman.com/200409130005, AD: 7/7/10) jl

**What would happen if there were a new terrorist attack inside the U**nited **S**tates on 11 September 2004? How would it affect the presidential election campaign? The conventional wisdom is that Americans - their patriotic defiance aroused - would rally to President George W Bush and make him an all but certain winner in November. But consider the differences between the context of the original 9/11 and that of any attack which might occur this autumn. In 2001, the public reaction was one of disbelief and incomprehension. Many Americans realised for the first time that large-scale terrorist attacks on US soil were not only conceivable; they were, perhaps, inevitable. A majority focused for the first time on the threat from al-Qaeda, on the Taliban and on the extent to which Saudis were involved in terrorism. This time, the public response would move much more quickly from shock to anger; debate over how America should respond would begin immediately. Yet **it is difficult to imagine how the Bush administration could focus its response on an external enemy**. Should the US send 50,000 troops to the Afghan-Pakistani border to intensify the hunt for Osama Bin Laden and "step up" efforts to attack the heart of al-Qaeda? Many would wonder if that wasn't what the administration pledged to do after the attacks three years ago. **The president would face intensified criticism from those who have argued all along that Iraq was a distraction** from "the real war on terror".And what if a significant number of the terrorists responsible for the pre-election attack were again Saudis? **The Bush administration could hardly take military action against the Saudi government** at a time when crude-oil prices are already more than $45 a barrel and global supply is stretched to the limit. While the Saudi royal family might support a co-ordinated attack against terrorist camps, real or imagined, near the Yemeni border - where recent searches for al-Qaeda have concentrated - that would seem like a trivial, insufficient retaliation for an attack on the US mainland. Remember how the Republicans criticised Bill Clinton's administration for ineffectually "bouncing the rubble" in Afghanistan after the al-Qaeda attacks on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in the 1990s. So what kind of response might be credible? Washington's concerns about Iran are rising. The 9/11 commission report noted evidence of co-operation between Iran and al-Qaeda operatives, if not direct Iranian advance knowledge of the 9/11 hijacking plot. Over the past few weeks, US officials have been more explicit, too, in declaring Iran's nuclear programme "unacceptable". However, **in the absence of an official** Iranian **claim of responsibility for this hypothetical terrorist attack, the domestic opposition to such a war and the international outcry it would provoke would make quick action** against Iran **unthinkable.**In short, **a decisive response from Bush could not be external. It would have to be domestic**. Instead of Donald Rumsfeld, the defence secretary, leading a war effort abroad, Tom Ridge, the homeland security secretary, and John Ashcroft, the attorney general, would pursue an anti-terror campaign at home. Forced to use legal tools more controversial than those provided by the Patriot Act, Americans would experience stepped-up domestic surveillance and border controls, much tighter security in public places and the detention of a large number of suspects. Many Americans would undoubtedly support such moves. But **concern for civil liberties and personal freedom would ensure that the government would have nowhere near the public support it enjoyed for the invasion of Afghanistan**.

No – Bioterrorism – Reliability

**Bioweapons can’t be used – too unreliable**

Walter **Laqueur**, Cochairman, International Research Council, The Center for Strategic and International Studies, The New Terrorism, 19**99**, pg. 69

The attractions of biological weapons are obvious: easy access, low cost, toxicity, and the panic they can cause. But there are drawbacks of various kinds that explain why almost no successful attacks have occurred. While explosive or nuclear devices or even chemical agents, however horrific, affect a definite space, biological agents are unpredictable: they can easily get out of control, backfire, or have no effect at all. They constitute a high risk to the attackers, although the same, of course, is true of chemical weapons. This consideration may not dissuade people willing to sacrifice their own lives, but the possibility that the attacker may kill himself before being able to launch an attack may make him hesitate to carry it out. Biological agents, with some notable exceptions, are affected by changes in heat or cold, and, like chemical agents, by changes in the direction of the wind. They have a limited life span, and their means of delivery are usually complicated. The process of contaminating water res­ervoirs or foodstuffs involves serious technical problems. Even if an agent survives the various purification systems in water reservoirs, boiling the water would destroy most germs. Dispersing the agent as a vapor or via an aerosol system within a closed space‑for instance, through the air conditioning system of a big building or in a subway‑would ear to offer better chances of success, but it is by no mens foolproof.

On balance, biological weapons are less effective, or obtainable than other weapons – prefer our comparative evidence

Parachini 1 (John, Policy Analyst, Rand Corporation, http://www.rand.org/pubs/testimonies/2005/CT183.pdf, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Despite the incentives for seeking and using biological weapons, there are a number of even more compelling disincentives. As noted earlier, terrorists may hesitate in using biological weapons specifically because breaking the taboo on their use may evoke considerable retaliation. In addition, state sponsors of terrorist groups may exert restraint on the weapons the group uses. State sponsors have a great incentive to control the activities of the groups they support, because they fear that retaliation may be directed against them if they are connected to a group that used biological weapons. Moreover, terrorists may be drawn to explosives like arsonists are drawn to fire. The immediate gratification of explosives and the thrill of the blast may meet a psychological need of terrorists that the delayed effects of biological weapons do not.

No – Bioterrorism – No Tech

Technical barriers prevent bioweapons

Tucker 99 (Jonathan, director of the CBW Nonproliferation Project at Center for Nonprolif Studies at Monterey Instit, Amy Sands, http://www.bullatomsci.org/issues/1999/ja99/ja99tucker.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

One reason there have been so few successful examples of chemical or biological terrorism is that carrying out an attack requires overcoming a series of major technical hurdles: gaining access to specialized chemical-weapon ingredients or virulent microbial strains; acquiring equipment and know-how for agent production and dispersal; and creating an organizational structure capable of resisting infiltration or early detection by law enforcement. Many of the microorganisms best suited to catastrophic terrorism-virulent strains of anthrax or deadly viruses such as smallpox and Ebola-are difficult to acquire. Further, nearly all viral and rickettsial agents are hard to produce, and bacteria such as plague are difficult to "weaponize" so that they will survive the process of delivery. As former Soviet bioweapons scientist Ken Alibek wrote in his recent memoir, Biohazard, "The most virulent culture in a test tube is useless as an offensive weapon until it has been put through a process that gives it stability and predictability. The manufacturing technique is, in a sense, the real weapon, and it is harder to develop than individual agents." The capability to disperse microbes and toxins over a wide area as an inhalable aerosol-the form best suited for inflicting mass casualties-requires a delivery system whose development would outstrip the technical capabilities of all but the most sophisticated terrorists. Not only is the dissemination process for biological agents inherently complex, requiring specialized equipment and expertise, but effective dispersal is easily disrupted by environmental and meteorological conditions. A large-scale attack with anthrax spores against a city, for example, would require the use of a crop duster with custom-built spray nozzles that could generate a high-concentration aerosol cloud containing particles of agent between one and five microns in size. Particles smaller than one micron would not lodge in the victims' lungs, while particles much larger than five microns would not remain suspended for long in the atmosphere. To generate mass casualties, the anthrax would have to be dried and milled into a fine powder. Yet this type of processing requires complex and costly equipment, as well as systems for high biological containment. Anthrax is simpler to handle in a wet form called a "slurry," but the efficiency of aerosolization is greatly reduced.

No risk of a bio-attack—even if terrorists could build the weapons, they would be difficult to transport.

Parachini 1 (John, Policy Analyst, Rand Corporation, http://www.rand.org/pubs/testimonies/2005/CT183.pdf, AD: 7/7/10) jl

Sub-national groups or individuals can develop or acquire their own biological weapon capabilities for clandestine use, but it is not easy. Terrorist groups and individuals have historically not employed biological weapons because of a combination of formidable barriers to acquisition and use and comparatively readily available alternatives and disincentives. Procurement of materials and recruitment of people with skills and know-how are formidable barriers. Even if some of the materials and production equipment are procurable for legitimate scientific or industrial purposes, handling virulent biological materials and fashioning them into weapons capable of producing mass casualties is beyond the reach of most sub-national groups or individuals.

Bioterrorism is not a threat—methods are too inefficient and impractical

Sievers 1 (Rod, chancellor for media relations at SIUC, http://news.siuc.edu/news/October01/100901r1152.html, AD: 7/7/10) jl

CARBONDALE, Ill. -- In the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C., many Americans have concluded that what was once unthinkable may now be possible. Some speculate terrorists may next try to unleash deadly toxins or diseases. "Certainly, bio and chemical terrorism is a credible threat," said Talley, the associate director of SIUC's Center for Environmental Health and Safety, "but it's not very practical for terrorists who want immediate results." Take crop dusters for instance. "Sure, someone could load up a crop duster with deadly chemicals or biologicals, but those agents would have to be spread over a very large, populated area to have any chance of causing a lot of harm," Talley said. "Getting a crop duster to fly over a large city at a low altitude just isn't very probable." Spraying deadly chemicals onto crops is a more likely scenario, but Talley believes the U.S. Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration, responsible for ensuring the safety of America's food supply, would be quick to quarantine contaminated food.

No – Bioterrorism – Deterrence

Deterrence works against bioterrorism now—the impact doesn’t equal nuclear war and multiple checks prevent spread

Danzig 3 (Richard, Former Secretary of the Navy and Senior Fellow at The CNA Corporation, 24 Cardozo L. Rev. 1497, Lexis) jl

One of the striking differences (though it has not been broadly grasped) about biological terrorism in this regard is that self-protective mechanisms are, in fact, stabilizing rather than destabilizing. They increase deterrence. If you are thinking about unleashing a biological weapon, and the United States has thought about it in advance, has worked up a methodology for dealing with it, and has come to grips with many of the kinds of issues I described, it decreases, rather than increases, the incentives to use it. So, that is the first of the three differences that I would cite. A second major difference is in the continuous nature of a biological attack, and the fact that, unlike a nuclear attack, it is not cataclysmic at the moment of release. As a result, you have some opportunities for limiting damage: for example, the ability to quarantine so that your smallpox cases are limited in number.  [\*1510]  Similarly, you have the ability to administer treatment, so that the anthrax cases result in relatively small numbers in terms of deaths caused. In fact, we have substantially improved our anthrax and smallpox response capabilities in the wake of the 5/11 attacks. That is a big achievement. Thus, a biological attack is very different from nuclear warfare and the creation of a civil defense against nuclear warfare. We have to jettison the old paradigm both for the reasons of deterrence and also because of the opportunities for consequence management. The third difference is that investments in civil defense shelters in the 1950s were essentially sterile. If there was no nuclear attack, they yielded no reward to this country. They sit there and absorb our resources for no benefit. By contrast, investments in a public health capacity, which is the main form of preparation against bioterrorism, yield enormous rewards against everyday infectious diseases. Put another way, we are consistently being attacked by nature. Having a capacity to deal with that is very important. In 1918, the United States suffered, along with the rest of the world, from a global influenza epidemic. More than half a million Americans died as a result. We have progressed considerably in modern medicine, but we still do not know how to deal with viruses in ways that would thwart such an epidemic. Every year there is the potential for that kind of epidemic. So, quite apart from civil defense, investments in dealing with these epidemic-like issues can be extremely rewarding to society. Putting these together - the difference in deterrence, consequence management, and the everyday utility of these investments - you come up with a very different world from the traditional 1950's civil defense paradigm.

