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#### Romeny win now – Obama’s base crumbling

Wayne Allyn Root 5/30/12 (Political commentator and senior Economic Advisor to a global financial services company, “Why Obama Will Lose in a Landslide”, <http://townhall.com/columnists/wayneallynroot/2012/05/30/why_obama_will_lose_in_a_landslide>, S.O.)

Most political predictions are made by biased pollsters, pundits, or prognosticators who are either rooting for Republicans or Democrats. I am neither. I am a former Libertarian Vice Presidential nominee, and a well-known Vegas oddsmaker with one of the most accurate records of predicting political races. Neither Obama nor Romney are my horses in the race. I believe both Republicans and Democrats have destroyed the U.S. economy and brought us to the edge of economic disaster. My vote will go to Libertarian Presidential candidate Gary Johnson in November, whom I believe has the most fiscally conservative track record of any Governor in modern U.S. political history. Without the bold spending cuts of a Gary Johnson or Ron Paul, I don’t believe it’s possible to turnaround America. But as an oddsmaker with a pretty remarkable track record of picking political races, I play no favorites. I simply use common sense to call them as I see them. Back in late December I released my New Years Predictions. I predicted back then- before a single GOP primary had been held, with Romney trailing for months to almost every GOP competitor from Rick Perry to Herman Cain to Newt- that Romney would easily rout his competition to win the GOP nomination by a landslide. I also predicted that the Presidential race between Obama and Romney would be very close until election day. But that on election day Romney would win by a landslide similar to Reagan-Carter in 1980. Understanding history, today I am even more convinced of a resounding Romney victory. 32 years ago at this moment in time, Reagan was losing by 9 points to Carter. Romney is right now running even in polls. So why do most pollsters give Obama the edge? First, most pollsters are missing one ingredient- common sense. Here is my gut instinct. Not one American who voted for McCain 4 years ago will switch to Obama. Not one in all the land. But many millions of people who voted for an unknown Obama 4 years ago are angry, disillusioned, turned off, or scared about the future. Voters know Obama now- and that is a bad harbinger. Now to an analysis of the voting blocks that matter in U.S. politics: \*Black voters. Obama has nowhere to go but down among this group. His endorsement of gay marriage has alienated many black church-going Christians. He may get 88% of their vote instead of the 96% he got in 2008. This is not good news for Obama. \*Hispanic voters. Obama has nowhere to go but down among this group. If Romney picks Rubio as his VP running-mate the GOP may pick up an extra 10% to 15% of Hispanic voters (plus lock down Florida). This is not good news for Obama. \*Jewish voters. Obama has been weak in his support of Israel. Many Jewish voters and big donors are angry and disappointed. I predict Obama's Jewish support drops from 78% in 2008 to the low 60’s. This is not good news for Obama. \*Youth voters. Obama’s biggest and most enthusiastic believers from 4 years ago have graduated into a job market from hell. Young people are disillusioned, frightened, and broke- a bad combination. The enthusiasm is long gone. Turnout will be much lower among young voters, as will actual voting percentages. This not good news for Obama. \*Catholic voters. Obama won a majority of Catholics in 2008. That won’t happen again. Out of desperation to please women, Obama went to war with the Catholic Church over contraception. Now he is being sued by the Catholic Church. Majority lost. This is not good news for Obama. \*Small Business owners. Because I ran for Vice President last time around, and I'm a small businessman myself, I know literally thousands of small business owners. At least 40% of them in my circle of friends, fans and supporters voted for Obama 4 years ago to “give someone different a chance.” I warned them that he would pursue a war on capitalism and demonize anyone who owned a business...that he’d support unions over the private sector in a big way...that he'd overwhelm the economy with spending and debt. My friends didn’t listen. Four years later, I can't find one person in my circle of small business owner friends voting for Obama. Not one. This is not good news for Obama. \*Blue collar working class whites. Do I need to say a thing? White working class voters are about as happy with Obama as Boston Red Sox fans feel about the New York Yankees. This is not good news for Obama. \*Suburban moms. The issue isn’t contraception…it’s having a job to pay for contraception. Obama’s economy frightens these moms. They are worried about putting food on the table. They fear for their children’s future. This is not good news for Obama. \*Military Veterans. McCain won this group by 10 points. Romney is winning by 24 points. The more our military vets got to see of Obama, the more they disliked him. This is not good news for Obama. Add it up. Is there one major group where Obama has gained since 2008? Will anyone in America wake up on election day saying “I didn’t vote for Obama 4 years ago. But he’s done such a fantastic job, I can’t wait to vote for him today.” Does anyone feel that a vote for Obama makes their job more secure? Forget the polls. My gut instincts as a Vegas oddsmaker and common sense small businessman tell me this will be a historic landslide and a world-class repudiation of Obama’s radical and risky socialist agenda. It's Reagan-Carter all over again. But I’ll give Obama credit for one thing- he is living proof that familiarity breeds

#### Investment in transportation infrastructure helps Obama win the election – jobs and base support

Cooper 12 Dana [Senior Fellow at American Progress] “Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?” Center for American Progress 1/25/12 accessed: 6/28/12 <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html> DR

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to help the middle class grow and prosper. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens. Just as the creation of our middle class finds it roots, in part, in the building of our infrastructure, so too is the restoration of our infrastructure essential to the restoration of the breadth and vibrancy of America’s middle class

#### Obama will intervene in Syria after reelection

Ghitis June 11 2012, (Frida Ghitis is a world affairs columnist for The Miami Herald and World Politics Review for a special on CNN), “Is Obama’s re-election delaying action on Syria?”, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/11/opinion/ghitis-obama-syria/index.html> AP

Anyone who doubts that electoral considerations have become a major factor in U.S. foreign policy should look to Obama's own words from a few months ago. Obama did not realize his microphone was on during a meeting in Seoul with then-Russian President Dimitry Medvedev, so he leaned in close and whispered, "This is my last election. After my election I have more flexibility." In this instance, Obama was referring to the contentious issue of missile defense. It's not uncommon for presidents to worry about reelection while charting foreign policy. In Robert Caro's new biography of President Lyndon B. Johnson, "The Passage of Power," he describes how Johnson made decisions about Vietnam with an eye towards the elections. Caro concluded that "the steps he took had, as their unifying principle, an objective dictated largely by domestic — indeed, personal — political concerns." With less than five months until November, the last thing Obama needed on his already very full plate is another shockingly cruel, politically complicated conflict in the Middle East, complete with gruesome, heartrending images, a recalcitrant dictator, and prominent voices calling on Washington to do something. In Syria, families flee and rebels fight You can't put history on hold until after Election Day, but you can certainly try. The Obama administration has put other major foreign policy issues on the back burner in order to avoid giving Republicans fodder for criticism, to prevent new risks to the economy, or simply to avoid stepping on a landmine while moving along a dangerous global landscape. A report in Britain's Sunday Times claims that the White House asked Israel to delay an attack on Iran until after November. Many fear that a war with Iran would send oil prices skyrocketing and hurt Obama's reelection prospects. Although that scenario could be averted, the risk of armed conflict creates too much uncertainty during a pivotal year. For now, Obama and the West are backing slow-motion talks with Iran along with economic sanctions. They have significantly reduced their demands from a requirement that Iran stop enriching uranium to a call for Tehran to "curb" enrichment to higher grades. Elsewhere in the Middle East, a top Palestinian leader said the Obama administration told Palestinians to be patient this year, with a promise that a reelected Obama, unbound by the need to win votes, would make a forceful return to his mediation efforts. Even with Afghanistan, Obama has been perceived as putting political goals ahead of strategic decisions. Leslie Gelb, President Emeritus of Council on Global Relations, suggested that the November election is the main reason why Obama has not ordered a faster draw-down of troops. "But wait till next year," he wrote. "The fig leaf of vital interests will no longer be sustainable in the postelection marketplace." While the Obama administration tries to plug all the holes, or at least slow the leaks until it has more freedom of movement, its timid efforts in Syria are starting to look like an abdication of a fundamental moral duty. The death toll in Syria continues to rise, with more than 13,000 people killed. At this rate, the political cost of doing nothing will outweigh the risk of taking action. There is no obvious, easy answer. And the American people so far seem to have no desire to see American forces step in to stop the horrifying massacres. But Washington could, without sending in American troops, take a stronger leadership role. Pressure is mounting on Obama to launch a more muscular response as Syria unravels and risks creating chaos in other parts of the region. Even Democrats are making a case for American intervention. After all, Syria is Iran's closest ally. Helping to staunch the bloodshed there could help prevent a war with Iran by weakening Tehran's hand. The U.S. could also try to fortify the Syrian opposition and work with other Arab countries who want to see Assad removed from power. For too long, the White House placed its faith in a plan negotiated by former U.N. chief Kofi Annan, which was doomed to fail from the very beginning. Washington has blamed Moscow for the diplomatic stalemate and the lack of progress in Syria, but not everyone buys that argument. Obama would like to prevent a major crisis with uncertain political ramifications from standing in the way of his reelection. But the tragedy in Syria is not waiting until November. Sure, everyone would like to see all the tough geopolitical problems solved by diplomacy, with a handshake and a smile, without massacres of civilians and lies from dictators. But the world does not work that way.

#### Military intervention guarantees Iranian aggression.

Cordesman, 12-13-2011 [Anthony, Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy, INSTABILITY IN SYRIA:

Assessing the Risks of Military Intervention, Working Draft, CSIS, 12-13-2011, <http://csis.org/files/publication/111213_SyriaMilitaryIntervention.pdf>]

With the exception of Syria’s fighting political forces, Iran truly has the most to lose should its key regional ally suffer further destabilization. Military intervention even on the most limited scale would be particularly troubling. Whenever Damascus has faced wholesale international pressure in the past, Iran has traditionally responded with highstakes foreign policy choices that often complicated matters further rather than helped to secure and stabilize Syria’s regional position. 36 Iran has already signaled (unsuccessfully) its Palestinian allies, including Hamas, to escalate instability in Israel, while Hezbollah remains largely held in reserve (though the group is also constrained by growing Sunni-Shi’a tension in Lebanon). Iran also appears to have provided support to the Asad regime as it confronts both peaceful protesters and armed insurgents. In the event of more direct international intervention, there is no reason to assume that Iran will not seek to support the Asad regime by deepening its own role in the country. This could include mobilizing elements of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corp (IRGC)’s Quds Force to play a more heavy-handed role, turning to Shi’a allies in Iraq, and bolster clandestine operations and asymmetric competition with the US, the EU and their key (mainly Sunni) regional allies including Saudi Arabia and Turkey. Should the Asad regime truly destabilize, Syria will likely supplement if not outright replace Iraq as a key arena for regional competition between Iran on the one hand and the US and its allies on the other.

#### The impact is extinction.

Michel Chossudovsky, Professor of Economics, University of Ottawa, May 2005, “Planned US-Israeli Attack on Iran,” http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO505A.html

The Bush Administration has embarked upon a military adventure which threatens the future of humanity. Iran is the next military target. The planned military operation, which is by no means limited to punitive strikes against Iran's nuclear facilities, is part of a project of World domination, a military roadmap, launched at the end of the Cold War. Military action against Iran would directly involve Israel's participation, which in turn is likely to trigger a broader war throughout the Middle East, not to mention an implosion in the Palestinian occupied territories. Turkey is closely associated with the proposed aerial attacks. Israel is a nuclear power with a sophisticated nuclear arsenal. (See text box below). The use of nuclear weapons by Israel or the US cannot be excluded, particularly in view of the fact that tactical nuclear weapons have now been reclassified as a variant of the conventional bunker buster bombs and are authorized by the US Senate for use in conventional war theaters. ("they are harmless to civilians because the explosion is underground") In this regard, Israel and the US rather than Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The planned attack on Iran must be understood in relation to the existing active war theaters in the Middle East, namely Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine. The conflict could easily spread from the Middle East to the Caspian sea basin. It could also involve the participation of Azerbaijan and Georgia, where US troops are stationed. An attack on Iran would have a direct impact on the resistance movement inside Iraq. It would also put pressure on America's overstretched military capabilities and resources in both the Iraqi and Afghan war theaters. (The 150,000 US troops in Iraq are already fully engaged and could not be redeployed in the case of a war with Iran.) In other words, the shaky geopolitics of the Central Asia- Middle East region, the three existing war theaters in which America is currently, involved, the direct participation of Israel and Turkey, the structure of US sponsored military alliances, etc. raises the specter of a broader conflict. Moreover, US military action on Iran not only threatens Russian and Chinese interests, which have geopolitical interests in the Caspian sea basin and which have bilateral agreements with Iran. It also backlashes on European oil interests in Iran and is likely to produce major divisions between Western allies, between the US and its European partners as well as within the European Union.

# Uniqueness – romney win

### Uniqueness – 2nc wall

#### Extend the Root 5/30 evidence – Romeny will win now (add in the warrants of the evidence)

#### Obama will lose – jobs and economy – BUT it can still change

Connie Cass 6/2 Business Week, <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V4SLHO1.htm>

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

#### Romney will win the undecides now

CBS News, 6/12 (Lexis)

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

### Romney win – generic

#### Obama is losing

John Podhoretz, 5/1/12 (Political commentator for the New York Post and ex-presidential speechwriter, “What is O’s case?”, <http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/what_is_case_G2XmxRTEFv1ieifcFmAs3O>, S.O.)