\*\*\*TRADE\*\*\*

Trade – High Now

Obama has recently endorsed many policies that will increase international free trade.

Wessel 7/1/10(David Wall Street Journal's economics editor “Free-Trade Winds May Be Picking Up Again” WSJ)AQB

The long-standing U.S. campaign for ever-freer global trade was a casualty of job-destroying recessions and widespread American suspicion that free trade means making it easier for China to steal American prosperity. But we may—emphasize may look back on the past few weeks as the moment when the trade tide turned. Consider three noteworthy developments. One, President Barack Obama promised Russia he'd push harder to bring it into the World Trade Organization. Moscow agreed to resume imports of U.S. chickens. Hey, all trade politics is local: The U.S. sold $750 million a year in chicken parts to Russia until Moscow blocked them on Jan. 1, citing concerns about the chlorinated wash used to clean them. Two, Mr. Obama suddenly revived a U.S.-South Korea free-trade pact, aiming for a handshake deal when he visits Seoul in November while conveniently deferring any congressional vote until after this fall's U.S. elections. Three, leaders of the Group of 20, the de facto board of directors of the world economy, publicly acknowledged the obvious: The nine-year-old Doha round of global trade talks won't end in agreement this year. But privately, they had a candid conversation about what it would take to break the current stalemate. Economists argue that trade helps both exporters (yes, jobs) and importers (not only more, cheaper goods, but also competition from abroad that keeps domestic producers on their toes). Embracing that view, President Bill Clinton persuaded skeptical Democrats to approve the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Uruguay Round and the admission of China into the world-trading system.

Recent win at the WTO will increase US free trade.

Capitol Confidential 7/8/10(Breitbart news service, “WTO Delivers Victory for Boeing, US Trade”)AQB

In a victory for American trade interests, the World Trade Organization rebuked the European Union for issuing government subsidies to European companies, giving them an advantage in international contract bidding. In what is being called a “stinging rebuke,” the WTO charged that the EU’s assistance constituted an illegal export subsidy. They requested that EU figure out a way to help European companies without adversely affecting American companies or discontinue the subsidies altogether. The ruling has particular significance for American company Boeing, which has been locked in a bidding war for large civil aircraft with a European company receiving these very subsidies, EADS. Boeing, which filed the case in the WTO, contended that EADS was being given an unfair advantage when bidding for American contracts since they were able to undercut American companies; the EU would provide a “loan” to EADS allowing them to bid less, with the agreement that EADS would repay the loan as planes were sold. The result? European companies were able to underbid American companies, take jobs from American workers and send them to Europe. Today, the WTO agreed that this was an unfair practice. The Wall Street Journal puts it bluntly: This has been obvious for years to most fair observers, but with the WTO ruling Germany, France, Spain and the U.K. now have a strong legal and political reason to end the practice of lending money to Airbus on easy terms to fund the development of new aircraft. The practice dates to Airbus’s beginnings as an multi-government-owned consortium, but the aircraft maker is no longer a fledgling and now splits the market for large civil aircraft nearly equally with Boeing. With soaring deficits and a debt crisis that is still creating turbulence on the Continent, politicians have better uses for taxpayer money than subsidizing a successful company. In each of the five individual cases involving Airbus models, the WTO found that these subsidies led to a loss of sales and exports for Boeing. U.S. Trade Representative lawyers stated that the key finding in this case was that without these subsidies, Airbus would not have been able to develop or produced when they were or with their current slate of features. The A-330, the base airplane EADS intends to use for the tanker is, unsurprisingly, one of the aircraft models that the EU subsidized. Boeing has already contended time and again that their plane is superior but had feared that EADS’s unfair competitive advantage would stall their bid, which could mean uncertainty for Boeing’s American workforce.

Trade – Low Now

Free trade is low and will remain so, because Democrats have blocked free trade agreements to several aspiring economic partners.

The National Review 7/9/10(“Trading Up” http://article.nationalreview.com/437835/trading-up/the-editors)AQB

Much too much is made of the U.S. trade deficit, and our trading relationships with Panama, Colombia, and South Korea are deeply beneficial to all parties. Democrats have used dishonest tactics to prevent a free-trade deal’s being signed with Colombia while its president is Álvaro Uribe, whom they wish to punish for his stalwart support of the United States during the Bush presidency. But President Uribe is on his way out this year, and so Democrats’ protests that the proposed free-trade agreement lacks adequate protections for Colombia’s workers and its environment are fading — as they should: The labor and environmental protections in the Colombia pact are identical to those in the Peru free-trade agreement, which met with much less resistance from Democrats. In any case, Colombian goods already enjoy unrestricted access to the U.S. market; the Colombia deal would mainly benefit U.S. exporters seeking better market access. That it has been stalled this long is an unhappy example of narrow partisan politics trumping Americans’ real economic interests. Obama’s goal of doubling U.S. exports in five years is a nice pie-in-the-sky target, but it is not going to happen. The United States never has doubled its exports in any five-year period. The current value of our exports is about 13 percent of GDP. It is unlikely that in 2015 our exports will be worth 26 percent of GDP. Even in raw dollar terms, expanding our exports from their current level of about $2 trillion a year to $4 trillion a year — the size of the entire planet’s telecommunications industry — is unlikely. But if exports are to grow, free trade — freer trade, anyway — is the way to make that happen.

Free trade has hit its lowest point in 62 years.

Lazzaro 9(Joseph managing editor of financial news on WallStreetEurope.com/WallStreetItalia.com, “

WTO predicts worst trade decline in more than 60 years”)AQB

As far as international trade is concerned, the G-20 meeting cannot occur a moment too soon. The World Trade Organization (WTO) has just issued a report predicting that global trade will plunge about nine percent in 2009 -- the worst performance in the 62 years the WTO has been keeping such records. The takeaway from the findings, based on new data for the first months of the year, couldn't be clearer: The economic crisis is having a devastating effect on world trade, and further adverse developments in the financial markets could prolong the misery. The question now is whether the developed-nation leaders meeting this week in London will take the steps needed to ease the global slump and get the economy back on a sustainable growth track. Break down the WTO's numbers and it's not pretty: In January, China's exports plummeted -26 percent; Japan's, -35 percent; Germany's, -28 percent, Canada's, -34%; and the U.S.'s, -21 percent.. Overall, developed-world trade is expected now to fall -10 percent in 2009; the developing world will fare somewhat better, at about -3 percent. Those drops compare to a global trade increase of 2 percent in 2008 (up to $15.8 trillion). Adding insult to injury, global GDP is predicted to contract by about -2 percent. The WTO said four factors have lead to the trade contraction: 1) the synchronized global recession -- the world's first in the modern era, 2) tapped-out consumers in developed countries, who overspent during the recent economic expansion, 3) the globalized supply chain, where lower demand for goods in the U.S or E.U. leads to factory closures in China, and, most ominously 4) an uptick in protectionism, with countries as Russia and Mexico starting to break their free-trade promises and impose tariffs.

Trade – Free Trade Prevents War (1/2)

**Free Trade fosters peace.**

**Boudreaux 6**(Donald, author for the CSM, November 20, “Want World Peace? Support Free Trade”)AQB

Back in 1748, Baron de Montesquieu observed that "Peace is the natural effect of trade. Two nations who differ with each other become reciprocally dependent; for if one has an interest in buying, the other has an interest in selling; and thus their union is founded on their mutual necessities." If Mr. Montesquieu is correct that trade promotes peace, then protectionism – a retreat from open trade – raises the chances of war. Plenty of empirical evidence confirms the wisdom of Montesquieu's insight: Trade does indeed promote peace. During the past 30 years, Solomon Polachek, an economist at the State University of New York at Binghamton, has researched the relationship between trade and peace. In his most recent paper on the topic, he and co-author Carlos Seiglie of Rutgers University review the massive amount of research on trade, war, and peace. They find that "the overwhelming evidence indicates that trade reduces conflict." Likewise for foreign investment. The greater the amounts that foreigners invest in the United States, or the more that Americans invest abroad, the lower is the likelihood of war between America and those countries with which it has investment relationships. Professors Polachek and Seiglie conclude that, "The policy implication of our finding is that further international cooperation in reducing barriers to both trade and capital flows can promote a more peaceful world." Columbia University political scientist Erik Gartzke reaches a similar but more general conclusion: Peace is fostered by economic freedom. Economic freedom certainly includes, but is broader than, the freedom of ordinary people to trade internationally. It includes also low and transparent rates of taxation, the easy ability of entrepreneurs to start new businesses, the lightness of regulations on labor, product, and credit markets, ready access to sound money, and other factors that encourage the allocation of resources by markets rather than by government officials. Professor Gartzke ranks countries on an economic-freedom index from 1 to 10, with 1 being very unfree and 10 being very free. He then examines military conflicts from 1816 through 2000. His findings are powerful: Countries that rank lowest on an economic-freedom index – with scores of 2 or less – are 14 times more likely to be involved in military conflicts than are countries whose people enjoy significant economic freedom (that is, countries with scores of 8 or higher).

Trade – Free Trade Prevents War (2/2)

**Free trade creates peaceful conditions in countries at risk for conflict.**

**Glaeser, 9** (Edward L, professor of economics at Harvard University “Building walls with US trading partners,” The Boston Globe, lexis)AQB

FREE TRADE is a child of economic confidence; protectionism is pessimism's progeny. In today's fearful economic climate, policy-makers have again cried "buy American," and embraced interventions that support domestic producers at the expense of our trading partners. Protectionism is bad economics and worse foreign policy, for many of our trading partners have only a tenuous link to peaceful democracy. To avoid the terrible path of the 1930s that led to prolonged depression and global conflict, the United States must maintain its commitment to globalization. My father was born in Berlin in 1930, at the start of an earlier global downturn, when democracy still held sway over most of Central and Western Europe. The United States had adopted the Smoot-Hawley Tariff, setting off a global tariff war. Between 1929 and 1934, world trade declined by two-thirds. In the dark years that followed, thuggish dictators snuffed out nascent republics and Europe descended into the madness of war. Today as we contemplate an international recession, it is worth remembering that worse terrors than double-digit unemployment have stalked human history. Few findings in social science are more robust than the fact that democracies almost never fight one another. If the current downturn causes democracies to become dictatorships, then the probability of conflict between those places and our own democracy will increase. Since dictators are far more likely to slaughter their own people, America may be faced with the awful choice of military intervention or standing by and watching the deaths mount. Democracy is bolstered by prosperity and damaged by downturns. Since the pioneering work of Martin Lipset 50 years ago, social scientists have tried to understand why democracies and wealth go together. My colleague Robert Barro found that this link exists not because democracies increase prosperity, but because prosperity supports democracy. The appeal of democracy's enemies increases when democracies, like the Weimar Republic, are unable to deliver economic success. Trade is crucial for the prosperity of the world's poorer countries, especially during a downturn. My own research finds little connection between trade and economic growth among rich or middle-income countries, but in the poorest places, where democracies are least stable, a 20 percent drop in the ratio of trade to GDP is associated with per capita incomes growing by 1 percent less per year. Reductions in trade had a devastating impact on Argentina in the 1930s, ending decades of democracy and ushering in a long period of dictatorship and political turmoil. Free trade brings prosperity to the world's poorer countries, strengthening their transitions to democracy and making their citizens, and us, safer. But the United States is now contemplating policies that threaten our ability to argue that an economically connected world is stronger and safer. The Recovery Act's "Buy American" clause forbids spending on public works "unless all of the iron, steel, and manufactured goods used in the project are produced in the United States." That clause sends a terrible message to our trading partners.

Trade – Free Trade =/= Deter War

**Free Trade doesn’t deter war.**

**Barbieri, 96** (Katherine Department of Political Science University of North Texas, February Journal of Peace Research, p. 42-43)AQB

This study provides little empirical support for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace. Even after controlling for the influence of contiguity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities, the evidence suggests that in most instances trade fails to deter conflict. Instead, extensive economic interdependence increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; however, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war. The greatest hope for peace appears to arise from symmetrical trading relationships. However, the dampening effect of symmetry is offset by the expansion of interstate linkages. That is, extensive economic linkages, be they symmetrical or asymmetrical, appear to pose the greatest hindrance to peace through trade. Although this article focuses exclusively on the pre-WWII period, elsewhere I provide evidence that the relationships revealed here are also observed in the post WWII period and more extended period, 1870—1985 (Barbieri, 1995). Why do the findings differ from those presented in related studies of the trade—conflict relationship, which reveal an inverse relationship between trade and conflict? Several explanations, other than the temporal domain, can be offered. First, researchers differ in the phenomena they seek to explain, with many studies incorporating both conflictual and cooperative interstate behavior (e.g., Gasiorowski, 1986a, b; Gasiorowski & Polachek, 1982; Polachek, 1980, 1992; Polachek & McDonald, 1992). Studies that focus exclusively on extreme forms of conflict behavior, including disputes and wars, differ in their spatial and temporal domains, their level of analysis, and their measurement of central constructs. Preliminary tests reveal that the composition of dyads in a given sample may have a more dramatic impact on the empirical findings than variations in measurement. For example, the decision to focus exclusively on ‘politically relevant dyads’ may be one source of difference (O’Neal et al., 19%). Perhaps the primary component missing from this and related research is the inclusion of a more adequate assessment of the costs and benefits derived from interdependence. I have repeatedly argued that the conflictual or pacific elements of interdependence are directly related to perceptions about trade’s costs and benefits. Yet, a more comprehensive evaluation of these costs and benefits is needed to see whether a link truly exists between the benefits enjoyed in a given trading relationship and the inhibition of conflict in that relationship, or con¬versely, the presence of net costs for at least one trading partner and the presence of conflict in that relationship. For example, are trading relationships that contain two partners believed to benefit from trade less conflict-prone than those containing at least one partner perceived to be worse off from trade? I have merely outlined the types of relationships believed to confer the greatest benefits, but such benefits and costs require a more rigorous investigation.

**Free Trade can’t deter war – its not actually “free”**

**Haslam 2** (James, , Op-Ed in Rutland Herald, “Free Trade Is Bad For Everybody”, August 2002) AQB

But let's be clear, the corporations that basically run our country have never really wanted "free trade". What they have wanted is to make as much money as possible, whatever the costs. Sometimes this means opening foreign labor and natural resource markets to corporate exploitation under the guise of "free trade", no matter the effect on the populations at home or abroad. But in other instances, making as much money as possible means going completely against free trade policies, for example, by having major domestic industries such as aerospace, computer technology and pharmaceuticals, be highly subsidized by the public while profits go to private shareholders. The editorial called for something they termed "free trade-plus", which puts some fetters on corporations by including some sort of basic labor and environmental standards. Others call this crazy idea - "fair trade". And fair trade is exactly what Rep. Sanders has been fighting for. The good news is that Vermonters and millions of people around the world are joining him in the struggle to change our economy from one focused on corporate profit, to one that puts people first.

\*\*\*WARMING\*\*\*

No Warming – Data Proves

No warming – data from satellites, balloons and past records prove

Singer 0 (S. Fred, Professor emeritus of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia and the founder and president of The Science & Environmental Policy Project, June 18, <http://www.nationalcenter.org/KyotoSingerTestimony2000.html>) LL

1. There is no Appreciable Climate Warming Contrary to the conventional wisdom and the predictions of computer models, the Earth's climate has not warmed appreciably in the past two decades, and probably not since about 1940. The evidence is overwhelming: a) Satellite data show no appreciable warming of the global atmosphere since 1979. In fact, if one ignores the unusual El Nino year of 1998, one sees a cooling trend. b) Radiosonde data from balloons released regularly around the world confirm the satellite data in every respect. This fact has been confirmed in a recent report of the National Research Council/National Academy of Sciences [1]. c) The well-controlled and reliable thermometer record of surface temperatures for the continental United States shows no appreciable warming since about 1940. [See figure] The same is true for Western Europe. These results are in sharp contrast to the GLOBAL instrumental surface record, which shows substantial warming, mainly in NW Siberia and subpolar Alaska and Canada. d) But tree-ring records for Siberia and Alaska and published ice-core records that I have examined show NO warming since 1940. In fact, many show a cooling trend. Conclusion: The post-1980 global warming trend from surface thermometers is not credible. The absence of such warming would do away with the widely touted "hockey stick" graph ((with its "unusual" temperature rise in the past 100 years) [see figure]; it was shown here on May 17 as purported proof that the 20th century is the warmest in 1000 years.

No Warming – Experts Wrong/Exaggerated

No warming – warming is an alarmist approach based off exaggerated data

Lewis 7 (Institute of Economic Affairs, Mar 6, <http://www.lyd.com/lyd/controls/neochannels/neo_ch4260/deploy/gwfalsealarm.pdf>) LL

The government claim that global warming is more threatening than terrorism is alarmist and unwarranted. It is also suspect as an excuse for mounting taxes and controls. It is strikingly similar to the dire predictions of 40 years ago of an imminent ice age and to other past doom forecasts due to alleged overpopulation, depletion of food and fuel supplies, and chemical pollution. There are serious doubts about the measurements, assumptions and predictions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), with regard to global CO2 growth, temperature and the role of clouds. Indeed there is a strong case that the IPCC has overstated the effect of anthropogenic greenhouse gases on the climate and downplayed the influence of natural factors such as variations in solar output, El Niños and volcanic activity. The empirical evidence used to support the global warming hypothesis has often been misleading, with ‘scare stories’ promoted in the media that are distortions of scientific reality. The high salience of the climate change issue reflects the fact that many special interests have much to gain from policies designed to reduce emissions through increased government intervention and world energy planning.

No Warming – IPCC Indict

IPCC is a politicized institution

Marshall 7 (Andrew, Center for Research on Globalization, Mar 15, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5086>) LL

Claude Allegre, a leading French scientist, who was among the first scientists to try to warn people of the dangers of global warming 20 years ago, now believes that “increasing evidence indicates that most of the warming comes of natural phenomena”. Allegre said, “There is no basis for saying, as most do, that the "science is settled." He is convinced that global warming is a natural change and sees the threat of the ‘great dangers’ that it supposedly poses as being bloated and highly exaggerated. Also recently, the President of the Czech Republic, Vaclav Klaus said, when discussing the recent ruling by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), that global warming is man-made, “Global warming is a false myth and every serious person and scientist says so. It is not fair to refer to the U.N. panel. IPCC is not a scientific institution: it's a political body, a sort of non-government organization of green flavor. It's neither a forum of neutral scientists nor a balanced group of scientists. These people are politicized scientists who arrive there with a one-sided opinion and a one-sided assignment.” And if you are about to ask why no politicians here seem to be saying this, Klaus offered up an answer, “Other top-level politicians do not express their global warming doubts because a whip of political correctness strangles their voice”. Nigel Calder, the former editor of New Scientist, wrote an article in the UK Sunday Times, in which he stated, “When politicians and journalists declare that the science of global warming is settled, they show a regrettable ignorance about how science works.” He further stated that, “Twenty years ago, climate research became politicised in favour of one particular hypothesis”. And in reference to how the media is representing those who dissent from the man-made theory he stated, “they often imagine that anyone who doubts the hypothesis of man-made global warming must be in the pay of the oil companies”, which is exactly what I believed up until I did my research. He also wrote, “Enthusiasm for the global-warming scare also ensures that heatwaves make headlines, while contrary symptoms, such as this winter’s billion-dollar loss of Californian crops to unusual frost, are relegated to the business pages”.

No Warming – Exaggerated

Effects of warming are exaggerated

Fuller 10 (Thomas, SF Environmental Policy Examiner, Mar 3, <http://www.climatechangefraud.com/climate-reports/6518-global-warming-is-real-but-effects-have-been-exaggerated-and-we-dont-know-the-future>) LL