As June begins and the election inches closer, the question bedeviling the president and his advisers is this: What case will Barack Obama make on his own behalf to undecided voters over the next five months? That must have been on their minds yesterday, as they surveyed the cascade of disappointing data. “All the economic data was bad,” wrote Joe Wiesenthal of Business Insider. The gross domestic product for the first quarter of 2012 was revised down to 1.9 percent from the original 2.2 percent. The previous quarter saw a respectable growth rate of 3 percent; the revision means an already worrisome slowdown just worsened by about 14 percent. The anemic nature of the economic recovery, as the American Enterprise Institute’s James Pethokoukis notes, can be measured by the fact that GDP growth in the past five quarters has been 0.4 percent, 1.3 percent, 1.8 percent, 3 percent and now 1.9 percent. We also learned that initial jobless claims for the week rose to 388,000 — up from 370,000 the week before. The general consensus had been that it would remain around 370,000, so the higher number came as a troubling surprise. Meanwhile, job cuts rose 53 percent from April to May, according to the firm Challenger, Gray and Christmas — the worst such monthly jump since September. Nationally, reports the payroll firm ADP, “manufacturing employment dropped 2,000 jobs, the second consecutive monthly decline.” Manufacturing-sector growth is key to any serious recovery. Maybe the unemployment numbers released this morning will show a reduction in the rate. But if so, that will almost surely be due to a decline in the overall size of the labor force. In other words, it won’t be that more people have found jobs, but that more have joined the ranks of those not even looking for jobs. And it’s not just these data points that make the prospects for economic growth in the coming months mediocre. They are shadowed alarmingly by the deepening crisis in Europe: It is increasingly likely that Greece will pull out of the euro and default on the billions put up for its bailout. Meanwhile, Europe’s fourth largest economy, Spain, may need a giant bailout of its own. The world is preparing itself for a general European recession. Money is flooding into US Treasury bonds as a safe harbor. Demand is so high for Treasuries that the interest rate the US government must offer has dropped to an astonishing low. “You have no growth, no inflation, huge fear and a shortage of safe assets,” Wiesenthal writes. And this is the atmosphere in which Obama must now make the argument that he deserves a second term. Every president who wins re-election has such an argument. Reagan 1984: “I’ve brought America back.” Clinton 1996: “I’ve turned the economy around while shrinking the deficit.” Bush 2004: “I’m keeping America safe.” The presidents who don’t win a second term seem to base their campaigns on an argument against the other guy. Carter 1980: “Reagan is a madman.” Bush 1992: “Clinton is personally unworthy of this high office.” The Obama team must know that they can’t prevail solely with a negative assault on Mitt Romney, but really, what is the positive case? Ordering the mission to kill Osama bin Laden isn’t a case; it could be an important element of a larger argument about his stewardship if it connected to anything larger. But he hasn’t done that, and it’s hard to see where it fits in. There’s an element of bad political luck here for the president, especially when it comes to Europe. And he’s just not used to bad political luck. In 2004, running for US Senate in Illinois, he got an enormously lucky break when an unprecedented judicial ruling made public some ugliness from child-custody proceedings that caused his strong Republican rival, Jack Ryan, to withdraw and left Obama to face an absurd GOP challenger. In 2008, he enjoyed good fortune in the Democratic primaries in large measure due to the shocking incompetence of Hillary Clinton’s political team, which didn’t actually understand the rules governing delegate selection. Winning the presidency with three years of national political experience under his belt was probably the luckiest event in the history of American politics. He needs a lucky break of some kind between now and November. Hard to say what it could be, since it would by definition be unexpected. But without it, he’s not going to win a second term

#### As of May, Romney is projected to win the 2012 election because of empirics and unpopularity

Golub May 4, 2012, (conservative columnist, author, and public speaker at the Washington times), “Electoral college prediction: the race to 270 gives Romney the may win”, Washington times, <http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/tygrrrr-express/2012/may/4/2012-electoral-college-projection-race-270/> AP

President Obama will have more money than Governor Romney. Mr. Obama will also have a pliant media and the majesty of the office. Incumbency contains a built in advantage. The conditions for running are not what they were in 1984 and 1996, when incumbents Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton had everything in their favor.They were expected to win easily, and they did. **Mr. Obama is facing tough conditions on the domestic and foreign policy fronts.** Therefore, my subjective analysis has his chances of reelection at the outset to be better than 50/50 but less than 60-40. Perhaps 57% would be the approximate chance for Mr. Obama to win again. Yet **the Electoral College provides a different result. Population shifts in all of the states have moved 6 electoral votes away from Mr. Obama's 2008 totals and toward Mr. Romney.** So that has Mr. Obama up 359 to 179. Now the conditions of 2008 and 2012 need to be looked at. **In 2008, the Republicans had everything going against them. Winning three straight elections is very difficult. People wanted change, and the economy was collapsing. Mr. Obama was a rock star and Mr. McCain, while a war hero, was not.** Yet despite having every advantage under the sun, Mr. Obama did not win a landslide like the 1972 Nixon and 1984 Reagan blowouts. **In 2012, Mr. Obama is an unpopular incumbent. People like him personally, but not his job performance. Mr. Romney is not Ronald Reagan, but he is a stronger candidate than Mr. McCain**. Therefore, at this point a basic premise has to be accepted for the entire model to carry weight. President Obama is not going to win by a bigger margin in 2012 than he did in 2008. The Republicans are not going to do worse than they did four years ago. **Mr. Obama may lose ground, and the question is how much he can lose and still win overall. His margin for error is not a comfortable one. Any state Barack Obama lost in 2008, he will lose in 2012. He will not flip any new states.** So everything John McCain won will be won by Mitt Romney. **The theory that Southerners will be too bigoted to vote for a Mormon is insulting and wrong.** This adds up to 169 electoral votes for Governor Romney. The 22nd state McCain won was his home state of Arizona. Democrats are hoping that the large Hispanic population will change things, but every four years Arizona is seen as a possible pickup and every four years the Republicans win safely. Many people in Arizona support the tough illegal immigration measures, and resent being sued by the federal government. Therefore, Arizona and its 11 electoral votes stay in the GOP column to get Mr. Romney up to 180. (Mr. Obama won one electoral vote from Nebraska in 2008 since they are only one of two states that are not winner-take-all. That will not happen in 2012, as Mr. Romney will get that rogue electoral vote.) President Obama won some states with ease in 2008 and he will win them easily again in 2012. (Yes, Mr. Romney will lose his home state badly. No, Mr. Obama will not have to spend a single dollar in Massachusetts. No, this does not redeem Al Gore for losing Tennessee in 2000.Mr. Obama has 14 safe states + DC,  giving him 186 electoral votes. Florida is a state totally controlled by Republicans. Governor Rick Scott is well liked and fairly non-controversial. Florida will vote Democrat only under a perfect liberal storm, as 2008 was. In 2012 they will revert back to form. Even if Mr. Romney does not choose favorite son Marco Rubio, his pro-business stance works well in Florida. North Carolina does have a large black population, but Mr. Obama still only won that by a hair in 2008. This is another one of those states that Democrats like to say has finally changed, but this is not true. 2008 was a unique situation. Also, the Democrats are a mess in North Carolina. The Democratic Governor Beverly Perdue is so unpopular that she is not running for a second term. The Democratic Convention will be in Charlotte, but the North Carolina Democratic Party is bleeding from a sexual harassment scandal. While this has nothing to do with John Edwards, Republicans will make sure voters subtly notice the comparisons. **The Democrats are terribly disliked at the moment, and Republicans should reap the benefits for Mr. Romney**. Virginia was reliably Republican for a long time, although Virginia was always two states. Southern Virginia is the South, but Northern Virginia is moving closer to DC, Maryland, and the rest of the mid-Atlantic. The Senate race features a pair of heavyweights in Democrat Tim Kaine and Republican George Allen. Yet Republican Governor Bob McDonell is very popular, and his is one state with an organized GOP machine determined to restore the state to its place as a Republican stronghold. The machine will succeed. **At this point Mr. Romney now has 28 states, 272 electoral votes, and an election victory. Conservatives will not be caught napping again**. The state also has a large Mormon population. Mr. Reid is a Mormon, but he is not at the top of the ticket. Mr. Romney is. The Republicans in Colorado are a mess. They will pull themselves out of it, but it may take another election cycle. Mr. Obama won Colorado by a surprisingly high 9 points, so he can lose ground and still win the state. He could hang on here. New Hampshire is a traditionally Republican state, and the home field advantage Mr. Romney lacks in Massachusetts may still help him in New Hampshire. Yet every other state in New England votes liberal, and in recent years New Hampshire has joined them. This can go either way. New Mexico has a large Hispanic population, but it also has a highly popular Hispanic, female, Republican Governor in Susanna Martinez. Mr. Romney could ride her coattails. This could go either way. Giving Nevada to Mr. Romney, Colorado to Mr. Obama, and splitting New Hampshire and New Mexico either way would not change the final outcome. Mr. Obama could keep Virginia and it would still not be enough unless he won both New Mexico and New Hampshire. If Mr. Obama keeps North Carolina, he wins unless Mr. Romney gets New Mexico and New Hampshire. Mr. Obama must hold Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. Mr. Romney must flip Florida, Ohio, and North Carolina, and just to be safe, Virginia. **Final prediction: Mr. Romney wins 30 states and 283 electoral votes. Mr. Obama wins 20 states plus DC for 255 electoral votes. The popular vote flips 5 to 6 percentage points from 2008, with Mr. Romney winning between 52 and 53% and Mr. Obama receiving between 46 and 47%.** **The May analysis has Mitt Romney as the 45th President. As we all know, May is not even June, much less November.**

### Romney win – economy

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

Ramesh Ponnuru (Senior Editor at the National Review) 6/25 National Review, lexis

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

### Romney win – undecided voters

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

CBS News, 6/12 (Lexis)

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

#### Romeny win – undecided turnout low

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

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

### Romney win – turnout

#### Obama lose now – turnout

US News and world report 6/8 (lexis)

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

### Romeny win – democratic splits

#### Obama losing now because democrat divisions

The Hill, 6/11/12

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

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

### Romeny win – middle class

#### Romney is currently in control of the key struggling middle class voters

Clement 2012, (political staff writer for the Washington Post), “Romney winning struggling middle-class voters”, Wahsington Post, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/behind-the-numbers/post/romney-winning-struggling-middle-class voters/2012/04/10/gIQAR1PN8S\_blog.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/behind-the-numbers/post/romney-winning-struggling-middle-class-voters/2012/04/10/gIQAR1PN8S_blog.html) AP

M**ore than four in 10 Americans see themselves as belonging to the middle class**, and a new [Washington Post-ABC News poll](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/postabcpoll_04082012.html) finds that if the 2012 election were held today, they would split 50 percent for President Obama vs. 46 percent for Mitt Romney. **The middle class already represents a sizable electoral force, swelling to a majority when “upper middle class” is taken into account. And although politicians proclaim how their policies will help middle-class families, the survey reveals big differences between voters who feel secure in their economic position and those who fear it’s slipping away.** Obama leads Romney by 20 percentage points among voters who are “comfortable” in the middle class and those who are “moving up” beyond it. **But Romney counters with a 23-point edge among those who say they are “struggling” to hang on. Both are more lopsided than voters at the highest and lowest end of the economic spectrum. Voters who call themselves “upper middle class” and even better off split 47 percent for Obama, 51 percent for Romney, and the candidates are also close among voters who say they are working class or below.** The middle-class schism is evident across economic issues. More than half of “struggling” middle-class Americans say high gas prices have caused them serious hardship, compared with less than two in 10 of those who are “comfortable” in the middle class. **Compared with those who feel more secure in the middle class, those who are struggling are more likely to say that the economy in their area is not improving and that jobs are more difficult to find.Struggling middle-class dwellers are deeply negative on Obama’s economic record. More than three-quarters disapprove of Obama’s handling of the economy, and 53 percent say it’s a major reason to oppose him this fall.** By contrast, four in 10 of those who are comfortable in the middle class disapprove of Obama on the economy. Looking forward, those who are comfortable or moving up beyond the middle class trust Obama over Romney to protect the middle class by a 57 to 33 percent margin. **“Struggling” middle-class Americans tilt toward Romney, but by a less lopsided 48 to 40 percent.** Breaking the trend, the divergent middle-class constituencies align on the question of fairness and overregulation. About half of both groups see “unfairness in the economic system that favors the wealthy” as a bigger problem than “overregulation of the free market that interferes with growth and prosperity.”People who see themselves as middle class don’t fit squarely into income and educational boxes. In the Post-ABC poll, more than four in 10 report annual incomes under $50,000, but 17 percent make $100,000 or more. Like most Americans, most of the middle class lacks a four-year college degree, and more than a third has no education past high school.