Temperatures have risen 0.7 degrees Celsius over the past century, which is about twice the rate of the previous century. Even if Anthony Watts and Steve McIntyre are absolutely correct about urban heat island effects and paleoclimatic temperature reconstructions, the earth has warmed--and both Watts and McIntyre have said so on their websites repeatedly. This is not really part of the controversy at all. Nor is the reality of the greenhouse effect. Nor is the capability of CO2 contributing to the greenhouse effect. Nor is the reality of human contributions of large amounts of CO2. Almost all skeptics agree with the scientific consensus about this. (It is very convenient for the climate establishment to say they 'deny' this, but the skeptics mostly don't.) What many (not just skeptics) disagree on is the observed effects to date and the future effects as estimated. The Effects Have Been Exaggerated The current warming began around 1880 (give or take a decade) upon the conclusion of the Little Ice Age. The warming has not been even or steady--it accelerates and decelerates for reasons we don't really understand. Those who cry for political action to combat global warming have described some effects of it that they claim have already occurred. In almost every case, their claims have proven to be exaggerated. The 'poster children' for global warming have been polar bears, Himalayan glaciers, African agriculture, increased damage and destruction due to hurricanes and floods, Amazonian rainforests and Arctic ice. Polar bears face an uncertain future. Climate change is just one of many factors that are changing for them. Other factors include human encroachment on their habitat, the response of other wildlife to changes, and most importantly, hunting. Some of the sub-populations of polar bears are decreasing. Some are increasing and some are staying the same. The single most important contribution we could make to helping the population of polar bears increase is to stop shooting them. If we were serious about preserving large numbers of polar bears, we would limit the expansion of human activities throughout their habitat, which would make polar bears less of a threat to people and remove one of the reasons for our killing them. Polar bears have lived through periods of higher temperatures than now, including periods of zero Arctic ice cover. They can swim 200 miles without resting, and Arctic ice loss in and of itself is not a threat to polar bears. Arctic ice comes and goes. We're not sure exactly why, and we're not sure exactly of the cycles that govern its increase and decrease. The most recent decrease was dramatic, but only because it was the first decrease we were able to photograph from satellites. We now know that much of the reason for the 2007 low point of ice cover was that winds and currents pushed Arctic ice out of the Arctic to warmer parts of the Atlantic, where it then melted normally. It has since recovered dramatically. Himalayan glaciers increase and decrease, and always have, just like glaciers all over the world. Claims in the IPCC report that they will disappear by 2035 are flat out wrong. The error was caused because for years the area of Himalayan glaciers were measured in November, when snow cover made them look bigger. When the time of measurement was switched to September, they amazingly looked smaller. Although Indian scientists understood this, the journalists whose comments were hijacked for the IPCC report did not. The Amazonian rain forest can be compared to polar bears. The biggest threat it faces is encroachment of humans on its territory. The Amazon is being torn down for firewood, hardwood furniture and living space. It is being burned for slash and burn agriculture--some of that to grow biofuels to combat global warming. Like all forests, it is vulnerable to drought--being rainforest, it is more vulnerable than some other forests. If global warming produces drought in the Amazon, it will have an impact. However, the computer models that project scenarios of global warming cannot produce sufficient detail to say whether global warming will bring drought to the Amazon. The most that models can say is that overall precipitation worldwide should increase by 5%. Hurricanes and floods cause damage. Loss of life due to them has been reduced by between 95% and 99%, due to better weather predictions, but damage has increased. But none of the increase is attributable to climate change. Rather, a host of papers have shown that all of the increased damages due to hurricanes and floods is easily explained by richer people building more expensive property in areas vulnerable to storms and floods. African agriculture is, like agriculture anywhere, vulnerable to drought--just like the Amazon rainforest. However, a single report examining the possible effects of drought on cereal production on irrigated farms in 3 African countries was taken by the IPCC and reported as the probable future for all agricultural production throughout all the continent. The report was incorrect. African agricultural production is increasing and is expected to increase in the future. The Future Is Not Likely To Be As Desperate As We

No Warming – Exaggerated

Are Told The rate of temperature rise has slowed, from about 2 degrees C per century (1975-19998) to about 1.2 degrees C per century (1995-2009). However, the recent slowdown is over too short a period to be statistically significant. Nonetheless, this is quite different from projections of accelerating temperature rises. This is what Phil Jones, director at CRU and a staunch advocate of the global warming establishment, said in an interview last week. Flaws in recent scientific studies have been found which make it distinctly possible that the temperature rises we have experienced are not unique--not even unusual. Keith Briffa, a member of the CRU team and a staunch advocate of the global warming establishment, said that he thought temperatures had been warmer than today 1,000 years ago in an email that was part of the Climategate release of emails and documents. Arctic ice has recovered about 25% of the ice it lost in 2007. Hurricanes are predicted to be less frequent in future--although it is possible that some will be stronger. The Amazon and polar bears both need our help and attention--but the current threats to them are from sources other than climate change, and we can easily make both strong enough to resist climate change if we change our current bad habits of shooting polar bears and burning down forests. Global warming is predicted to provide net benefits to many parts of the world, especially in the first few decades of this century. Generally speaking, cold kills more people than heat (although this is not a straightforward issue), CO2 is often good for many crops (but not all, and it's good for weeds as well), and the natural progress of economic development will strengthen the communities of people who are currently very poor enough that, like the Amazon and the polar bear, they will be better able to resist the effects of climate change after 2050. A generation of politicians supported by a cadre of scientists have consistently exaggerated the extent of the effects of past and projected climate change due to human contributions of CO2. This has distorted the debate, caused enormous expenditures of taxpayers' money on green projects that will have little or no effect on global warming and led to scientific misbehaviour that threatens public confidence in the best way we have for understanding the world around us. The scientists and politicians who have performed this disservice need to be held accountable for this. It has badly distracted us from doing the right things at the right times to take better care of each other and the planet we live on.

No Warming – Slow

Relative to the ability of humans to adapt, climate change is slow

Tennekes 8 (Hendrick, former director of research at The Netherlands' Royal National Meteorological Institute, Jul 15, <http://climaterealists.com/index.php/forum/?id=1554>) LL

“Fortunately, the time rate of climate change is slow compared to the rapid evolution of our institutions and societies. There is sufficient time for adaptation. We should monitor the situation both globally and locally, but up to now global climate change does not cause severe problems requiring immediate emission reductions. Successive IPCC reports have presented no scientific basis for dire warnings concerning climate collapse. Local and regional problems with shorter time scales deserve priority. They can be managed professionally, just as the Dutch seem to do.”

The so-called scientific basis of the climate problem is within my professional competence as a meteorologist. It is my professional opinion that there is no evidence at all for catastrophic global warming. It is likely that global temperatures will rise a little, much as IPCC predicts, but there is a growing body of evidence that the errant behavior of the Sun may cause some cooling in the foreseeable future.

No Warming – Not Anthropogenic

17,000 scientists agree – warming is not a concern and climate models not accurate

Singer 0 (S. Fred, Professor emeritus of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia and the founder and president of The Science & Environmental Policy Project, June 18, <http://www.nationalcenter.org/KyotoSingerTestimony2000.html>) LL

We hold a skeptical view on the climate science that forms the basis of the National Assessment because we see no evidence to back its findings; climate model exercises are NOT evidence. Vice President Al Gore keeps referring to scientific skeptics as a "tiny minority outside the mainstream." This position is hard to maintain when more than 17,000 scientists have signed the Oregon Petition against the Kyoto Protocol because they see "no compelling evidence that humans are causing discernible climate change." Others try to discredit scientific skeptics by lumping them together with fringe political groups. Such ad hominem attacks are deplorable and have no place in a scientific debate.

Several sources indicate that global warming is a solar-system wide phenomenon

Marshall 7 (Andrew, Center for Research on Globalization, Mar 15, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5086>) LL

First off, it is very important to address the fact that Earth is not the only planet to be experiencing climate change in our solar system currently. In fact, many astronomers have announced that Pluto has been experiencing global warming, and suggested that it is a seasonal event, just like how Earth’s seasons change as the various hemispheres alter their inclination to the Sun. We must remember that it is the Sun that determines our seasons, and thusly has a greater impact upon the climate than we could ever even try to achieve. In May of 2006, a report came forward revealing that a massive hurricane-like storm that occurred on Jupiter may be caused by climate change occurring on the planet, which is expected to raise its temperatures by 10 degrees. National Geographic News reported that a simultaneous rising in temperature on both Mars and Earth suggest that climate change is indeed a natural phenomenon as opposed to being man-made. The report further explains how NASA has reported that Mars’ carbon dioxide ice caps have been melting for a few years now. Sound familiar? An astronomical observatory in Russia declared that, “the Mars data is evidence that the current global warming on Earth is being caused by changes in the sun”. They further point out that both Mars and Earth have, throughout their histories, experienced periodic ice ages as climate changes in a continuous fashion. NASA has also been observing massive storms on Saturn, which indicate a climate change occurring on that planet as well. NASA’s Hubble Space Telescope has also been recording massive climate changes on Neptune’s largest moon, Triton. Triton, whose surface was once made up of frozen nitrogen, is now turning into gas. The Associated Press has reported that satellites that measure the temperature of sunlight have been recording an increase in the sun’s temperature, meaning that the sun itself is warming up. Even the London Telegraph reported in 2004 that global warming was due to the sun being hotter than it has ever been in the past 1,000 years. They cited this information from research conducted by German and Swiss scientists who claim that it is increasing radiation from the sun that is resulting in our current climate change.

Warming is a natural phenomenon

Gary 7 (William, Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Oct 28, <http://gsa.confex.com/gsa/2007AM/finalprogram/abstract_127972.htm>) LL

The role of anthropogenic CO2 as a causal mechanism of the observed global warming over the past 30 years and last century has been exaggerated. Most of this warming is due to natural climatic cycles driven by changes in the mean rate of the ocean's meridional overturning circulation (MOC). The numerical GCM simulations of the influence of human-induced greenhouse gases are flawed due to their inability to realistically model upper-level water vapor. Most GCM's are programmed to cause increases in upper-level water vapor as global precipitation increases. However, observations over the last 40-50 years indicate that there has been a small decrease in upper-level water vapor associated with increased precipitation and global warming. Evidence will be presented to show that global atmospheric temperature warming over the last 30 years (and the last century) is primarily due to natural changes in salinity-driven deep ocean circulation. Atmospheric and oceanic proxies for the mean rate of meridional ocean circulation (MOC) will be presented that link variations in the mean rate of MOC (with a multi-year lag) to periods of global warming and cooling.

Warming Real – Expert Consensus

Warming real – expert consensus

CNN 9 (Jan 20, <http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/americas/01/19/eco.globalwarmingsurvey/index.html>) LL

(CNN) -- Human-induced global warming is real, according to a recent U.S. survey based on the opinions of 3,146 scientists. However there remains divisions between climatologists and scientists from other areas of earth sciences as to the extent of human responsibility. A survey of more than 3,000 scientists found that the vast majority believe humans cause global warming. Against a backdrop of harsh winter weather across much of North America and Europe, the concept of rising global temperatures might seem incongruous. However the results of the investigation conducted at the end of 2008 reveal that vast majority of the Earth scientists surveyed agree that in the past 200-plus years, mean global temperatures have been rising and that human activity is a significant contributing factor in changing mean global temperatures. The study released today was conducted by academics from the University of Illinois, who used an online questionnaire of nine questions. The scientists approached were listed in the 2007 edition of the American Geological Institute's Directory of Geoscience Departments. Two questions were key: Have mean global temperatures risen compared to pre-1800s levels, and has human activity been a significant factor in changing mean global temperatures? About 90 percent of the scientists agreed with the first question and 82 percent the second. The strongest consensus on the causes of global warming came from climatologists who are active in climate research, with 97 percent agreeing humans play a role. Petroleum geologists and meteorologists were among the biggest doubters, with only 47 percent and 64 percent, respectively, believing in human involvement. "The petroleum geologist response is not too surprising, but the meteorologists' is very interesting," said Peter Doran associate professor of earth and environmental sciences at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and one of the survey's authors. "Most members of the public think meteorologists know climate, but most of them actually study very short-term phenomenon." However, Doran was not surprised by the near-unanimous agreement by climatologists. "They're the ones who study and publish on climate science. So I guess the take-home message is, the more you know about the field of climate science, the more you're likely to believe in global warming and humankind's contribution to it. "The debate on the authenticity of global warming and the role played by human activity is largely nonexistent among those who understand the nuances and scientific basis of long-term climate processes," said Doran.

Warming is real – every major scientific organization agrees

Oreskes 4 (Naomi, Department of History and Science Studies Program, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, December 2004, <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/306/5702/1686>) LL

The scientific consensus is clearly expressed in the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Created in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environmental Programme, IPCC's purpose is to evaluate the state of climate science as a basis for informed policy action, primarily on the basis of peer-reviewed and published scientific literature (3). In its most recent assessment, IPCC states unequivocally that the consensus of scientific opinion is that Earth's climate is being affected by human activities: "Human activities ... are modifying the concentration of atmospheric constituents ... that absorb or scatter radiant energy. ... [M]ost of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations" [p. 21 in (4)]. IPCC is not alone in its conclusions. In recent years, all major scientific bodies in the United States whose members' expertise bears directly on the matter have issued similar statements. For example, the National Academy of Sciences report, Climate Change Science: An Analysis of Some Key Questions, begins: "Greenhouse gases are accumulating in Earth's atmosphere as a result of human activities, causing surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to rise" [p. 1 in (5)]. The report explicitly asks whether the IPCC assessment is a fair summary of professional scientific thinking, and answers yes: "The IPCC's conclusion that most of the observed warming of the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations accurately reflects the current thinking of the scientific community on this issue" [p. 3 in (5)]. Others agree. The American Meteorological Society (6), the American Geophysical Union (7), and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) all have issued statements in recent years concluding that the evidence for human modification of climate is compelling (8).

Warming Real – Scientific Proof

Warming is real – CO2 data proves

WAIS 6 (World Associated of International Studies; Research institution associated w/ Stanford U, Aug 13, <http://cgi.stanford.edu/group/wais/cgi-bin/?p=4941>) LL

We do know because of the so-called “paleoclimatic data”. Starting in 1980 scientists started drilling for ancient ice-core samples in Greenland and Antarctica. Much like tree rings, the level of seasonal depositions of snow leave distinct lines in the ice, and this can be used to establish a time scale for that layer of ice. By analyzing the air bubbles trapped in the ice when it formed, we can determine the amount of CO2 and other greenhouse gases that existed in the atmosphere at the time when that ice-core sample was formed. Thus the ice serves as a kind of permanent record of atmospheric conditions that existed in the past, and by making measurements and analysing this data, we can read this record. This then can be correlated with the average atmospheric temperature at the same time, which we can also determine by other means. Thus temperature can be plotted as a function of time and levels of greenhouse gases for the past 420,000 years. This data has now been determined and published. The data show that the natural oscillation of the level of CO2 in the atmosphere due to natural causes, oscillated between 180 ppm and 290 ppm, in roughly 100,000-year cycles. We also know from the data that the Earth’s temperature has closely tracked the concentration of CO2 and other greenhouse gases. This natural oscillation was the pattern for the past 420,000 years prior to 1750, the approximate start of the Industrial Revolution. We know that global warming is caused by human activity, because the data also shows a dramatic change in the above described natural pattern that happened since about 1750. The data for the past 250 years establishes a dramatic departure from that observed in the previous 420,000 years. Beginning in about 1750 the level of CO2 and other greenhouse gases starts to rise sharply and continuously and shoots past the previous maximum level of 290 ppm. This establishes without a doubt that politically motivated alternative theories of those that contend, for example, that human activity cannot have caused the rise in CO2, because natural phenomena such as volcano emissions and so on have a much larger effect are just plainly wrong.

Warming Real – Scientific Proof

Warming real – multiple measurements prove

IPCC 1 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2001, <http://www.grida.no/publications/other/ipcc_tar/?src=/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/005.htm>) LL

The Third Assessment Report of Working Group I of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) builds upon past assessments and incorporates new results from the past five years of research on climate change1. Many hundreds of scientists2 from many countries participated in its preparation and review. This Summary for Policymakers (SPM), which was approved by IPCC member governments in Shanghai in January 20013, describes the current state of understanding of the climate system and provides estimates of its projected future evolution and their uncertainties. Further details can be found in the underlying report, and the appended Source Information provides cross references to the report's chapters. An increasing body of observations gives a collective picture of a warming world and other changes in the climate system. Since the release of the Second Assessment Report (SAR4), additional data from new studies of current and palaeoclimates, improved analysis of data sets, more rigorous evaluation of their quality, and comparisons among data from different sources have led to greater understanding of climate change. The global average surface temperature has increased over the 20th century by about 0.6°C. The global average surface temperature (the average of near surface air temperature over land, and sea surface temperature) has increased since 1861. Over the 20th century the increase has been 0.6 ± 0.2°C5, 6 (Figure 1a). This value is about 0.15°C larger than that estimated by the SAR for the period up to 1994, owing to the relatively high temperatures of the additional years (1995 to 2000) and improved methods of processing the data. These numbers take into account various adjustments, including urban heat island effects. The record shows a great deal of variability; for example, most of the warming occurred during the 20th century, during two periods, 1910 to 1945 and 1976 to 2000. Globally, it is very likely7 that the 1990s was the warmest decade and 1998 the warmest year in the instrumental record, since 1861 (see Figure 1a). New analyses of proxy data for the Northern Hemisphere indicate that the increase in temperature in the 20th century is likely7 to have been the largest of any century during the past 1,000 years. It is also likely7 that, in the Northern Hemisphere, the 1990s was the warmest decade and 1998 the warmest year (Figure 1b). Because less data are available, less is known about annual averages prior to 1,000 years before present and for conditions prevailing in most of the Southern Hemisphere prior to 1861. On average, between 1950 and 1993, night-time daily minimum air temperatures over land increased by about 0.2°C per decade. This is about twice the rate of increase in daytime daily maximum air temperatures (0.1°C per decade). This has lengthened the freeze-free season in many mid- and high latitude regions. The increase in sea surface temperature over this period is about half that of the mean land surface air temperature. Temperatures have risen during the past four decades in the lowest 8 kilometres of the atmosphere. Since the late 1950s (the period of adequate observations from weather balloons), the overall global temperature increases in the lowest 8 kilometres of the atmosphere and in surface temperature have been similar at 0.1°C per decade. Since the start of the satellite record in 1979, both satellite and weather balloon measurements show that the global average temperature of the lowest 8 kilometres of the atmosphere has changed by +0.05 ± 0.10°C per decade, but the global average surface temperature has increased significantly by +0.15 ± 0.05°C per decade. The difference in the warming rates is statistically significant. This difference occurs primarily over the tropical and sub-tropical regions. The lowest 8 kilometres of the atmosphere and the surface are influenced differently by factors such as stratospheric ozone depletion, atmospheric aerosols, and the El Niño phenomenon. Hence, it is physically plausible to expect that over a short time period (e.g., 20 years) there may be differences in temperature trends. In addition, spatial sampling techniques can also explain some of the differences in trends, but these differences are not fully resolved. Snow cover and ice extent have decreased. Satellite data show that there are very likely7 to have been decreases of about 10% in the extent of snow cover since the late 1960s, and ground-based observations show that there is very likely7 to have been a reduction of about two weeks in the annual duration of lake and river ice cover in the mid- and high latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere, over the 20th century. There has been a widespread retreat of mountain glaciers in non-polar regions during the 20th century. Northern Hemisphere spring and summer sea-ice extent has decreased by about 10 to 15% since the 1950s. It is likely7 that there has been about a 40% decline in Arctic sea-ice thickness during late summer to early autumn in recent decades and a considerably slower decline in winter sea-ice thickness. Global average sea level has risen and ocean heat content has increased. Tide gauge data show that global average sea level rose between 0.1 and 0.2 metres during the 20th century. Global ocean heat content has increased since the late 1950s, the period for which adequate observations of sub-surface ocean temperatures have been available.

Warming Real – Scientific Proof

Overwhelming scientific evidence concludes global warming is real – in particular, the RATE of warming is rapidly increasing

Avi-Yonah and Uhlman ‘8 (Reuven, the Irwin I. Cohn Professor of Law and the Director of the International Tax LLM Program at the University of Michigan Law School, and David, the Jeffrey F. Liss Professor from Practice and the Director of the Environmental Law and Policy Program at the University of Michigan Law School, Mar 18, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1109167>) LL

The scientific evidence that global warming is occurring is overwhelming. In its synthesis report released in November 2007, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“IPCC”) stated that “[e]leven of the last twelve years (1995- 2006) rank among the twelve warmest years in the instrumental record of global surface temperatures (since 1850).”5 The IPCC reported that temperature increases have occurred throughout the world, but most significantly at higher northern latitudes.6 The melting of Arctic ice has often been called “the canary in the coal mine” of global warming.7 In 2007, Arctic ice melted at record levels, causing the opening of the fabled Northwest Passage to navigation for the first time.8 During the same summer, a record 552 billion tons of ice melted from the Greenland ice sheet.9 It is hard to overstate the significance of melting in Greenland. If global warming continues unabated, climatologists predict that the entire Greenland ice sheet would melt, causing several meters of sea level rise and coastal flooding that could imperil much of the Eastern United States.10 While some skeptics argue that global warming is part of normal climate change,11 few climatologists agree. The earth has experienced periods of cooling and warming over time, but warming has never occurred at the rate that it is happening today. The most recent IPCC report noted that “[m]ost of the observed increase in globally-averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic [greenhouse gas] concentrations.”12 Anthropogenic greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Carbon dioxide is by far the most significant of the greenhouse gases, accounting for approximately seventy-five percent of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions between 1970 and 2004.13 Annual global emissions of carbon dioxide increased “almost fivefold in the past century,” and these emissions “have tripled since 1950.”14 The most significant contributing factor in the carbon dioxide emissions increase is the burning of fossil fuels for electricity, heating, air conditioning, and transportation; land- use changes, particularly deforestation, also have played a significant but smaller role.15

Warming Inevitable

Warming inevitable – time scales prove

IPCC 7 (a scientific intergovernmental body set up by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 2007, <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_spm.pdf>) LL

Anthropogenic warming and sea level rise would continue for centuries due to the time scales associated with climate processes and feedbacks, even if GHG concentrations were to be stabilised. {3.2.3} Estimated long-term (multi-century) warming corresponding to the six AR4 Working Group III stabilisation categories is shown in Figure SPM.8. Contraction of the Greenland ice sheet is projected to continue to contribute to sea level rise after 2100. Current models suggest virtually complete elimination of the Greenland ice sheet and a resulting contribution to sea level rise of about 7m if global average warming were sustained for millennia in excess of 1.9 to 4.6°C relative to pre-industrial values. The corresponding future temperatures in Greenland are comparable to those inferred for the last interglacial period 125,000 years ago, when palaeoclimatic information suggests reductions of polar land ice extent and 4 to 6m of sea level rise. {3.2.3}