#### Obama loses with white voters – economy key

Moore 6/12 Steven [American economic writer and policy analyst who founded and served as president of the Club for Growth from 1999 to 2004] “Obama's White Voter Problem” *The Wall Street Journal* 6/12/12 accessed: 6/27/12 <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303901504577462250353667914.html?mod=googlenews_wsj> DR

Everyone is always scrutinizing the polling numbers for every demographic group—blacks, Hispanics, Asians, soccer moms, seniors, etc.—except the largest one: whites. They're still about 70 percent of the voters and Barack Obama is struggling with them. Back in 2008 Mr. Obama corralled 43 percent of the white vote and more than 95 percent of the black vote. This year his numbers are falling slightly behind that pace among whites. The latest Peter Hart/Bill McInturf poll now has Mr. Obama capturing just 39 percent of the white vote (with 52 percent going to Romney). That's not enough to win and is giving Democratic strategists nightmares. Mr. Hart, a Democrat, has said that because of the president's slippage with white voters, "Obama's chances for re-election . . . are no better than 50-50." There are other signs of white voter falloff for Mr. Obama. The latest Rasmussen poll in two battleground states, Indiana and Pennsylvania, has Mr. Romney with about a 17-point lead with white voters. Earlier this year, a Public Religion Research Institute/Georgetown University poll of college-age voters found strong support for the president among blacks and Hispanics but not among whites, who preferred a Republican by a margin of 55 percent to 33 percent. Even if Mr. Obama wins by big margins with all other ethnic groups, it is hard to see him winning again if he gets only four of 10 white votes. His biggest problem now appears to be with white middle-class voters who feel that things are getting worse economically.

### Romney win – GOP base

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

Malone, 6/7/12 Jim Malone, “Romney Rising, Obama Slipping,” Voice of America News, 6-7-2012 (http://blogs.voanews.com/2012-election/2012/06/07/romney-rising-obama-slipping/)

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

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

Malone, 6/7/12 Jim Malone, “Romney Rising, Obama Slipping,” Voice of America News, 6-7-2012 (http://blogs.voanews.com/2012-election/2012/06/07/romney-rising-obama-slipping/)

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

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

### Romeny win – women voters

#### Romney’s Bringing Sexy Back

Mike Flynn, Architected and managed project to rewrite Answers.com to use the in- house modular PHP framework. Manages day-to-day development on important new initiatives for the company with a dedicated team of senior developers, Poll: Romney Winning The Women’s Vote, May 14, 2012,<http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/05/14/romney-winning-womens-vote-against-obama>, LV

I expect the media to be in a surly mood tonight. After months of manufactured "GOP War on Women" silliness, a new [CBS/NYT poll (!) finds Romney](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/CBSNYTPoll_051412.pdf?tag=contentMain;contentBody) leading Obama 46-44% among woman voters. Mind you, that isn't GOP woman or even independent women, but ALL women voters. More importantly, today's [poll](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/05/14/romney-winning-womens-vote-against-obama) finds a notable shift among women in just the last month. In April, Obama was leading Romney by 6% among women. No other group saw an 8 point shift in their support. Turns out women's top concern is the same as men's: The Economy. All the contrived outrage about contraceptives and women's health can't mask the fact that 73% of voters listed either the economy or the federal deficit as their number on issue. Looks like its going to be a long, hot summer for Team Obama.

#### Romney’s Winning Women’s vote

Napp Nazworth, Napp Nazworth is Writing, Research, Political Analysis, a Research professional with experience in higher-level academics and a thorough understanding of US politics and institutions, Poll: Romney Edges Obama With Women Voters May 15, 2012, <http://www.christianpost.com/news/poll-romney-edges-obama-with-women-voters-74999/>, LV

If there really is a "war on women," Republicans appear to be winning the battle for the female vote. A new [CBS News/New York Times](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/CBSNYTPoll_051412.pdf) poll shows Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney barely ahead of President Barack Obama among female registered voters. Forty-six percent of female [registered](http://www.christianpost.com/news/poll-romney-edges-obama-with-women-voters-74999/) voters said they would vote for Romney while 42 percent said they would vote for Obama. In the same poll a month earlier, Obama led among female registered voters 49-43 percent. Generally speaking, Republicans do better with male voters and Democrats do well with female voters. Romney also narrowly leads among both genders, 46 to 43 percent. The poll also shows that a majority believe Obama changed his position on same-sex marriage for political reasons

### Romney win – latino vote

#### Hispanics feel betrayed by Obama

Walsh 6/21 (James Walsh, former associate general counsel with the U.S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service, “Obama Is Still Losing Hispanic Votes,” MaxNews.com., June 21, 2012, Date Acessed: June 27, 2012, <http://www.newsmax.com/JamesWalsh/Obama-Hispanic-Votes-DREAMAct/2012/06/21/id/443070>, LG)

President Barack Obama, on June 15, 2012, announced that his administration is “deferring deportation” of illegal-alien youths for two years effective immediately. What he offers is a bastardized version of the DREAM Act (Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors) that was rejected by the Democrat-controlled U.S. Congress in December 2010. The president insists that “deferred deportation” is not an Executive Order but an exercise of “prosecutorial discretion” and a better use of limited resources, not a political ploy. In fact, this prosecutorial-discretion ploy has been in effect, ever since a DHS memo of June 17, 2011, authorized DHS officials to revaluate and reduce deportations. The Obama announcement merely builds on the DHS memo by authorizing work permits for illegal-alien youth. In addition, both the DHS memo and the president’s announcement of deferred deportation are in direct contrast to the record-setting deportations of illegal aliens by the Obama administration — 1.1 million deportations in three years. One Hispanic woman community organizer said that Obama is like “Bush on steroids.” The Obama administration says deferred deportation will affect 800,000 youths. But a Washington Post article on June 16 quoted a Pew Hispanic Center figure of 1.4 million illegal alien youths, most of them Hispanic. The actual number is unknown, just as the actual number of all illegal aliens is unknown. To qualify for non-deportation status, an applicant will need to show that he/she came into the United States before his/her 16th birthday, that he/she has been here continuously for five years, that he/she is not older than 30 years of age (since when is a person 18 to 30 years of age considered a minor?), that he/she has a high school diploma or GED or has served honorably in the U.S. military, and that he/she has no felony or serious misdemeanor convictions on record and does not constitute a national security threat. In return, these “youths” will be given work permits to compete with the millions of unemployed U.S. citizens in the 30-and-under age bracket. Current estimates have unemployment among all persons 18 to 25 years old at 20 percent and among black youths at 40 percent. Deferred deportation can only increase unemployment among U.S. citizen youth. How many of the “youth” have children and family in other countries, and may now enter legally if Obama’s administration has its way. Depending on the source, estimates are that 25 million to 40 million citizens of all ages are unemployed or under-employed. Data indicates that more than 25 percent of recent college graduates are unemployed, and another 15 percent are under-employed. he legalization of 1.4 million new workers will skewer the job market and bankrupt local and state welfare programs, when “deferred” youth can’t find jobs. What does the Hispanic community think of deferred deportations? Many have their doubts about Obama and his repeated promises of comprehensive immigration reform — La Promesa de Obama — dating from 2007. During a February 2012 interview with the Hispanic television network, Univision, the president said, “I’ve got another five years coming up. We’re going to get this done,” suggesting comprehensive immigration reform. Many Hispanics want to know why, in 2009 and 2010, when the Democrats controlled the White House as well as the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, was neither immigration reform nor the DREAM Act enacted? Obama never intended to actually seek the passage of comprehensive immigration reform, as it would defeat his idea of marginalizing America. Recent surveys show that Hispanics are worried about jobs, the economy, education for their children, and fiscal solvency, with immigration coming in a poor fifth. The average U.S. citizen/taxpayer of Hispanic lineage also worries about the additional costs of adding an estimated 1.4 million illegal-alien youth up to 30 years old to the welfare rolls. Obama’s non-enforcement of U.S. immigration laws has a growing number of voters citing the U.S. Constitution, which states clearly that only the Legislative Branch can make law. They say that the president has over-reached his constitutional authority by announcing what is, in fact, an Executive Order contradicting existing U.S. immigration laws. Non-enforcement of existing U.S. immigration laws is de facto amnesty Hispanic voters realize that Obama is pandering to them by offering a campaign concession with limited shelf life. They know by now that long-term meaningful immigration reform is not part of Obama’s game plan. Meanwhile, National Public Radio (NPR) interviewed young non-citizen Hispanic activists, who voiced their “demand” for all rights of U.S. citizenship. One young lady summed it up by saying, “Obama will get our votes.” Does she know something we don’t? Is the right to vote part of the Obama “deferred deportation” plan? At the same time, Latino journalists, community organizers, and political activists feel betrayed by President Obama’s broken promises. Many Hispanics see the Obama administration’s attack on the Catholic Church as an attack on religious freedom that impacts the Hispanic community, and many will see Obama’s “deferred deportation” for what it is — a Rose Garden re-election ploy. The president is still losing Hispanic votes.

### Romney win – A2 obama base support

#### Obama is losing support with the groups that helped him win the 2008 election

Saad June 12 2012, (analyst for the Gallup business analysis website), “Obama’s white base shows cracks compared to 2008”, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/155156/Obama-White-Base-Shows-Cracks-Compared-2008.aspx?version=print> AP

U.S. voters are roughly tied in their preferences for Obama vs. Romney for president, in contrast to Obama's nine-point lead over McCain among registered voters in October/November 2008. This is reflected in declines in support for Obama among most voter subgroups, and particularly among white subgroups. Although these declines are generally not dramatic, they are enough to make the 2012 race at this point more competitive than the 2008 election. Obama's support is down about equally among whites and blacks, while it is unchanged among Hispanics. Additionally, Obama has generally lost more support from the white subgroups that were most supportive of him in 2008 -- young adults, postgraduate women, nonmarried women, residents of low-income households, non-Christians, and nonreligious adults -- than from the white subgroups that were less supportive. Obama has also lost a greater-than-average amount of support among nonmarried men and non-postgraduate men. The declines in support among Obama's core white supporters may be especially troubling for him if his campaign strategy is, as many have speculated, to repeat his strong 2008 performance among women, the working class, and young voters, as well as minorities. On the one hand, these findings suggest his campaign may need to do more to mobilize those voters. On the other hand, the decline among his core 2008 white supporters could make these the easiest groups of voters for him to win back -- something the Democratic Convention this summer and Obama's fall campaigning will no doubt strive to do.

### Romney win – A2 obamacare decision

#### The recent Supreme Court ruling on Obamacare will be harmful for him in the election

Anderson June 28 2012, ,(writer for the Weekly standard), “The election just became about ObamaCare”, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/election-just-became-about-obamacare_647928.html> AP

In the wake of the Supreme Court’s decision upholding the constitutionality of Obamacare, the principal choice now facing Americans on November 6 will be whether to keep Obamacare or to repeal it.  The question is a binary one, and the answer — expressed almost entirely through their presidential vote — will go a long way toward determining the future course of this great nation.  Yes, the economy is extremely important; and, yes, Obamacare is hurting the economy. But the reason why this election is the most important since the Civil War is not because Mitt Romney would make a far better steward of the economy than President Obama (though he would). Rather, it’s because we are about to decide whether to put what will soon be one-fifth of our economy under the control of the federal government; whether to funnel previously unthinkable amounts of power and money to Washington; and whether this nation conceived in liberty will continue to prioritize liberty. It is understandable why President Obama has no interest in framing this election as a referendum on Obamacare. His party already suffered perhaps its worst defeat since the 19th century [thanks to his centerpiece legislation](http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/was-it-economy-or-obamacare_514977.html?nopager=1). With the Supreme Court’s ruling now behind him, he will have even less incentive to remind voters about Obamacare going forward. As far as he’s concerned, the less the American people think about it, the better. This means, of course, that the more they think about it, the better it will be for Mitt Romney.  It also means (of course) that Romney should encourage them to think about it, reminding them at every turn that this election isn’t merely — or even principally — about the economy; that it’s about something bigger; that we need to repeal Obamacare and replace it with real reform.  And he should convey to them what real reform would look like, thereby bringing into the fold those independents who don’t want to go back to the pre-Obamacare status quo.  He should start playing to win people’s votes, instead of merely trying not to lose them. Yes, the fate of Obamacare will be the most important outcome of this election.  On some level, the American people know this.  There’s a reason why Romney gets standing ovations simply for mentioning repeal.The question is whether either candidate will convey that *he* knows what this election is really about.  Obama can’t say it’s about Obamacare — even though that’s what he considers it to be about — because he’ll lose if he does.  Romney so far hasn’t said it’s about Obamacare — perhaps because that’s not what he considers it to be about — even though he’ll likely win if he does.