Too late – plan won’t be able to solve in time

Alleyne 9 (Richard, Telegraph Science Correspondent, Mar 29, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/5244246/World-unlikely-to-stop-global-warming-reaching-critical-levels.html>) LL

Two studies on climate change have concluded that rises in global temperatures are unlikely to remain below a critical threshold deemed by the world's governments to be safe. Policy-makers have adopted a goal of keeping the average global rise in surface temperatures to no more than 3.6F (2C) above pre-industrial revolution levels. This will mean stabilising CO2 emissions immediately and then substantially after 2015 to avoid the kind of levels in the atmosphere which will accelerate global warming. But two studies from Oxford University and Potsdam Institute for Climate Impacts Research, published in Nature, claim that current levels of carbon emission – actually increasing at three per cent a year – will mean the temperature rise will be exceeded. There is now only a 50 per cent chance of avoiding it even if drastic measures are taken. Rises above 3.6F (2C) are expected to lead to deforestation, flooding and droughts across the world. Dr Vicky Pope, Head of Climate Change Advice at the Met Office, said: "Even with drastic cuts in emissions in the next 10 years, our results project that there will only be around a 50 per cent chance of keeping global temperatures rises below 3.6F (2 C). "This idealised emissions scenario is based on emissions peaking in 2015 and quickly changing from an increase of 2–3 per cent per year to a decrease of 3 per cent per year. For every 10 years we delay action another 0.9F (0.5C) will be added to the most likely temperature rise." Meanwhile a separate study by the UK Energy Research Centre found meeting the target to cut greenhouse emissions by 80 per cent by 2050 will cost around £17 billion a year, or around £700 on the average electricity bill by 2050.

Warming Inevitable

Can’t solve – 30 year lag and positive feedback proves

Adve 8 (Nagra, One World South Asia, Apr 23, <http://southasia.oneworld.net/Article/can-we-avoid-2018dangerous2019-global-warming/>) LL

As a consequence, the Earth’s average temperature has risen about 0.8 degrees C since the Industrial Revolution, reaching 14.5 degrees C in 2005. This seemingly mild rise has already caused lands to be nibbled by rising sea levels in the Sunderbans and the Gujarat coast, the 2005 floods in Bombay which killed a thousand people, Himalayan glaciers to recede, and rainfall patterns to change.

According to the UN, 66 million people were affected by floods this year in South Asia alone. What used to seem ‘natural’ phenomena are not natural any more, as Bill McKibben lamented in The End of Nature nearly 20 years ago.

The problem, as Paul Brown explains in Global Warming: The Last Chance for Change, is that there’s more warming in the pipeline. There’s a lag of about 25-30 years between greenhouse gases being emitted and the full effects of their warming. So the recent climate chaos is actually the consequence of emissions in the late 1970s. The full effects of more recent emissions, including from China’s coal-based power stations that some are suddenly and rightly concerned about, will be felt in the years to come.

We are committed, Brown writes, to a further 0.7 degrees C. That would add up to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial levels. At 1.5 degrees, 18% of the world’s species will die, and 400 million more people worldwide will be exposed to water stress. It gets worse. As the Earth gets warmer, it will trigger off certain ‘feedbacks’, which could be understood as the Earth’s systems themselves contributing to warming: as Arctic ice melts, there will be less of it to reflect heat, warming further, melting more, and so on.

**Warming Not Inevit.**

We’re not out of time to stop warming – we just need to stabilize emissions by 2015.

Pachauri 7 (Rajendra, IPCC chairman, Sept24, <http://www.ipcc.ch/graphics/speeches.htm>) LL

Projections for this century tell us that at the lower end of feasible trajectories, we have a best estimate of 1.8 degrees centigrade as the increase in temperature by the end of the century and at the upper end of feasible scenarios we get 4 degrees centigrade. The inertia of the system that we have is such that climate change would continue for decades and centuries even if we were to stabilize the concentration of gases that are causing this problem today, which means that adaptation is inevitable. But let me emphasize that adaptation alone will not do. We need to bring about mitigation actions to start in the short term even when benefits may arrive in a few decades. And there are huge co-benefits from mitigation action in terms of energy security, in terms of local environmental benefits. The cost of adaptation and impacts, I might mention, will keep going up as the global temperature goes up. As far as mitigation is concerned the costs are going to be much lower than what was anticipated earlier. If we stabilize the concentration of these gases at 445 to 490 parts per million of CO2 equivalent which will give us an equilibrium increase, limit the equilibrium increase to 2 to 2.4 degrees centigrade, that will cost the world less than 3 per cent of the GDP in the year 2030. This means that the prosperity that we would normally achieve by 2030 may be postponed by a few months at the most. And as the honorable Secretary General has told us, we have up to 2015 if we want to stabilize at that level, after which we will have to ensure that emissions go down substantially.

Global Warming Preventable - Emissions

Reducing GHG emissions slows warming

Congressional Budget Office 8 (February 2008, <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/89xx/doc8934/02-12-Carbon.pdf>) LL

There is a growing scientific consensus that rising concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gases, which result from the burning of fossil fuels, are gradually warming the Earth’s climate. The amount of damage associated with that warming remains uncertain, but there is some risk that it could be large and perhaps even catastrophic. Reducing that risk would require restraining the growth of CO2 emissions—and ultimately limiting those emissions to a level that would stabilize atmospheric concentrations—which would involve costs that are also uncertain but could be substantial.

Reducing GHG emissions lessens the danger posed by global warming

Congressional Budget Office 8 (February 2008, <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/89xx/doc8934/02-12-Carbon.pdf>) LL

Global climate change is one of the nation’s most significant long-term policy challenges. Human activities are producing increasingly large quantities of greenhouse gases, particularly carbon dioxide (CO2), which accumulate in the atmosphere and create costly changes in regional climates throughout the world. The magnitude of such damage remains highly uncertain, but there is growing recognition that some degree of risk exists for the damage to be large and perhaps even catastrophic. Reducing greenhouse-gas emissions would be beneficial in limiting the degree of damage associated with climate change. However, decreasing those emissions would also impose costs on the economy—in the case of CO2, because much economic activity is based on fossil fuels, which release carbon in the form of carbon dioxide when they are burned. Most analyses suggest that a carefully designed program to begin lowering CO2 emissions would produce greater benefits than costs.

US not key in Global Warming – China

US not significant - China is the key contributor to global warming

The New York Times 7 (June 20, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/20/business/worldbusiness/20iht-emit.1.6227564.html>) LL

LONDON — China overtook the United States in 2006 as the world's biggest emitter of carbon dioxide, the greenhouse gas blamed for the bulk of global warming, a policy group that advises the Dutch government said. China produced 6,200 million tons of carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels and making cement last year, the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency said Tuesday on its Web site. That pushed it past the United States, which produced 5,800 million tons of the gas, the agency said. The United Nations blames greenhouse gases for causing global warming, increasing the risk of rising sea levels, droughts and floods. At present, neither China nor the United States are subject to targets under the only international treaty requiring emissions cuts, the Kyoto Protocol, whose provisions expire in 2012. European leaders hope to jump-start negotiations for a successor agreement this year. Rapid industrialization in China has long prompted predictions that it would overtake the United States as the world's biggest emitter. Fatih Birol, the International Energy Agency's chief economist, said in April that China would become the biggest emitter this year or next, an advance on the IEA's previous forecast of 2009. Ma Kai, chairman of the top economic planning body in China, the National Development and Reform Commission, said this month that China would "definitely" overtake the United States, though he did not say when that might be.

China’s CO2 emissions will overshadow emission cuts

National Geographic 8 (March 18, news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2008/03/080318-china-warming.html) LL

China's greenhouse gas emissions are rising much faster than expected and will overshadow the cuts in global emissions expected due to the Kyoto Protocol, according to a new study. Forecasts from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) had predicted that China's carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions would rise by about 2.5 to 5 percent each year between 2004 and 2010. But the estimates are two to four times too low, according to new research led by Maximilian Auffhammer of the University of California, Berkeley. The study calculated that for the period from 2004 to 2010, [China](http://www.nationalgeographic.com/places/countries/country_china.html)'s CO2 emissions will have grown by at least 11 percent a year. "The emissions growth rate is surpassing our worst expectations, and that means the goal of stabilizing atmospheric CO2 is going to be much, much harder to achieve," Auffhammer said. The new findings threaten to throw a damper on the Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Most countries—including all major industrialized countries except the U.S.—have signed on to the Kyoto Protocol. (Related: ["Australia Signs Kyoto Protocol; U.S. Now Only Holdout"](http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/12/071203-AP-aus-kyoto.html) [December 3, 2007].) But a major sticking point for the U.S. is that the agreement only mandates reductions for developed countries, mostly in North America and Europe. These areas are currently responsible for most of the CO2 that's causing [global warming](http://science.nationalgeographic.com/science/environment/global-warming). Developing nations such as China, India, and Brazil are exempt from any reduction targets. But China, the world's most populous country, has been developing at lightning speed—perhaps faster than any country in history. Since most of its electricity comes from coal, for instance, China has been building coal-fired power plants at a rate of roughly two a week for the past few years. The country recently surpassed the U.S. to become the world's single leading emitter of CO2, according to another recent study. (China has more than four times the population of the U.S., however, so China's emissions per person are much lower.) China's greater-than-anticipated emissions may completely nullify the Kyoto reductions, raising the pressure to find ways for the country to grow cleanly, according to experts. "Making China and other developing countries an integral part of any future climate agreement is now even more important," Auffhammer said. To create the updated forecast, the new study took the novel approach of looking at each of China's provinces individually. "Everybody had been treating China as single country," said study co-author Richard Carson of the University of California, San Diego. But each of its more than 20 provinces is large, with populations bigger than many European countries, Carson pointed out. The areas have different standards of living and different rates of development and population growth—all of which the new study factors in. Also, many of the new coal-fired power plants that have been built in the past few years are low-cost designs, which are less efficient and therefore emit more CO2. "The problem is that power plants, once built, are meant to last for 40 to 75 years," Carson said. "Our forecast incorporates the fact that much of China is now stuck with power plants that are dirty and inefficient."

US not key in Global Warming – Russia

Russia is the 3rd largest contributor of GHGs – can’t solve without them

Shuster 9 (Simon, Time Magazine, Nov 4, <http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1929071_1929070_1934785,00.html#ixzz0tCU3iT7K>) LL

Russia doesn't seem to care two bits about global warming, and it's not hard to see why. Most Russians would probably be happy if the country was a little warmer. Officials even joke that once climate change has run its course, people may start pouring into Siberia instead of trying to escape it. If the polar ice caps melt any further, Russia would be able to drill for oil and gas in the Arctic Ocean, where it's believed to have huge fossil-fuel reserves. For the rest of the planet, however, the picture is not so cheerful. To say that Russia is hesitant about tackling climate change is putting it mildly. The last time the world tried to get the country's cooperation on the issue was in 1997, during negotiations for the Kyoto Protocol (the international treaty on limiting greenhouse-gas emissions). Because Russia is the world's third largest source of emissions after the U.S. and China, the accord would have failed without it. So the treaty was written in a way that would allow Russia to keep polluting as much as it wanted and grant the country billions of dollars in emissions allowances to sell to other countries that needed to meet their Kyoto commitments.

US not key in Global Warming – India

India projected to be increasingly important in combating global warming

The Age 10 (Business, News, and World Events News Agency, May 11, <http://www.theage.com.au/environment/climate-change/india-on-course-to-become-thirdbiggest-co2-emitter-20100511-uu1m.html>) LL

India's greenhouse gas emissions grew 58 per cent between 1994 and 2007, official figures released on Tuesday showed, underlining the country's growing importance in the fight against climate change. Emissions rose to 1.9 billion tonnes in 2007 versus 1.2 billion in 1994, with the industrial and transport sectors upping their share in Asia's third largest economy and confirming India's ranking among the world's top five carbon polluters. By way of comparison, between 1994 and 2007, India added more than the entire emissions produced annually by Australia. Figures in the government report, released by Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh at a conference in New Delhi, show India is closing in on Russia, now the world's third largest greenhouse gas emitter, at nearly 2.2 billion tonnes in 2007. Russia's emissions have been growing at a slower pace than those of India, whose energy-hungry economy has been expanding at about 8 per cent a year as it tries to lift millions out of poverty. This has propelled investment in coal-fired power stations, steel mills, cement plants and mining, as well as renewable energy. "Interestingly, the emissions of the United States and China are almost four times that of India in 2007," Ramesh told the conference. "It is also noteworthy that the energy intensity of India's GDP declined by more than 30 per cent during the period 1994-2007 due to the efforts and policies that we are proactively putting into place. This is a trend we intend to continue," he said. Energy intensity refers to the amount of energy used per unit of gross domestic product. India has also set a carbon intensity reduction target of 20 to 25 per cent by 2020 from 2005 levels. Data from 1994 was the last official report to the United Nations on India's emissions because, as a developing country, India is not obliged to make annual emissions declarations to the world body, unlike rich nations. The latest U.N. emissions data for industrialised nations date to 2007. Along with China and the United States, the world's top two greenhouse gas emitters, India is seen as crucial player in trying to agree on a broad U.N. climate pact to curb the growth of greenhouse gas emissions blamed for heating up the planet. Emissions in developing nations, mainly from the rising consumption of coal, oil and gas, are growing quickly and are responsible for more than half of mankind's carbon pollution. Scientists say the world needs to try to limit average global warming to within two degrees Celsius to avoid the worst impacts of climate change but that nations need to act quickly to avoid runaway growth in carbon emissions.

India Will Not Cut Carbon Emissions

News Post India 8 (June 5, <http://www.newspostindia.com/report-59039>) LL

India will not reduce greenhouse gas emission at the cost of development and poverty alleviation, Minister of State for Environment and Forests Namo Narain Meena said Thursday. India is struggling to bring millions of people out of poverty. We cannot accept binding commitments to cut down greenhouse gas emission,' Meena said at a function to mark the World Environment Day. hough India has no commitment to reduce the global warming gases under the Kyoto Protocol, in recent climate change conferences many developed countries have said India needs to reduce the greenhouse burden.

US not key in Global Warming

Unilateral action can’t solve

Environmental Defense 7 (<http://www.edf.org/documents/7926_climate_brochure0408.pdf>) LL

The climate battle cannot be won without the help of large, fast-growing economies—including China, India and Russia—as well as rainforest nations where deforestation currently accounts for 20% of global emissions. These countries must be given incentives to choose a cleaner future as they grow.

US impact on global warming declining

Knappenberger 9 (Chip, Administrator of the World Climate Report, Apr 28, <http://www.masterresource.org/2009/04/the-epa-fights-global-warming-via-endangerment-going-after-a-00033cyr-prize/>) LL

Now that the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has announced intent to find that greenhouse gas emissions (primarily carbon dioxide) from human activities lead to the “endangerment of public health and welfare,” the question arises: What could EPA theoretically do about it? (I’ll leave the politics to others.) In other words, can a U.S.-side agency conceptually protect U.S. citizens from the endangerment of their health and welfare from the global issue of global warming? It turns out that they cannot do much of anything. EPA is simply saber-rattling to get Congress’s attention. If the agency was forced to actually draw their weapon in battle, they would be holding a rubber sword against a massive and growing global force. The bottom line: the EPA is brandishing only about 0.0033ºC/yr-worth of global temperature influence—and that is only if it managed to shut down all greenhouse gas emissions from U.S. economic activity and keep it that way. All the while, the warming pressure from the rest of the world steadily grows, shrinking the EPA’s already too-small-to-matter arsenal. This can be understood by simplifying the issue down to the Xs and Os—carbon dioxide emissions and global temperatures. I’ll cast carbon dioxide emissions in terms of the global temperature change they produce based on a few reasonable (although short of perfect) assumptions and then explore via the back of the envelope the potential impact of any EPA regulations. Assumption 1: Based on both observations and climate model projections, it takes an increase in the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide (CO2) of about 115 parts per million (ppm) to raise the global average temperature about 1ºC. Certainly, there is a lot of quibble room here (like the CO2 effect is logarithmic rather than linear), but this number is not that far off for the current conditions. Assumption 2:Based upon observations, it takes about 15,500 million metric tons (mmt) of carbon dioxide emissions to raise the atmospheric CO2 concentration 1 ppm. This is based on the observations that show that about half of the human CO2 emissions remain in the atmosphere and that this percentage has stayed relatively constant since good atmospheric concentration measurements began in the late 1950s. The 15,500 number comes from dividing the total global annual CO2 emissions each year by the annual CO2 increase (data available from CDIAC if you want to see for yourself). Again you could nit-pick this (like whether or not global CO2 sinks will continue to grow), but this will work for the time being. These two assumptions lead to the generality that it takes about 15,500 mmtCO2/ppm times 115 ppm/ºC which equals 1,782,500 mmt of CO2 emissions to produce a global temperature rise of 1ºC. This is a handy number to have. Every time you see someone touting some action that will lower CO2 emissions (and thus “save the planet” from global warming), you can take their emissions savings (in mmtCO2), divide it by the number above (1,782,500 mmtCO2/ºC) and see just how much of the planet they are saving. Here I’ll use it to look at what kind of temperature rise is being produced by U.S. emissions and what kind of temperature rise is being produced by the rest of the world (over which the U.S. EPA has no regulatory authority). In 2006, U.S. CO2 emissions were 5,903 mmtCO2, and the emissions from the rest of the world totaled 23,292 mmtCO2. So that means, roughly speaking, that with its 20% (and falling) world share, U.S. emissions in 2006 caused about 0.0033ºC (5903÷1,782,500) of global warming while emissions from the rest of the world caused about 0.0131ºC (23,292÷1,782,500). Now, the astute among you may point out that the global temperature didn’t increase by 0.0164ºC from 2005 to 2006—but realize that my analysis is aimed at a general characterization of the influence of CO2 emissions from human activities, and does not include other influences on the earth’s temperature, which, as we have seen over the past decade or so are quite large as they have acted to offset all the warming from CO2 emissions during that time. Figure 1 shows the results from not just 2006 but for the past 10 years (more specifically 1997-2006 since this is the most recent data available from the Energy Information Administration) from the U.S. and from the rest of the world. Figure 1. Influence on global temperature from U.S. CO2 emissions (blue) and emissions from the rest of the world (maroon). The overall height of each bar represents the total influence from CO2 emissions on global temperatures (emissions data from the EIA). Notice a few things. The amount of global warming each year that the U.S. is responsible for averages about 0.0033ºC per year—an amount that has changed little during this 10-yr period. And, at the same time, the amount of global warming contributed by emissions from the rest of the world has increased from about 0.010ºC/yr in the late 1990s to about 0.013ºC/yr during the past couple of years. This means that the percentage of the total warming that the U.S. is responsible for has been declining—which of course, means that the EPA’s ability to mitigate global warming by reigning in U.S. CO2 emissions is waning. In other words, as total emissions from the rest of the world grow at a pace that far exceeds that of the U.S. emissions, the EPA’s ability to protect Americans from the endangerment of their health and welfare diminishes.

No Impact – **No Resource War**

Even if warming leads to scarcity, war won’t escalate

Seng 0 (Ronnie, Journal of the Singapore Armed Forces, July 2000, <http://www.mindef.gov.sg/safti/pointer/back/journals/2000/Vol26_3/3.htm>) LL

Countries go to war for a variety of reasons. In the past, wars were often resource wars (wars to gain resources) - for land, to expand human settlement, or for food or other resources. Sovereignty issues also cause armed conflicts - perhaps as important previously, although perhaps less now for outright war. Motives for such conflicts in the regions do not for the most part concern economic issues, other than the resources i.e. oil, gas, fish that island territorial disputes involve, as in the example of the Spratlys where the main contention is the oil-rich resources that the atolls could provide. Nevertheless, the resource motivations for conquest in the past are less significant now that education, technology and the national manpower resource skills are more substantial sources of wealth. Although natural resources in some countries have contributed to immense wealth, the highly industrialised world today thrives on economies with a leading advantage in technological skills, financial stability, and good governance to bring in foreign investments. Globalisation has enabled the opportunity for an economy to be 'networked' with the external world where technological and economic activities abound. It is precisely the dependence on these very factors that Singapore, devoid of natural resources, has remained relatively unscathed during the financial crisis. Going to war for the purpose of gaining resources is highly improbable, as governments contemplating to do so, would weigh the costs against the benefits to be reaped from an outright war. For example, Vietnam had been secure with oil freely available on the open markets and it is less costly and more efficient to gain resources through the market than through the conquest of another country. Consequently, as the country's 'wealth' is increasingly enshrined in the quality of its technology-based economy and stable governance, an inclination to declare war to gain resource becomes even more remote.

Scarcity doesn’t cause conflict – four reasons

Billion 1 (Philippe, Asst Prof @ U of BC, Dept of Geo, <http://www.geog.ubc.ca/~lebillon/ecowar.pdf>) LL

According to advocates of the scarce resource wars hypothesis, people or nations will fight each other to secure access to the resources necessary for their survival: the more scarce the resource, the more bitter the fight (Bennett, 1991; Brown, 1977; Homer-Dixon, 1999; Renner, 1996; Suliman, 1998 — for a critique, see Dalby, 1998; Gleditsch, 1998; Peluso & Watts, 2001). An example is the progressive degradation of Easter Islands’ natural resources by its Polynesian inhabitants, which ended through internecine struggle and cannibalism until the number of inhabitants was reduced from 20,000 at its ‘apogee’ to 2000 when Europeans first arrived in 1722 (Diamond, 1998). While some of the most nuanced examinations offer convincing anecdotal evidence, there are several counter-arguments to the generalisation of the scarce resource war perspective. First, resource scarcity and population pressure can result in socio-economic innovation, including a diversification of the economy, which often results in a more equitable distribution of power across society (Boserup, 1965; Tiffen et al., 1994; Leach & Mearns, 1996). Second, international trade and market mechanisms can to some extent counterbalance localised scarcities or motivate innovations and shifts in resources. Third, in resource poor countries the state is more dependent on the diversified financial inputs from society than in resource rich countries, and so is more likely to be representative and accountable towards it, hence less violently conflictual. Finally, it is in the interest of the elite of resource poor countries to develop and harness human capital, rather than protect scarce or non-existent resource rents (Ranis, 1987). In this view, the likelihood of violent conflict decreases as human capital develops (e.g. through education, trading and manufacturing skills), the economy diversifies, and governance becomes more representative and accountable.