# Link – generic plan popular

### 2nc link wall

#### Extend the Cooper 12 evidence – Investment in infrastructure will swing the election to Obama – the public will perceive the plan as jobs expansion and economy boom – even the GOP concedes an Obama win in infrastructure will swing the election

#### Will swing voters – HUGE win for Obama

A.D.S. Logistics 5/29 2012 (Staff of authors at ADS Logistics are pulled from all of our different divisions. Collectively they have over 100 years of experience in the metals, transportation, and supply chain management industry, which they comb through on a daily basis to bring you the best and most important information that you need to know) “Transportation Infrastructure Weighs Heavy on the Minds of Voters” http://www.adslogistics.com/blog/bid/78595/Transportation-Infrastructure-Weighs-Heavy-on-the-Minds-of-Voters

With all the political issues you will be hearing about as the election nears, one important topic that will be on many Americans’ minds may surprise you. The transportation infrastructure concerns many in this country, and it will be heavily considered before voters decide who they want for the next president.In fact, according to Truckinginfo, about two thirds of American voters claim that each candidate’s stance on transportation infrastructure will help them vote. This is not exactly a hot button issue that you may see discussed on the news frequently, but it is clearly important to the average voter. The survey, which was conducted by HNTB Corp., also discovered the following results: 89% of citizens surveyed feel that federal funding is crucial to improve interstate highways. More than 80% wish to increase current funding for highways. 57% claimed that this country’s infrastructure is underfunded. Why Do Voters Care? Though people may not discuss this issue as much as they talk about hot topics, it is easy to see why it is important to most. When highways and bridges are left to deteriorate, they become unsafe for travel. In addition, when new roads and bridges are not being built as the population grows, travel becomes more difficult. A crumbling infrastructure is not just unsafe, it is also unappealing, as some older roads and bridges have simply become eyesores that passers-by and local residents alike do not want to look at. Putting additional money into improving the infrastructure, therefore, can increase safety, travel, and appeal. So it should be obvious now why so many voters will consider this issue when voting in the upcoming election

#### Plan boost Obama staninf in key battleground states

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

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

#### Transportation infrastructure is popular with voters, can swing likely voters and the election

HNTB May 18 2012 “Americans value highways and bridges as a national treasure”, Poll conducted on April 2-10, 2012. http://www.hntb.com/news-room/news-release/americans-value-highways-and-bridges-as-a-national-treasure

A new survey from HNTB Corporation finds two-thirds (66 percent) of Americans who intend to vote during this year's presidential election feel that a candidate's standing on American transportation infrastructure will influence their decision; more than one in five (22 percent) say this will be extremely influential on who they vote for. "Our highways, bridges and other transportation infrastructure are essential assets that support growth and investment in the U.S. economy," said Pete Rahn, HNTB leader national transportation practice. "People expect them to be resilient, reliable and safe." Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it’s important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways. Yet, this infrastructure isn’t receiving the fiscal attention it deserves. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The Highway Trust Fund – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds. More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation’s infrastructure is underfunded. The uncertainty over a long-term bill also is a challenge for state departments of transportation, which rely heavily on federal funding to support major highway and bridge programs, and creates ambiguity for planners and contractors who need the certainty of a long-term bill to commit to large, complex multiyear projects. "The absence of a long-term bill is hurting our economic competitiveness," said Rahn. "Recent efforts by the House and Senate to move discussions into a conference committee and hammer out potential details of a bill are a step in the right direction, but what’s really needed is a stable, long-term authorization that can adequately pay for our transportation system." Overall, 4 in 5 (80 percent) Americans would rather increase funding and improve roads and bridges than continue current funding levels and risk allowing our roads and bridges deteriorate.

### Link – popular – swings voters

#### Voters will notice the plan – swings their vote

Zachary A Callen (PHD student at The University Of Chicago) August 2009 “The Seams Of The State: Infrastructure And Intergovernmental Relations In American State Building” – A Dissertation Submitted To – The Faculty Of The Division Of The Social Sciences In Candidacy For The Degree Of Doctor Of Philosophy Department Of Political Science Http://Gradworks.Umi.Com/3369449.Pdf

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

### Link – popular – increase turnout

#### Motivates voter turnout

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

The bill is driven partly by election-year politics. Both Congress and President Obama have made transportation infrastructure investment the centerpiece of their jobs agendas. But the political imperative for passing a bill has been complicated by House Republicans' insistence on including a mandate for federal approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. The White House has threatened to veto the measure if it retains the Keystone provision. And there are other points of disagreement between the GOP-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate, including how to pay for transportation programs and how much leverage the federal government should have over how states spend their aid money. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has said it's unlikely Congress will pass a final bill until after the November elections. Despite LaHood's pessimism, lawmakers and transportation lobbyists said they believe prospects are improving for passage of a final bill by June 30, when the government's authority to spend highway trust fund money expires. The fund, which pays for roads and transit, is forecast to go broke sometime next year. A House-Senate conference committee is scheduled to begin formal negotiations May 8. It has taken Congress years to get this far. Work on a transportation overhaul began before the last long-term transportation bill expired in 2009. The Senate finally passed a $109 billion bill with broad bipartisan support in March. The bill would give states more flexibility in how they spend federal money, step up the pace of road construction by shortening environmental reviews, impose a wide array of new safety regulations and boost funding for a federal loan guarantee program to encourage private investment for major infrastructure projects. House Republicans, after failing to corral enough votes to pass their own plan, recently passed a placeholder bill that allows them to begin negotiations with the Senate. That bill included the Keystone provision, as well as provisions limiting the public's ability to challenge transportation projects on environmental grounds and taking away the Environmental Protection Agency's power to regulate toxic coal ash. "I feel like people are worn out on this issue and would like to get something done," said Jeff Shoaf, a lobbyist with the Associated General Contractors of America, a trade association for the construction industry. "I think the prospects are good." Winning approval of the Keystone provision, which would give federal regulators no choice but to approve a pipeline to transport oil from Canada's tar sands, appears to be House Speaker John Boehner's top priority, lawmakers and transportation lobbyists said. Republicans portray Obama's delay in the pipeline as a contributor to high gasoline prices. "Boehner wants to push Keystone as hard as he can because he sees it as a political winner," said Joshua Schank, president and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation, a nonprofit foundation dedicated to improving transportation. Senate Democratic conferees on the bill appear to have enough votes to block inclusion of the Keystone provision in the final product. Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., one of four Senate committee chairmen responsible for a portion of the bill, has announced he'll oppose Keystone and other House environmental provisions. An open question is whether House Republicans will balk on an overall transportation bill if they can't get Keystone. Similarly, despite their public statements, it's unclear whether Senate Democrats would be willing to sacrifice the bill in order to block a Keystone provision, and whether Obama would follow through on his veto threat, especially if the Keystone language were softened in negotiations. The president painted a bleak picture of America's infrastructure in a speech Monday to union workers in the construction industry, saying U.S. highways are clogged, railroads are no longer the fastest in the world and airports are congested. A transportation construction bill would boost employment and the economy, but "the House Republicans are refusing to pass a bipartisan bill that could guarantee work for millions of construction workers," Obama said, referring to the Senate bill. "Instead of making the investments we need to get ahead, they're willing to let us all fall further behind," he said. The transportation bill "is incredibly important to the president," said Ed Wytkind, president of the transportation trades department of the AFL-CIO. Both sides ultimately must decide whether they want an issue to be used as a campaign weapon or an accomplishment they can tout to voters.

#### Swings votes - high profile and perceived as job creation

Reuters 6/7/12 <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/usa-infrastructure-boehner-idINL1E8H7AH320120607>

Signaling that hopes for a deal on a transportation construction bill may be fading, U.S. House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner on Thursday floated the idea of a six-month extension of current funding to push the issue past the November elections. Boehner told reporters that if House and Senate negotiators fail to agree on new long-term funding by June 30, when the latest stop-gap authority for road, bridge and rail transit projects expires, he would not want another short-term extension. "Frankly, I think if we get to June 30, there would be a six-month extension and move this thing out of the political realm that it appears to be in at this moment," Boehner said. The fight in Congress over the transportation bill is one of several being waged between Democrats and Republicans on high-profile issues, with each side trying to gain the upper hand in their bids to win re-election on Nov. 6. The highway bill is particularly important as it would authorize major job-creating construction projects across the United States at a time when the economic recovery is losing momentum and jobs are the top issue for voters.

### Link – popular – all demographics

#### All voting demographic dig the plan –economic benefit and support federal funding

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

The public understands the economic benefits of infrastructure improvement. Four in five (80%) voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation “will boost local economies and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering.” Just 19% disagree with this. And 79% agree that “in order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.” Again, 19% disagree. In fact, voters are in strong agreement with President Obama’s ideas on investment in transportation. Survey respondents were read excerpts from the president’s State of the Union address related to transportation and asked their reaction. “The American Dream has required each generation to sacrifice and meet the demands of a new age. We know what it takes to compete for the jobs and industries of our time. We need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information—from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet. So over the last two years, we've begun rebuilding for the 21st century, a project that has meant thousands of good jobs for the hard-hit construction industry. We should redouble those efforts. We'll put more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges. We'll make sure this is fully paid for, attract private investment, and pick projects based on what's best for the economy, not what's best for politicians.” Fully 80% of voters agree with this statement, including 46% who strongly agree, while 19% say they disagree. Agreement is nearly unanimous among Democrats (95%) and is exceptionally high among independents (75%) and Republicans (66%). Indeed, 91% agree with the specific idea that “our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure--just as our parents and grandparents did”; only 8% disagree with this.

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

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

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

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

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

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

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

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

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

### Link – Dem base

#### Plan is perceived as win for Obama – mobilizies democratic base

Michael Tomasky (Newsweek/Daily Beast special correspondent) 6/26/11 <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/06/26/2012-how-obama-can-mobilize-his-liberal-base.html>

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

### Link – A2 not large issues

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

Yonah Freemark (independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University) 1/25/2012 http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

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

### 2nc independents

#### Plan signals cooperative leadership on transportation – benefits Obama

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

Key Findings Voters—be they Democrats, Republicans, or independents—are looking for cooperation and consensus in Washington. As has been the case for well over a year, a majority of the public believe that things in the country are off on the wrong track—55% say this is the case, while 33% say things are headed in the right direction. One of the key things the public is looking for right now is for elected leaders to work together. Two-thirds (66%) of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground, compared with just 20% who say leaders should hold fast to their positions (another 10% say it depends on the issue). Interestingly, this sentiment crosses party lines—74% of Democrats, 65% of independents, and 58% of Republicans say leaders should be seeking common ground. Even a plurality (46%) of voters who identify as Tea Party supporters want common ground, versus 34% who say leaders should hold fast to their positions. Voters want common ground on transportation legislation more than on any other issue. Americans want leaders to seek common ground across a host of issues, but they want it on transportation legislation more than any other area. 71% of voters say there should be common ground on this issue—higher than other major issues—while 19% say leaders should hold fast to their positions, which is lower than other major issues. By comparison, the next-highest issue is legislation dealing with the budget deficit, where 69% would like to see common ground and 25% want to see leaders holding fast to their positions. This pattern holds across other issues as well, from energy development to health care reform to tax cuts to Social Security.

#### Cooperative leadership critical to get independents on board

Will Marshall (President and Founder of the Progressive Policy Institute) March 17 2010 http://progressivepolicy.org/tag/deficits-and-debt/page/3

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

### 2nc unions

#### Unions want increases in transportation infrastructure investment

Keith Laing (Transportation Columnist at The Hill) June 12 2012 <http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/highways-bridges-and-roads/231939-house-senate-highway-funding-talks-veering-toward-stalemate>

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

#### Union support key – plan jumpstarts it

Washington Times 2/17/2012

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

### Union link – plan popular

#### Labor kiles the plan

Doc Hastings (Chair of the National Resources Committee, US House of Reps) February 1 2012 <http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=277534>

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

#### More evidence – top priority

Portland Business Journal Januarary 27 2012

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

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

#### Plan a win for labor

Paul Bedard (Columnist at US News and World Report) August 25 2012 http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2011/08/25/afl-cio-threatens-obamas-re-election-over-jobs-

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

### Union link – key to election

#### Labor key to Obama win – voter turnout

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

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

#### Unions Key

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

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

### 2nc vote targeting

#### The plan will allow Obama to target votes – key swing states

Geoffrey Skelley (Political Analyst, U.Va. Center for Politics) 5/23/2012 <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/unemployment-update-who-gets-the-credit/>

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

#### Infrastructure investment key pitch to swing votes

Volodmyr Bilotkach (Department of Economics, University of California) October 2010 <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf> (the october date is correct even though the web address says September

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

### Vote targeting link – Obama will target

#### Obama will tafrget voting blocks and states

Chicago Tribune, may 4 2012

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

### 2nc Florida

#### Transportation investment popular with Florida voters

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 “Florida Report”

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

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

#### Florida key to the election

### Florida link – plan popular

#### Transportation investment popular in Florida

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 “Florida Report”

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

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

### 2nc Ohio

#### Manufacturing industry likes the plan

Doc Hastings (Chair of the National Resources Committee, US House of Reps) February 1 2012 <http://naturalresources.house.gov/News/DocumentSingle.aspx?DocumentID=277534>

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

#### Manufacturing support swings Ohio for Obama

CNN (Cable News Network) May 16 2012

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

### Ohio link – plan popular

#### Popular in Ohio – economic win

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 “Florida Report”

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

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

#### Popular in Ohio – swings voters

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 “Florida Report”

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

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

### Ohio link – manufacturing key ohio

#### Manufacturing voters key to ohio

Chicago Tribune, 12 (5/4, lexis)

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

### 2nc Virginia

#### Plan popular in Virgina – mobilizes support and votes

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 “Virgina Report”

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

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

#### Virginia swings the election for Obama

Nate Silver (Pollster and creator of 538 polling) June 7 2012

<http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/>

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

### Virginia link – plan popular

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

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 “Virgina Report”