No Impact – **Tech Solves Warming**

Multiple ways to solve global warming exist in the SQ

Science Daily 4 (Aug 16, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2004/08/040816091135.htm>) LL

ScienceDaily (Aug. 16, 2004) — Existing technologies could stop the escalation of global warming for 50 years and work on implementing them can begin immediately, according to an analysis by Princeton University scientists. The scientists identified 15 technologies — from wind, solar and nuclear energy to conservation techniques — that are ripe for large-scale use and showed that each could solve a significant portion of the problem. Their analysis, published in the Aug. 13 issue of Science, indicates that many combinations of these 15 technologies could prevent global emissions of greenhouse gasses from rising for the next five decades. The finding counters the common argument that a major new technology needs to be developed before greenhouse gasses can be controlled, said professors Stephen Pacala and Robert Socolow, who conducted the study. "It certainly explodes the idea that we need to do research for a long time before getting started," said Pacala, a professor of ecology and evolutionary biology and co-director with Socolow of Princeton's Carbon Mitigation Initiative. "If we decide to act, we will need to reduce carbon emissions across the whole global economy," said Socolow, a professor of mechanical and aerospace engineering. "Fortunately, we have the tools to do this, especially if we think in terms of 50-year campaigns, not instant solutions." Although the current study did not examine the costs of scaling up each of the 15 possible technologies, the authors point out that implementing the measures would likely generate economic benefits, including creating new industries, reducing the U.S. dependence on foreign oil and lessening the need for other pollution-control expenses associated with burning coal and other fossil fuels. Carbon the culprit The study focuses on the main contributor to greenhouse warming, carbon dioxide, which comes from burning carbon-based fossil fuels such as oil, natural gas and coal. Throughout Earth's history, changes in carbon dioxide levels have been linked to changes in climate. Current global emissions of carbon dioxide contain 7 billion tons of carbon per year. That amount is projected to double to 14 billion tons per year over the next 50 years as the world population increases and people consume more energy. To keep emissions stable, technologies and conservation efforts would have to prevent 7 billion tons worth of emissions per year by 2054. Pacala and Socolow show how each of the 15 options they identified could prevent 1 billion tons a year worth of carbon emissions by 2054. To illustrate their idea, the researchers created a graph that divides the problem into seven 1 billion-ton-per-year "wedges." (See figures.) In their paper and 51 pages of supplementary online material, they identify opportunities and difficulties associated with each option and compare alternative combinations of seven "wedges." Several of the options, for example, involve capturing carbon dioxide at power plants or other locations and storing it deep underground (carbon dioxide gas already is commonly injected into the Earth as part of some oil drilling operations). Others involve improving energy conservation faster than the modest improvements that are continually occurring. The researchers identify various renewable energy sources, including solar and wind, that could be scaled up faster than current projections. Changes in forestry and farming techniques also could lead to substantial reductions in carbon emissions.

No Impact – **Alt Causes**

Alt causes – deforestation

Howden 7 (Daniel, deputy foreign editor of The Independent, May 14, <http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/deforestation-the-hidden-cause-of-global-warming-448734.htm>) LL

Most people think of forests only in terms of the CO2 they absorb. The rainforests of the Amazon, the Congo basin and Indonesia are thought of as the lungs of the planet. But the destruction of those forests will in the next four years alone, in the words of Sir Nicholas Stern, pump more CO2 into the atmosphere than every flight in the history of aviation to at least 2025. Indonesia became the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world last week. Following close behind is Brazil. Neither nation has heavy industry on a comparable scale with the EU, India or Russia and yet they comfortably outstrip all other countries, except the United States and China. What both countries do have in common is tropical forest that is being cut and burned with staggering swiftness. Smoke stacks visible from space climb into the sky above both countries, while satellite images capture similar destruction from the Congo basin, across the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo. According to the latest audited figures from 2003, two billion tons of CO2 enters the atmosphere every year from deforestation. That destruction amounts to 50 million acres - or an area the size of England, Wales and Scotland felled annually. The remaining standing forest is calculated to contain 1,000 billion tons of carbon, or double what is already in the atmosphere. As the GCP's report concludes: "If we lose forests, we lose the fight against climate change."

Alt causes – deforestation key

Matthews 6 (Christopher, Information officer with Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Sept 4, [http://www.fao.org/newsroom/en/news /2006 /10003 85/index.html](http://www.fao.org/newsroom/en/news%20/2006%20/10003%2085/index.html)) LL

Most people assume that global warming is caused by burning oil and gas. But in fact between 25 and 30 percent of the greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere each year – 1.6 billion tonnes – is caused by deforestation. About 200 experts, mostly from developing countries, met in Rome last week to address this issue in a workshop organized by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and hosted by FAO. “We are working to solve two of the key environmental issues – deforestation and global warming – at the same time,” said FAO Senior Forestry Officer Dieter Schoene. Trees are 50 percent carbon. When they are felled or burned, the C02 they store escapes back into the air. According to FAO figures, some 13 million ha of forests worldwide are lost every year, almost entirely in the tropics. Deforestation remains high in Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia. Delegates of the 46 developing countries present at the Rome workshop signalled their readiness to act on deforestation, 80 percent of which is due to increased farmland to feed growing populations. Part of the solution is to increase agricultural productivity so that there is less demand to convert forests into farmland. But they also stressed that they needed financial help from the developed world to do the job. A major flow of capital from north to south – under new instruments still waiting to be negotiated -- would be required to help the developing nations conserve their forests.

No Impact – Alt Causes

Alt cause – the sun is responsible

Shachtman 8 (Noah, Wired News, winner of the 2007 [Award](http://journalist.org/awards/archives/000891.php) for best beat reporting, June 4, [http://www.climatechangefraud.com/content /view/1293/218/](http://www.climatechangefraud.com/content%20/view/1293/218/)) LL

The Army is weighing in on the global warming debate, claiming that climate change is not man-made. Instead, Dr. Bruce West, with the Army Research Office, argues that "changes in the earth’s average surface temperature are directly linked to ... the short-term statistical fluctuations in the Sun’s irradiance and the longer-term solar cycles." In an advisory to bloggers entitled "Global Warming: Fact of Fiction [sic]," an Army public affairs official promoted a conference call with West about "the causes of global warming, and how it may not be caused by the common indicates [sic] some scientists and the media are indicating." In the March, 2008 issue of Physics Today, West, the chief scientist of the Army Research Office's [mathematical and information science directorate](http://www.arl.army.mil/www/default.cfm?Action=29&Page=216), wrote that "the Sun’s turbulent dynamics" are linked with the Earth's complex ecosystem. These connections are what is heating up the planet. "The Sun could account for as much as 69 percent of the increase in Earth’s average temperature," West noted. It's a position that puts West at odds with nearly every major scientific organization on the planet. "The American Meteorological Society, the American Geophysical Union, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science all have issued statements in recent years concluding that [the evidence for human modification of climate is compelling](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/306/5702/1686)," Science magazine observes. So has the United Nations' [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intergovernmental_Panel_on_Climate_Change) (IPCC), which shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore, for their work on global warming. West acknowledges that the IPCC and other scientific groups have "conclude[d] that the contribution of solar variability to global warming is negligible." He argues that these groups have done a poor job modeling the Sun's impact, however, and that's why they have "significantly over-estimated" the "anthropogenic contribution to global warming."

Modeling – China Will Model US

China will model the U.S. on global warming

Gardner 7 (Timothy, Correspondent Energy and Environment, <http://www.linkedin.com/pub/3/895/144>) LL

China would soon follow the U.S. lead if Washington agrees to tackle its emissions in the next few years because China's government takes the threat of global warming more seriously than the United States does, a climate expert said on Tuesday. "My impression is that the national government -- top level ministry officials -- in China regard the threats of global warming to their country with a much higher level of seriousness than their counterparts do here in the United States," said David Hawkins of the environmental group National Resources Defense Council. Hawkins, head of the group's climate center, spoke by telephone to the Reuters Environment Summit in New York. If the United States agrees to cut emissions deeply with a baseline that gets tougher over time, it would spur U.S. manufacturers to build low-emissions technologies like alternative energy and coal plants that store carbon dioxide underground. It could then market those technologies to the world, forcing China to act. "The biggest carrot is to have the U.S. to take a leadership role," he said. "Then countries like China are going to say, 'What does the United States know that we don't know?' and agree to their own cuts," said Hawkins. Hawkins is based in Washington but visits China often, meeting with government ministers heading the country's science and technology, environmental protection, agriculture, and development reform agencies. He said they are very concerned about the possibility that global warming will lead to drastic cuts in water for agriculture.

Modeling – US Modeled

Other nations adopt U.S. environmental policies

Brookings Institute 2006 (June, <http://www.brookings.edu/views/papers/easterbrook/20060517.pdf>) LL

True, previous air pollution problems have been national or regional in character; greenhouse gases are a global issue whose resolution must involve all nations. But this does not mean greenhouse gases cannot be overcome using the same tools that have worked against other air pollution problems. In the last 30 years, the United States has substantially reduced air pollution—during the same period the United States population and economy have both boomed. If air pollution can be reduced even as a national economy grows, there is good reason to hope that greenhouse gases can be reduced even as the global economy grows. Nor do developing nations need an "era of pollution" in order to industrialize. In the 19th century, it was true that air pollution and industrialization were inexorably linked: then, the unregulated smokestack was essential to manufacturing advancement. Today power plants and factories are being built that emit only a fraction of the air pollution of their predecessors—and efficient, low-polluting facilities tend to have the highest rates of return. Already China to a great extent and India to a lesser extent are switching to low-pollution approaches to power production and manufacturing, observing that low-polluting industry not only is good for the environment but for the bottom line. Fifteen years ago, smog was rising at dangerous rates in Mexico City. Mexico adopted anti-pollution technology and now Mexico City smog is in decline, even as the city booms economically and its population grows. Such examples suggest that the air pollution controls that have worked so well in the United States can be expanded to the world. And if the whole world can act against air pollution, maybe the whole world can act against greenhouse gas.