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

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

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

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

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

#### Dem base mobilization key to virginia

Chicago Tribune, May 4 2012 lexis

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

# Link – policy specifics

### Airports

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

Volodymyr Bilotkach (Department of Economics, University of California) October 2010 <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft_September10.pdf>

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

### Roads

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

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

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

### HSR

#### HSR popular

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

The public understands the economic benefits of infrastructure improvement. Four in five (80%) voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation “will boost local economies and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering.” Just 19% disagree with this. And 79% agree that “in order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.” Again, 19% disagree. In fact, voters are in strong agreement with President Obama’s ideas on investment in transportation. Survey respondents were read excerpts from the president’s State of the Union address related to transportation and asked their reaction. “The American Dream has required each generation to sacrifice and meet the demands of a new age. We know what it takes to compete for the jobs and industries of our time. We need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information—from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet. So over the last two years, we've begun rebuilding for the 21st century, a project that has meant thousands of good jobs for the hard-hit construction industry. We should redouble those efforts. We'll put more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges. We'll make sure this is fully paid for, attract private investment, and pick projects based on what's best for the economy, not what's best for politicians.” Fully 80% of voters agree with this statement, including 46% who strongly agree, while 19% say they disagree. Agreement is nearly unanimous among Democrats (95%) and is exceptionally high among independents (75%) and Republicans (66%). Indeed, 91% agree with the specific idea that “our generation has a responsibility to the future to invest in America's infrastructure--just as our parents and grandparents did”; only 8% disagree with this

### National Infrastructure Bank

#### National Infrastructure bank popular – avoids spending and effectiveness concerns

Washington Post February 14 2011

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

#### Strong voter support

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

Voters are open to several suggested funding streams for national transportation projects, though there is considerable hesitancy among voters to backing higher taxes to pay for them. Proposals that the majority of voters find acceptable are encouraging more private investment (78% acceptable) and imposing penalties on projects that go over budget or exceed their deadline (72% acceptable). There also is significant support for establishing a National Infrastructure Bank (60%), issuing new transportation bonds (59%), and eliminating subsidies for American oil companies that drill in other countries (58%). Voters are far less accepting of proposals that would affect their own wallets. Seventy-one percent (71%) say it would be unacceptable to increase the federal gas tax; majorities also are opposed to placing a new tax on foreign oil (51% unacceptable), replacing the federal gas tax with a mileage fee (58%), and adding new tolls to interstate highways and bridges (64%).

### Mass Transit

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

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 Virginia Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rockefeller Foundation 11

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

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

# A2 link turns – Obama bad

### A2 spending turn

#### Infrastructure spending is popular

The Washington Post April 24 2012

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

#### Jobs perception outweighs spending concerns for voters

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

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

#### Voters overwhelming support infrastructure investment

Rockefeller Foundation February 14 2011 http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure

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

#### Voters will favor transportation spending

Richard Barcaskey (Executive Director, CAWP, Construction Association of Western Pennsylvania) july 18 2011 Pitt Post Gazette

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

### A2 big government

#### Big government people are already anti-Obama

Charlie Cook (Political Report) May 7 2012 National Journal, http://cookpolitical.com/node/12467

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

#### Dem base and independents favor large spending programs that generate jobs

NYT (New York Times) July 31 2011 http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/31/us/politics/31dems.htm

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

### A2 wasteful spending

#### Plan not perceived as wasteful spending

SGA (Smart Growth America) February 2011 Virginia Report,

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

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

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

David Madland (Center For American Progress) march 22 2012 <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/experts/MadlandDavid.html>

And make no mistake, the broader American public supports increased investments in infrastructure. Ninety-three percent feel making improvements to infrastructure is important; 72 percent support “increasing federal spending to build and repair roads, bridges, and schools”; and 81 percent are prepared to pay more in taxes to do so.

### A2 independents hate spending

#### Independent voters will not mind spending on the plan

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

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

# Obama bad – Syrian intervention

### Romney not intervene

#### No intervention – against air strikes

Landler 12 Mark [White House correspondent for The New York Times Prior to taking up this post in March 2011, he was the newspaper’s diplomatic correspondent. He has reported for The Times from 67 countries on six continents, from Afghanistan to Yemen] “Romney Calls for Action on Syria, but His Party Is Divided” *The New York Times* 5/29/12 accessed: 6/28/12 <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/30/world/middleeast/romney-condemns-obamas-syria-policy.html> DR

Mr. Romney, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, condemned Mr. Obama on Tuesday for a “policy of paralysis” toward Syria that he said had allowed President Bashar al-Assad to “slaughter 10,000 individuals.” But Mr. Romney’s own prescriptions for ending the mounting death toll in Syria have been less definitive than his denunciations of the president. He called for the United States to “work with partners to organize and arm Syrian opposition groups so they can defend themselves” — a policy that goes somewhat further than Mr. Obama’s but falls short of the airstrikes advocated by Republicans like Senators John McCain of Arizona and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina. The White House has rejected arming rebel groups, saying it does not know enough about them and does not want to “further militarize the situation.” But the question of whether to arm the Syrian opposition has also split Republicans. Such caution, from both the incumbent and the challenger, reflects the complexities of the Syrian uprising as well as the recognition that Americans have little appetite for another large-scale military engagement. Even human rights groups are not demanding intervention. “No human rights organization wants to criticize the administration for failing to do something we haven’t yet asked them to do,” said Tom Malinowski, the head of the Washington office of Human Rights Watch. “We see more complexity and risk in Syria because of the sectarian dimension and the weakness of the opposition.” That does not mean Mr. Obama has escaped criticism for his cautious approach to Syria. Some analysts said he had missed a chance early in the uprising to push out Mr. Assad, calling instead for an orderly political transition. Other critics said the White House had also failed to play a later leadership role, even as it announced Tuesday that it had expelled Syria’s top diplomat to the United States. That announcement, said the chairwoman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, should have come before similar moves by countries like Britain, France and Germany. “The U.S. should have taken the lead in expelling Syrian regime officials,” Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, a Republican from Florida, said in a statement. Mr. Malinowski said that “complexity can’t be an argument for paralysis.” Even if the White House has valid reasons to avoid intervening, he said, it is useful to raise the possibility of military action — as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, did in an interview Monday — if only to prod the diplomatic process. Still, proponents of a harder line acknowledge that there is little support in either party for military intervention. Despite the support for intervention in Libya voiced by Mr. Graham, Mr. McCain and Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, the Connecticut independent, Republicans pummeled Mr. Obama when the United States did join NATO in acting there. “Maybe the kids will make the difference,” Mr. Graham said in an interview, referring to the killings on Friday in the Houla area of central Syria. “We live in a visual world. When you see the slaughter of 30 children, it reminds us of who we are.” The peace plan promoted by Kofi Annan, the former United Nations secretary general, is “dead,” Mr. Graham said, adding that the peacekeepers “are just becoming better at counting the dead.” Mr. Romney has not embraced airstrikes — in part, one of his advisers said, because Syria, unlike Libya, does not have a long, isolated highway that NATO could bomb to cut off the government’s forces. But Mr. Romney believes arming opposition groups is critical to asserting a “robust American leadership role,” said Richard Williamson, a foreign policy adviser to his campaign. From the start of the uprising, Mr. Williamson said, Mr. Obama’s response has been muted and “slow on the draw,” even after horrendous abuses by the Assad government. While Mr. Williamson acknowledged a risk of bad elements among the rebels, he said: “You could help the opposition unify. Instead we’re subcontracting it to Kofi Annan.”

### Intervetions = war

#### **Iran will go nuclear if there is U.S. intervention in Syria**

Bryanski May 17 2012,(Russian reporter and writer for Reuters), “Russia says action on syria, Iran may go nuclear”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/17/us-g8-russia-idUSBRE84G18M20120517> AP

MOSCOW (Reuters) - Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev warned on Thursday that military action against sovereign states could lead to a regional nuclear war, starkly voicing Moscow's opposition to Western intervention ahead of a G8 summit at which Syria and Iran will be discussed. "Hasty military operations in foreign states usually bring radicals to power," Medvedev, president for four years until Vladimir Putin's inauguration on May 7, told a conference in St. Petersburg in remarks posted on the government's website. "At some point such actions which undermine state sovereignty may lead to a full-scale regional war, even, although I do not want to frighten anyone, with the use of nuclear weapons," Medvedev said. "Everyone should bear this in mind." Medvedev gave no further explanation. Nuclear-armed Russia has said publicly that it is under no obligation to protect Syria if it is attacked, and analysts and diplomats say Russia would not get involved in military action if Iran were attacked. Russia has adamantly urged Western nations not to attack Iran to neutralize its nuclear program or intervene against the Syrian government over bloodshed in which the United Nations says its forces have killed more than 9,000 people. Medvedev will represent Russia at the Group of Eight summit in place of Putin, whose decision to stay away from the meeting in the United States was seen as muscle -flexing in the face of the West. Putin said previously that threats will only encourage Iran to develop nuclear weapons. Analysts have said that Medvedev also meant that regional nuclear powers such as Israel, Pakistan and India could get involved into a conflict. As president, Medvedev instructed Russia to abstain in a U.N. Security Council vote on a resolution that authorized NATO intervention in Libya, a decision Putin implicitly criticized when he likened the resolution to "medieval calls for crusades". Medvedev rebuked Putin for the remark, and some Kremlin insiders have said the confrontation over Libya was a factor in Putin's decision to return to the presidency this year instead of letting his junior partner seek a second term.

# Obama bad – EPA – internals

### Obama Bad 1nc – EPA

#### Romney will roll back the EPA CO2 regulations

Star Ledger June 3 2012 <http://blog.nj.com/njv_editorial_page/2012/06/scary_times_for_environment_--.html>

The grim report on jobs Friday greatly improves the odds that Republicans will win in November, putting Mitt Romney in the White House and bolstering GOP positions in the House and Senate. If that happens, they promise to roll back the progress made under President Obama and Environmental Protection Agency administrator Lisa Jackson. Romney wants to strip the EPA of its power to regulate carbon emissions. Jackson relied on that power to enact rules that will double automobile efficiency standards by 2025 and toughen truck standards, too. Transportation is the largest single source of air pollution. So cutting emissions in half will make a profound change, especially in a car-centric state such as New Jersey. It also will reduce oil imports sharply, lessening our dangerous dependence on unstable regimes in the Mideast. Jackson’s tough limits on coal-fired power plants rely partly on carbon controls, as well. So those gains would be endangered. Again, the air in New Jersey will get dirtier. Because, while our own coal plants have exotic pollution control equipment, those to the west and south do not. Many lack even the most basic filters, known as scrubbers, and rely only on tall smoke stacks to push the toxins higher into the atmosphere.

#### EPA regulations cause global economic collapse

Alan Caruba (Public Relations Counselor and member of the Society of Professional Journalists, American Society of Journalists and Authors and the National Association of Science Writers) 2009 How to Destroy the U.S. Economy: Regulate Carbon Dioxide, Canada Free Press

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

#### Economic collapse causes extinction

Michael Auslin (Resident Scholar at American Enterprise Institute) and Desmond Lachman (Resident Fellow at American Enterprise Institute) March 6 2009 “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, http://www.aei.org/article/100187

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

### Yes Romney Roll Back

#### Romney win blocks EPA regs

Williams, 12 (Jean, Environmental Policy, 5/31, Examiner, <http://www.examiner.com/article/a-romney-administration-would-intensify-the-world-s-climate-extremes>)

Nonetheless, a Mitt Romney presidency would strive for Republican control in congress and the senate, which would guarantee that carbon emissions management would grind to a halt. They have vowed to dismantle the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), because any laws that aim to guard water and air from the ramifications of greenhouse gas pollution is in direct opposition to GOP vested interests. Environmentalists believe the Republican Party is not concerned about the possibility of impending atmospheric destruction or the survival of planet Earth for future generations, but are essentially controlled by what corporate billionaires and big oil companies want for their daily existence now.

### EPA regs now/coming

#### EPA CO2 regs now and will massively expand

Walsh, 11 (Bryan, senior writer for TIME magazine, covering energy and the environment,Time Magazine, 1/3, <http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2040485,00.html>)

But the Obama Administration has a Plan B — and its already putting it into place. On Jan. 2, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) enacted what are the first regulations of major stationary sources of greenhouse gases. (While auto fuel-efficiency standards of the sort strengthened by President Barack Obama in 2009 essentially regulate mobile sources of greenhouse gases, the EPA has never tried to regulate major stationary sources such as power plants, refineries and factories.) The new rules will be modest at first, affecting only new plants or existing facilities that are undergoing major upgrades — perhaps 400 facilities will be affected initially. But eventually the EPA will be issuing regulations for nearly all sources of greenhouse gases — providing the only federal action to control U.S. carbon emissions. "We are following through on our commitment to proceed in a measured and careful way to reduce GHG pollution that threatens the health and welfare of Americans, and contributes to climate change," EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said in a statement late last month.

### A2 dems block

#### EPA has discretion – doesn’t require congress

Institute for 21st Century Energy April 21 2009 US Chamber of Commerce, 4/21, http://energyxxi.org/sites/default/files/ClimateChange101.pdf

Massachusetts vs. EPA: Supreme Court decision that held that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority to regulate CO2 under the Clean Air Act from new automobile tailpipes if the agency finds that CO2 emissions endangers public health or welfare. However, the Court did not require EPA to regulate.

#### If Romney wins Congress will be GOP enough to block EPA regs

Kevin Drum, Blogger, Mother Jones,1-17-2012 <http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2012/01/president-romney-vs-president-obama-cage-match>

Karl Smith doesn't care if Mitt Romney is a liar, a cad, or a prick. He just wants to know what concrete things would be different under a Romney presidency compared to an Obama Presidency. My list is so conventional that I'm afraid it's pretty boring, but here goes. All of this is based on the assumption that if the electorate is pro-Republican enough to elect Romney, it will also be pro-Republican enough to give Republicans control of the Senate. Obamacare gets repealed via reconciliation. And even if that turns out not to be possible, it will be gutted enough to make it all but dead in practice. The judicial system gets packed with a lot more conservative, business-friendly judges. The Bush tax cuts are made permanent. Corporate tax rates are cut substantially. There's a slim chance that this would be done via a 1986-style tax reform bill that's a net positive, but since Republicans wouldn't need any Democratic help to pass it, probably not. The estate tax might very well be eliminated. Overall, for reasons of basic arithmetic, spending cuts will be much smaller than Romney and the GOP are promising, and the deficit will be substantially higher than it would be under Obama. We might stay in Afghanistan significantly longer than we would otherwise — though I'm not sure about this. Tightening of environmental regs would come to a halt. (Though it's unclear how much of the existing regulatory infrastructure would get rolled back. Probably not that much.) If another financial crisis hits, Romney would be very constrained in how he could deal with it. (So would Obama, but probably somewhat less so.) Although congressional Republicans will be less successful than they'd like at slashing social welfare programs, they'll still make some cuts. Life will get tougher for the poor. The NLRB would become toothless once again.

#### EPA rollback efforts are close now – election will determine outcome

Michael McAuliff (Washington correspondent for the New York Daily News) Octoiber 9 2011 <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/10/09/epa-republican-war-defund_n_1000664.html>

For the moment, it will be difficult for many of the House's bills to get through the Senate, where Boxer plans to stop them. The White House also has promised vetoes of the measures. Still, once anti-EPA legislation is written, it can wind up attached must-pass bills, or at least used to try and embarrass Democrats. Thursday night, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) tried to attach a measure to a bill on Chinese currency manipulation that ostensibly aimed to stop the EPA from regulating farm dust. But the measure's language doesn't actually mention "farm dust" after its title. Instead, it targets soot regulation. Democrats successfully blocked it. More troubling to environmental advocates is that they see the attempts to roll back regulations as a sustained effort that will not go away, and likely could pick up steam -- especially if Republicans take back the Senate in 2012. "I think it certainly will continue through the 2012 election," said Goldston. "I think it's partly an attack on Obama but I think much is a broader part of a Tea Party effort to question the role of government in providing public health protections across the board and funding that." And he predicted the range of attacks would only get broader. "This can play out in spending; this can play out in the series of efforts to block any additional protections, not only in the clean air area, but more broadly, there are bills that have been pending in the house and the senate ... that would change the entire structure necessary to create protections," Goldston said. The anti-EPA campaign has born some fruit already for the GOP, with President Obama delaying planned new regulations of ozone and citing economic reasons. The political climate has left Democrats wary -- and concerned they could lose some battles -- but they also think the GOP could pay a price. Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.), chairman of the Water and Wildlife Subcommittee, expressed relief that so far lawmakers had successfully blocked EPA-targeted legislation in the Senate. But, he added, environmental protections remain vulnerable.

# EPA Regs Bad

### 2nc Business confidence

#### Environmental regulations crush business confidence.

William G. Laffer, III 2/16/1993 Backgrounder #926

http://www.heritage.org/research/regulation/BG926.cfm

Regulation in one part of the economy can have an impact in other areas. For example, a recent study by economists Michael Hazilla of American University and Raymond Kopp of Resources for the Future, a Washington, D.C.-based research group specializing in environmental issues, found that environmental regulations had reduced employment in the finance, insurance, and real estate industries by 2.64 percent as of 1990. (Michael Hazilla and Raymond J. Kopp, "Social Cost of Environmental Quality Regulations: A General Equilibrium Analysis," Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 98, No. 4 (1990), p. 869.) This occurred despite the fact that these industries produce no pollution themselves and thus did not incur the direct cost of pollution abatement equipment. Hazilla and Kopp found that all sectors of the economy are affected by environmental regulations, because such regulations cause the cost of inputs to the production process such as labor, raw materials, and electricity to rise, and cause savings, investment and capital formation to fall.

#### Business confidence is the motor of economic growth.

Arthur F. Burns (recipient of the AEI Francis Boyer Award for 1978) 1/1/2000 http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15232,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp

The learning process that has thus been going on in our country is to me a basic reason for viewing our economic future with optimism. Education may proceed slowly, but economic mistakes do not go unnoticed indefinitely in a vital democracy such as ours. Responsible citizens have gradually learned that our striving for a better society must be disciplined by prudence. They have learned that our productivity must increase faster if we are to remain a great nation, that governmental regulation can be overdone, that persistent federal deficits release forces of inflation, that inflation has been sapping our nation's strength, and that inflation cannot be brought to an end without making some economic sacrifices. They have learned also that confidence is still the main driving force of our economy and that business confidence in particular requires sustained governmental policies for encouraging initiative, enterprise, and investment.

#### U.S. decline goes global.

Eric Pfanner 1/10/2003 International Herald Tribune http://www.iht.com/articles/2003/01/10/a11\_21.php

The global economy piggybacks on the United States, benefiting when America breaks into a run and suffering when the U.S. pace wanes.

#### The impact.

Walter Russel Mead (Policy Analyst, World Policy Institute) 1992

Hundreds of millions--billions--of people have pinned their hopes on the international market economy. They and their leaders have embraced market principles--and drawn closer to the west--because they believe that our system can work for them. But what if it can't? What if the global economy stagnates--or even shrinks? In that case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor. Russia, China, India--these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the 30s.

### 2nc Steel

#### Environmental regulations will crush U.S. steel.

Thomas Gale Moore Senior Fellow Hoover Institution 1997 http://www.stanford.edu/~moore/Energy.html

Each of the working groups found that higher energy outlays would boost the cost of production, lead to increased imports, slash employment and domestic output, and in some cases might eliminate all US production. The groups also agreed that the "policy scenarios would not produce a reduction in global emissions and these emissions could actually increase." The study concluded that employment in the steel industry would fall by about 65 percent, meaning that about 80,000 high-paid workers would lose their jobs. Employment in cement would be slashed by one-third. The United States would have to sacrifice its entire primary aluminum industry, abolishing all 21,000 jobs, and liquidating an industry essential for American security .

#### Key to hegemony.

William F. Jasper 11/29/2004 http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\_0286-14863882\_ITM

Foreign nations target U.S. steel: steel is the backbone and sinews of modern society. Without a robust domestic steel industry, we will not prosper in peace--or survive in war.(American Industry)(Cover Story) COPYRIGHT 2004 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. Kim Haws is the kind of entrepreneur who Republicans and Democrats both hold up as the exemplar of the American inventor-manufacturer we want to keep in this country. Mr. Haws is the owner of Agri-Trac manufacturing in Mesa, Washington, a small rural town near the Columbia River in the state's southeastern corner. Haws developed an ingenious hexagonal steel boot, the Agri-Trac, for the tires of center pivot irrigation systems. The Agri-Trac provides five times as much ground surface area as unshod tires and can reduce wheel rut depths by 80 percent. This means the farmers' rotating sprinkler systems are far less likely to get stuck in the mud. The Agri-Trac has been a smashing success. Haws manufactures the Agri-Trac in his six-man shop in Mesa for customers all over the United States. He even has a growing international market. In other words, he's an exporter, helping in his small way to subtract from our massive trade deficit. But like many other American manufacturers, Kiln Haws has a major problem: his product is made of steel. And steel prices and availability have been very volatile over the past few years. When we spoke to him in March, he had orders for Agri-Trac waiting, but no steel with which to fabricate them. "It's been pretty amazing," he told THE NEW AMERICAN. "I used to have steel suppliers calling me all the time trying to sell me steel, now I can't get any anywhere. When I ask what's happened to the supply, they all say, 'It's going to China.'" Now, the supply is still tight, but Haws says at least he can get it: "I have to scramble and spend a lot of time calling around to find steel and pay two and a half times what I used to for it." A load of plate steel that he could buy a year and a half ago for $8,000 now costs him $18-20,000. Mr. Haws' experience can be multiplied many thousands of times. Virtually every manufacturer and every contractor who uses construction steel has been whipsawed by critical steel shortages and radical price spikes. The U.S. steel industry has been on a wild ride over the past several years. Prices have fluctuated spectacularly, as has availability of this basic must-have commodity. And the bruising roller coaster ride is far from over. It will continue to dramatically impact virtually all other American industries, as well as every American consumer. It is not an exaggeration to suggest that the outcome of this ride will determine whether the United States will continue as a great power, or go the way of other has-been societies and civilizations.

### Steel – steel key

#### More evidence – steel maintains U.S. power.

William F. Jasper 11/29/2004 http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\_0286-14863882\_ITM

Steel Is King Yes, steel is an old "smokestack" industry, one supposedly without of microchips, nanotechnology, information technology, But the "New Economy" we keep hearing about still runs on fossil fuels and is built on (and out of) steel. Plastics, acrylics, composites, aluminum, and other materials have their important niches, but steel is still king. You can't have cars, trucks, trains, boats, airplanes, bridges, railways, power plants, commercial buildings, appliances, refineries, water treatment and distribution systems, and thousands of other essentials of modern society without it. Not to mention weapons of war, which, like it or not, are still very essential. September 11, 2001 and various looming threats and potential threats around the world should provide sufficient proof of that.

### 2nc Mining Industry

#### Environmental regulations are crushing our mining industry now – strike downs would protect domestic access to resources.

Art Schweizer 2004 http://www.smenet.org/news/2004\_president.cfm

Mining has changed considerably over the last several decades, and these changes will have a decided impact on the future of the industry. As far as I am concerned, the biggest of these changes is the fact that the United States has not maintained its status as being a safe and economic haven for mining industry investments. Mining operations in the United States have suffered significant costs from regulations and obstacles presented to them by communities that have potential metal and mineral deposits. Due to these environmental regulations, it is difficult to develop a new mine in the United States. As a result, companies are turning their efforts towards international operations. Internationally, environmental regulations do not exist to the degree that they do in the United States. In most countries, a new mining venture is welcomed and embraced as an opportunity to raise the standard of living for that locality. So I see the mining industry continuing with its focus on international development. The United States will be left with only its existing mines and a reliance on importation for its metal and mineral necessities.

#### Key to hegemony and averting global resource wars.

My name is Milton Copulos and I am President of the National Defense Council Foundation 3/4/2004

http://www.nma.org/pdf/cong\_test/copulos\_030404.pdf

The consequences of this lack of investment are already evident. Between 2000 and 2002, the most recent time period for which figures are available, the value of domestic minerals production in the United States declined by roughly $1.2 billion. When the “multiplier” effect is taken into account, this translates into an economic loss of roughly $2 billion. But as with oil, the dollar loss tells only part of the story. This decline in has fostered the loss of some 38,420 jobs within the domestic economy – and as noted earlier in my testimony, high-paying jobs. When firms move overseas, of course, their employees no longer pay U.S. taxes. As a result, federal, state and local coffers have lost some $167.6 million in tax revenues just from the most recent loss of jobs to overseas operations. As onerous as the economic consequences of the decline of our extractive industries has been, they represent only part of the overall damage this circumstance does to our nation. A second and equally important negative consequence is the extent to which our increasing dependence undermines the nation’s ability to defend itself. As the 21st Century unfolds, one thing is certain: the global threat environment has become far more complex and far more uncertain. Gone with this evolution in the threat environment is the relatively straightforward strategic doctrine that accompanied the era of superpower confrontation. FM-100, the United States Army’s Statement of Doctrine describes the new threat environment this way: “…The global realities of today are in a period of significant change. Army forces may find themselves called upon to fight under conditions of rapid force projection, that can build to major sustained operations in war and peace or that can terminate quickly only to lead to other commitments elsewhere.”

### Mining industry – economy

#### Also collapses our economy and competitiveness.

Major Gilda a. Jackson, USMC CSC 1988 Strategic Material-U.S. Vulnerability http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/1988/JGA.htm

Strategic minerals are often defined as minerals required to supply the military, industrial, and essential civilian needs of a country during a national emergency, and not found in or produced by that country in sufficient quantities to meet its need. In today's world any interruptions in the flow of these minerals will affect not only our national security, but also our economic stability and technological competitiveness. Therefore, the United States must place greater emphasis on reducing its import vulnerability in non-fuel materials and, in particular, critical strategic minerals.

#### More evidence.

My name is Milton Copulos and I am President of the National Defense Council Foundation 3/4/2004

http://www.nma.org/pdf/cong\_test/copulos\_030404.pdf

What then has the loss been, and what are its impacts? One of the most evident has been the decline in domestic investment in exploration for new mineral deposits – the most important single requirement for sustaining the hard rock minerals industry. Less than a decade ago, North American mining companies routinely allocated half or more of their exploration budgets to the search for domestic mineral deposits. Today, that figure has declined to between 7% and 10% depending on the size of the company. What is worse, though, is the reason for the decline. The Fraser Institute, a Canadian organization that rates various regions in terms of their desirability as a site for investment in the mining industry has sharply downgraded the United States – once the most favored region. According to the Institute, the reason for the change was the uncertain regulatory environment. In simple language, companies are not sure that they will be able to obtain a mining permit, no matter what steps they take to comply with the law. Given this assessment, it is likely that the erosion of investment in domestic exploration will not only continue, but accelerate. The consequences of this lack of investment are already evident. Between 2000 and 2002, the most recent time period for which figures are available, the value of domestic minerals production in the United States declined by roughly $1.2 billion. When the “multiplier” effect is taken into account, this translates into an economic loss of roughly $2 billion. But as with oil, the dollar loss tells only part of the story. This decline in has fostered the loss of some 38,420 jobs within the domestic economy – and as noted earlier in my testimony, high-paying jobs. When firms move overseas, of course, their employees no longer pay U.S. taxes. As a result, federal, state and local coffers have lost some $167.6 million in tax revenues just from the most recent loss of jobs to overseas operations. As onerous as the economic consequences of the decline of our extractive industries has been, they represent only part of the overall damage this circumstance does to our nation. A second and equally important negative consequence is the extent to which our increasing dependence undermines the nation’s ability to defend itself.

### Mining industry – red dawn

#### Foreign dependence on minerals sends a perception of weakness to Russia.

Major Gilda a. Jackson, USMC CSC 1988 Strategic Material-U.S. Vulnerability http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/1988/JGA.htm

Does the Soviet Union pose a mineral threat to the United States? As U.S. dependence for critical strategic minerals continues to increase, the capability of the Soviet Union and its surrogates to disrupt the flow of certain key materials or to influence a third country's policy increases daily. In 1973, Soviet Party Leader Brezhnev stated that the Soviet aim is to gain control of the "...two great treasure houses on which the West depends: the energy treasure house of the persian Gulf and the mineral treasure house of Central and Southern Africa." (2:1) This strategy has remained unchanged, and Soviet leaders following Brezhnev have remained loyal to the same. The Soviets have increased their presence in the world in the past two decades. The Soviet Union has dramatically increased its deep-water naval capabilities, with the introduction of the Soviet base at Cam Ranh Bays. Additionally the fishing rights agreement with the Gilbert Islands in the Pacific suggests that the Soviets are pursuing a forward maritime defense strategy. This expansion has frequently been in close proximity to countries that are U.S. allies or part of our national interest. Also, this movement has not been without a noticeable relationship to present sea lines of communication. Soviet surrogates have also moved into vital areas in close proximity to U.S. sources of supply for a number of strategic minerals. The Cubans, for example, are increasingly active in southern Africa, particularly in the neighboring countries to the north and northwest of Zaire and Zambia, two of the world's largest suppliers of cobalt. It is believed that approximately 40,000 Cuban surrogates are in central and southern Africa. Their major presence is forces occupying Angola. The U.S. news media and members of Congress have hinted that Angola may be edging toward an alignment in international politics closer to the Russians and further away from the United States. This move would weaken already strained trade relationships between the U.S. and southern African nations. A similar pattern seems to be evolving in Central America where the Cubans are now assisting the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and are believed to be in an advisory capacity in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Panama.

#### Motivates an attack.

Ryan Mauro 2003 http://www.worldthreats.com/russia\_former\_ussr/Russia%20911.htm

Although there can be no clear conclusions from all this, we can conclude that sects of the Russian intelligence communities and government did know about 911 in advance. We can conclude that there are distinct anti-American sects in Russia that will not help us detect a “financial attack”, and may even egg it on. We can conclude that there is certain coordination between state sponsors and these rogue elements in Russia. We can conclude that the branches of forces that help terrorists and the organized crime groups allied to them, is far more extensive than commonly believed. And finally, we can conclude that there are rogue elements in Russia eagerly awaiting the collapse of America’s economic system to exploit our weaknesses, and perhaps even take power themselves in Russia after such an event.

#### Causes nuclear war and takes out hegemony.

J. R. Nyquist 10/14/2004 http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2004/1014.html

The destruction of America's nuclear deterrent in a surprise attack is not fantasy. Russia has been training its forces for exactly such an opportunity. In fact the entire international landscape of today, down to the anti-U.S. shift of France and Germany, the diversionary nature of the "war on terror" and the Russia-China strategic partnership fits snuggly into this scenario. While our strategic attention is fixed on al Qaeda and Iraq, America's nuclear deterrent may be vulnerable to surgical strikes. "Terrorist" hits against critical U.S. communications might conceivably negate U.S. early warning systems. New methods for tracking ballistic missile submarines may already exist. Russian intercontinental missiles, launched in the wake of diversionary terror attacks, might destroy America's missile silos and bomber bases. Pundits and so-called "experts" are often guided by the mistaken notion that nuclear weapons exist solely for the purpose of obliterating population centers; but the shock wave of a 25-megaton bomb detonated in the ocean will destroy all submarines within an 18 to 20-kilometer radius. Smaller nuclear weapons can take out bomber bases and missile silos. The truth that Mr. Bayer has put forward in the pages of the Wall Street Journal, therefore, has much wider significance. It is not simply that Russia has the power of launching a suicidal strike that could destroy America. Russia possesses weapons that have a war-winning potential if used in proper combination with other forces (regular and irregular). In this context, President Vladimir Putin's resuscitation of the USSR is hardly a spontaneous shift. There is a growing body of evidence that this shift was long in the making; that it may have been conceived prior to the Soviet Union's collapse.

### 2nc Dairy

#### EPA regulations have massive cost for dairy farmers

Sowell 2-5 (Thomas, “EPA Issues Regulations on Farmers’ Spilled Milk” http://patriotupdate.com/articles/epa-issues-regulations-on-farmers-spilled-milk)

Despite the old saying, “Don’t cry over spilled milk,” the Environmental Protection Agency is doing just that. We all understand why the Environmental Protection Agency was given the power to issue regulations to guard against oil spills, such as that of the Exxon Valdez in Alaska or the more recent BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. But not everyone understands that any power given to any bureaucracy for any purpose can be stretched far beyond that purpose. In a classic example of this process, the EPA has decided that, since milk contains oil, it has the authority to force farmers to comply with new regulations to file “emergency management” plans to show how they will cope with spilled milk, how farmers will train “first responders” and build “containment facilities” if there is a flood of spilled milk. Since there is no free lunch, all of this is going to cost the farmers both money and time that could be going into farming— and is likely to end up costing consumers higher prices for farm products.

#### Dairy industry growth is key to overall economic growth—ripple effect

IDFA 2007 (“IDFA's DAIRY POLICY PROPOSALS” International Dairy Foods Association, http://www.healthydairyindustry.org/vision\_for\_reform\_c1.html)

Today’s dairy industry is a vital component of the U.S. economy. The nation’s dairy production and marketing system – dairy farms, dairy processors, supermarkets, grocery stores, other retail food outlets and exporters – generates hundreds of thousands of domestic jobs and provides U.S. and international consumers with a dependable stream of nutritious, high quality milk and dairy products. Americans spend about 11% of their food dollar on dairy products, resulting in over $90 billion in annual retail sales. The industry’s prospects for a prosperous future have never been more favorable. It is among the world’s leaders in production and processing and has exceptional potential for future growth. At current market prices and without government subsidies, global demand for our milk powder products, wheys, and lactose is growing. Domestic consumption of innovative, value-added dairy products that meet the needs of the modern American consumer is also increasing. Dairy farmers, cooperatives, and dairy processors all stand to gain from the unlimited possibilities in meeting the growing demand for American milk and dairy products. The timing could not be better for the introduction of dairy policies that support this drive for prosperity. The robust domestic marketplace and growing international demand for U.S. dairy products provide an unprecedented opening for a long-overdue shift in the direction of federal dairy programs. By adopting innovative, market-compatible public policies at a time when dairy markets are strong, policy makers can ensure that the industry will be able to capitalize on these opportunities, and lay the groundwork for industry success for generations to come. This report provides a common-sense blueprint of the forward-looking policies that will help the industry reach its market potential, while contributing to the nation’s economic and environmental well-being, providing a sustainable financial safety net for dairy farms, and generating widespread public support.

#### Extinction

Bearden 2000 (T.E. Fellow Alpha Foundation’s Institute for Advaned Study & Director, Association of Distinguished American Scientists June 12 “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve It Quickly,” Adas Position Paper: Solution To The Energy Crisis, [www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc](http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc))

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions.  Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released.  As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {2} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response.  Or suppose a desperate China whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States attacks Taiwan.  In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary.  The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed.  Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible.  As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed .  The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

### Dairy collapse exts

#### EPA regulations hurt farmers and ranchers

Murphree 2010 (Julie, member of the Arizona Farm Bureau “EPA Permitting Could be the Straw that Breaks the Dairy Cow’s Back” http://fillyourplate.wordpress.com/2010/05/10/epa-permitting-could-be-the-straw-that-breaks-the-dairy-cow%E2%80%99s-back/)

EPA’s recent actions under the structure of the Clean Air Act mean that agriculture businesses, including dairies, could be required to obtain a permit to emit greenhouse gases. To comply with greenhouse gas regulations, annual permit costs covering a myriad of businesses would be regulated. Based on a carefully assessed evaluation by the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), estimates put dairy permit fees at about $175 per cow per year. Such expense ultimately put too many farm families out of business, if not all of them. For the Kerr’s 1,000-cow dairy the cost is $175,000 annually. “This basically puts us out of business,” says Bill Kerr, owner in the dairy. Efforts are under way in Congress and legal challenges undertaken by state governments are offering corrective paths to undo a very real disaster headed toward farm and ranch families in Arizona and across the country. In Arizona alone, some farmers and ranchers are estimating that dozens of large animal operations will fall under the permit requirements. This is despite EPA’s original assertion that very few agriculture operations would be impacted. “We believe the EPA’s greenhouse gas requirements will lead to costly and ineffective regulations on America’s farmers and ranchers,” said American Farm Bureau Federation President Bob Stallman. “We vehemently oppose regulating carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act (CAA) because we believe it will require livestock producers and other agricultural operations to obtain costly and time-consuming permits as conditions to continue farming.” In Arizona, the Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative Association says in a white paper, “Using the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gases would be like using a hammer to tighten a screw ─ it may be theoretically possible to do it, but the hammer is not the right tool for the job. Likewise, the CAA is not the right tool for the job of addressing climate change. Congress and the White House must step in to prevent the use of an inappropriate tool to force emission reductions from stationary sources.” Grand Canyon State Cooperative further explains that the Clean Air Act was enacted to control pollutants on a local and regional scale that cause direct health effects. The act is ill-suited for controlling greenhouse gas emissions, including carbon dioxide, for stationary sources like power plants and animal agriculture operations. Dan Thelander, cotton farmer in Pinal County and someone tracking the issue, believes the endangerment finding has consequences for the economy as a whole. “It’s going to drive up the cost of everything and much more dramatically than some expert estimates have stated,” says Thelander. “Some of their cost estimates are bare bones costs and they’re not really factoring in the various costs that are going to reverberate throughout our entire economy right down to the individual consumer.”

#### EPA regulations collapse dairy farms

Pura 2010 (Anthony, reporter for KHAS new “Dairy farmers cringe at possible EPA regulations” http://www.khastv.com/news/local/Dairy-Milk-98983149.html)

There is no use crying over spilled milk unless you are a dairy farmer and the EPA has its way. Under the Clean Water Act, the EPA said it has the authority to regulate milk, like it does oil. How it is stored and disposed of has dairy farmers up in arms. Wednesday afternoon, Senator Mike Johanns introduced a bill that would block those regulations for milk. So how does milk even fall under the same regulations as oil? Milk contains animal fat, which under EPA laws, is considered non–petroleum oil. Now, last year the EPA was considering exempting milk from these regulations. There is no decision from them yet, but Senator Johann's bill would pretty much make the decision for them. If there is anything lawmakers have learned in the past months, it is that you cannot be too careful trying to prevent oil spills. But instead of thick, black waters, imagine the threat of a white watery coastline from say a milk spill. "I have never actually heard of milk killing anything. If it was spilled out on the ground, I think most animals would probably enjoy that," said Steve Wolfe. Milk as hazardous waste seems ridiculous to Steve Wolfe. He has been processing milk safely and cleanly for years. He milks his cows here. The milk is transferred to a 6,000 gallon tank where it does not stay for long before heading to a processor. It is this storage tank that could fall under new EPA rules. "It is a stainless steel tank that is about 6 inches thick. I do not know what else they can us do to contain the milk better," Wolfe said. The EPA is not sure, either, according to Senator Mike Johanns. "Rural businesses are facing a deadline in just a few months and they still do not know what to do," said Johanns. That deadline — those regulations – they are expected to kick in November 10th. The senator wants dairies exempted. "It is very concerning that anyone would ever equate milk handing with oil," said Johanns. Many dairies already struggling in the recession, and Wolfe said the price of a new storage change would not be milk money. "When you are talking about an engineer, it is going to be way over done. So anything like that would be costly," said Wolfe. And remember these EPA rules against milk really falls only on the producer. The EPA is not too interested whether you spill milk in your kitchen or at the grocery store.

### Dairy collapse – economy

#### Dairy industry fuels the recovery—creates jobs

Rosson et al 2009 (June, Parr Rosson, Flynn Adcock, Dwi Susanto and David Anderson, Authors are Professor and Extension Economist and Director, Center for North American Studies, Texas AgriLife Extension Service; International Program Coordinator and Assistant Director; and Research Associate, both with the Center for North American Studies, Texas AgriLife Research; and Professor and Extension Economist, Texas AgriLife Extension Service; all are in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University “The Economic Impacts of Immigration on U.S. Dairy Farms” http://nmpf.org/files/file/NMPF%20Immigration%20Survey%20Web.pdf)

Value-added is the part of output that includes employee compensation, proprietor income, royalties, rents and payment of indirect business taxes, such as fuel. Of the $28.7 billion in output attributed to dairy farms, $8.9 billion is considered to be value-added. Another $6.7 billion in value-added is attributed to input suppliers and other sectors that support dairy production, while $4.0 billion in value-added is due to household spending. As a result, total value-added attributed to the dairy sector is $19.6 billion. It is important to reiterate that value-added is included in total output and therefore, should not be added to output. It was estimated that U.S. dairies required 138,124 full-time equivalent employees annually for the 2005 to 2007 time period. Another 105,775 workers were employed by input and service sectors, while another 57,474 workers were employed as a result of induced spending by households related to the dairy industry. As a result, the U.S. dairy industry supports a total of 301,374 full-time equivalent employees. The permanent loss of significant portions or all foreign labor would have major negative economic impacts on the U.S. dairy sector. A 50 percent labor loss would be expected to reduce fluid milk sales by dairies by $6.7 billion for a total economic loss to the U.S. economy of $11.2 billion (table 9). The majority of the losses occurring off the dairy farm ($3.0 billion), would be due to declining purchases by dairies from sectors that support dairy farm operations such as input supply (fuel and feed), transportation, real estate and wholesale trade. A complete loss of foreign labor would reduce dairy fluid milk sales by $13.3 billion, or 46.5 percent, and result in total economic losses to the U.S. economy of $22.4 billion. Nearly $6 billion of these losses would occur in sectors supporting dairy farm operations, while another $3 billion would be lost due to reduced household income in dairy operations and supporting sectors.

#### Dairy production key to farm income – spills over into all sectors

Conlin 2003 (Joe, Dairy Cows Are Rural Economic Development Engines, http://www.ansci.umn.edu/dairy/dinews/12-1-economic\_engines.htm)

More dairy cows on the Minnesota landscape will help revitalize Minnesota rural communities. A recent University of Wisconsin study shows each cow generates $13,737 of economic activity. A 1993 Minnesota study estimated the impact of one cow to be $11,671. This money ripples through the community in the form of jobs, goods, and services created by a cow. Each cow paid $604 in state and local taxes in the Minnesota study and $512 in the Wisconsin study. These estimates are in close agreement given that 10 years separated the time of the studies. Many people in local rural communities benefit from the ripple effect. The farm family benefits from milk and animal sales. Providers of goods and services benefit from sales to the farm. Processors add large value to milk products and employ many workers. These two dairy sectors create added business activity in the local community. Some of the statewide businesses benefiting from the cow include retail and wholesale trade, restaurant/bar, personal services, medical services, banking, insurance, electrical services, housing, and real estate. Cows generate jobs. Every nine cows supported one job in the recent Wisconsin study. The number of jobs supported by the Minnesota dairy industry surpasses the combined employment of 3M, Target, and Northwest Airlines. A 1999 study showed the Minnesota dairy industry supported 53,595 jobs. The industry employed 44,529 people in dairy production, processing, marketing, and supply sectors. This created another 9,347 jobs through local spending. Dairy ranks fourth for employment in Minnesota's manufacturing industries. The dairy industry adds $600 million in value to Minnesota's crops each year. Minnesota cows convert about 60 million bushels of corn, 5.5 million tons of corn silage, 2.4 million tons of hay, and 400,000 tons of high-protein feed to the higher-value product of milk. In times of normal prices, the added value benefit of each $1 of feed converts to $3.68 in value of milk. The value of each $2.60 bushel of corn contributes $9.57 to the economic base of the community when marketed as milk.

### 2nc Agriculture – Economy

#### EPA regulations collapses US agriculture sector

Lucas 2-11 (Rep. Frank Lucas, “Rep. Frank Lucas: American agriculture is under attack” http://thepacker.com/Rep--Frank-Lucas--American-agriculture-is-under-attack/FreshTalkBlog.aspx?oid=1307317&fid=PACKER-ALL-NEWS&aid=117)

American agriculture is under attack. Every day the administration seems to demonstrate just how vastly disconnected it is from the folks who feed us. The administration fails to realize that rural America’s economy is dependant on agriculture. The in-your-face-approach that the administration has taken regarding government regulation has increased the cost of doing business for America’s farmers and ranchers. If the administration is allowed to continue down this path, the only choice for many farmers and ranchers will be to stop farming altogether. From the dairies in Vermont, to the wheat fields near the Chesapeake Bay, to the corn farms in the Midwest, American agriculture is under a constant barrage of irrational and unworkable regulations from the Environmental Protection Agency, which are burdensome, overreaching, and that negatively affect jobs and rural economies.

#### The Agriculture industry is key to the economy

Rock Products August 1 2004

Agriculture is the backbone of the economy. Brian Lego, an economist at Economy.com says if crops such as sorghum and corn fall victim to the drought, the cost of animal feed will rise and so will the cost of beef. People will have less money to spend, and the housing market will suffer, Lego says.

#### Extinction

Bearden 2000 (T.E. Fellow Alpha Foundation’s Institute for Advaned Study & Director, Association of Distinguished American Scientists June 12 “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve It Quickly,” Adas Position Paper: Solution To The Energy Crisis, [www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc](http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc))

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions.  Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released.  As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {2} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response.  Or suppose a desperate China whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States attacks Taiwan.  In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary.  The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed.  Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible.  As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed .  The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

### Ag collapse exts

#### EPA regulations are a double jolt for farmers

America Farm Bureau 2-9 (“EPA GHG Regulations Brings ‘Double Economic Jolt’ to Ag” http://www.fb.org/index.php?fuseaction=newsroom.newsfocus&year=2011&file=nr0209.html)

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 9, 2011 – America’s farmers and ranchers will receive a “double economic jolt” from the Environmental Protection Agency’s regulation of greenhouse gases, the American Farm Bureau Federation told a House subcommittee today. Philip Nelson, president of the Illinois Farm Bureau, testified on behalf of AFBF before the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power. “First, any costs incurred by utilities, refiners, manufacturers and other large emitters to comply with GHG regulatory requirements will be passed on to the consumers of those products, including farmers and ranchers,” Nelson explained. “As a result, our nation’s farmers and ranchers will have higher input costs, namely fuel and energy costs, to grow food, fiber and fuel for our nation and the world.” The Illinois farm leader said EPA’s regulations could increase fertilizer prices for farmers because the rules outline a larger role for natural gas, replacing coal and other fossil fuels. Natural gas is a principal component in fertilizer production. Nelson said the second “jolt” to agriculture will come when regulation is fully phased in under the EPA’s “tailoring” approach, under which farms and ranches that emit, or have the potential to emit, more than 100 tons of greenhouse gases per year must obtain a Title V operating permit. Based on EPA’s numbers, he said, just the expense of obtaining permits would cost agriculture more than $866 million.

#### EPA regulations kill agriculture – lawsuits and costs

Middleton 1-11 (Laura, writer for climate action “EPA pollution rules threaten agriculture says American farming bureau” http://www.climateactionprogramme.org/news/epa\_pollution\_rules\_threaten\_agriculture\_says\_american\_farming\_bureau/)

Apprehension regarding the EPA has existed from farmers for years, and recent opposition arose from concerns that regulation of GHGs will hike up farming costs. Rejection of the EPA plans has become more widespread in the US and the lawsuits may drag on for years without final conclusions. This in itself could slow investment in energy dependent industries. The AFBF move follows the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit granting a request by Texas officials last week to issue a stay on the EPA plan. Texas rejects regulations obliging it to issue GHG permits to its biggest polluters. The EPA's rules were imposed 13 months after the agency declared CO2 emissions a danger to public health and welfare. The EPA's "endangerment finding" followed a Supreme Court ruling in 2007 declaring that the agency has the authority to regulate CO2 emissions under the Clean Air Act. This declaration is being challenged by several states, including Texas, Virginia and Florida, as well as companies and business groups. A lawsuit against EPA regulations was filed yesterday (Monday 10th January) in US District Court, Pennsylvania, to block what he called the Chesapeake Bay "pollution diet". He voiced concerns that regulations may lead to the downsized American agriculture and out-sourced farming. Katherine Cesinger, a spokeswoman for Republican Governor Rick Perry said in an e-mailed statement: "The EPA's misguided plan paints a huge target on the backs of Texas agriculture and energy producers by implementing unnecessary, burdensome mandates…threatening hundreds of thousands of Texas jobs." Continued lawsuits, however, could further threaten the agriculture industry. Subsequent reduction in investment in energy industries could slow the US economy.

### Ag collapse – economy exts

#### Ag industry spills over to all levels of the economy

Hall 2010 (Shane, Ph.D. in political economy "The Effect of Agriculture Industry on the Economy", 1-4-10, http://www.ehow.com/facts\_5829019\_effect-agriculture-industry-economy.html, http://www.ehow.com/facts\_5829019\_effect-agriculture-industry-economy.html)

In 1789, when the U.S. was a young nation, 90 percent of Americans lived and worked on farms. By 2008, fewer than 5 percent worked in agriculture. Despite this, agriculture remains a significant sector in the U.S. economy. According to government statistics cited by Iowa State University, the agricultural industry employs 15 percent of the U.S. work force and contributes more than $1 trillion a year to the nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Agricultural products accounted for more than $115 billion in U.S. exports in 2008, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce's International Trade Administration. Top U.S. exports include such agricultural products as feed grains, soybeans and wheat. Production of food in the agricultural industry affects many other sectors of the economy, including hospitality (restaurants and hotels), grocers and other food retailers, transportation and tourism. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, technological advances in agriculture have allowed U.S. farms to increase production with fewer resources. These advances enable farmers to grow more crops per acre

#### Vital part of the ecomony – ripple effect

Kriesel 1999 (Warren, Economic Impacts of a Drought on the Southwest Georgia Regional Economy, http://interests.caes.uga.edu/drought/articles/dryimpact.htm)

Thus, the food and fiber sectors together are a vital part of the regional economy. The next largest industrial group, manufacturing, generated about half as much income and jobs. *Economic impacts (multipliers) of agricultural production changes* The input-output model also generated economic impact multipliers. These multipliers measure the ripple effects that spread through an economy when a shock disrupts the normal flow of dollars and goods in and out of the economic region. These multipliers could be applied to the decreased sales and employment that might be caused by drought conditions if: (1) there are no disaster assistance payments and (2) there are no crop insurance payments for losses. The economic impact multipliers for food and fiber production are: 1.7 for the value of production, or gross sales 2.1 for income generation 2.4 for employment These multipliers are interpreted as saying that if ag production declines $1 million, this would **ripple through the economy** to generate an additional $700,000 decline, for a total decline of $1.7 million. A similar interpretation applies to income: for each $1 million of lost farm income an additional $1.1 million income loss would be felt. The employment multiplier says that for each job lost, an additional 1.4 jobs would be lost **because of the ripple effect**.

#### Spillsover and collapses the entire economy and free trade

Francl 1998 (Et al, senior economist and commodity specialist, Impact of the Kyoto Protocol on Agriculture, Online)

No single study can capture **the ripple effect** that a **decline in farm income** would have on **other aspects** of the agricultural and non-agricultural economy. A 1998 study by the Sparks Companies, using data from Standard and Poor's DRI and based on the commitments agreed to by the United States in Kyoto, found significant economic effects: Consumer food prices would rise. A 2 percent decline in GDP resulting from the Kyoto Protocol would in turn cause a 0.7 percent decline in domestic demand for food. This would create a mild, short-term, downward pressure on food prices, counterbalanced by the inflationary pressures of higher energy costs. On net, food consumption expenditures would rise 2.6 percent. This would have only minor effects on the average U.S. consumer, whose food costs account for 11.9 percent of disposable income. But the impact on poor families would be considerable. The 37.4 percent of U.S. households earning under $20,000 after taxes spend between 21.4 and 100 percent of their income on food. Public assistance demand and costs would rise. The U.S. Department of Agriculture allocates more than $39 billion annually to six food programs, most notably the child nutrition programs and food stamps. Reduced employment could add roughly 500,000 to the food stamp rolls and raise costs of USDA food programs 5 percent annually, or by $2 billion. Agricultural exports would fall. By increasing the energy costs of farm production in America while leaving them unchanged in developing countries, the Kyoto Protocol would cause U.S. food exports to decline and imports to rise. Reduced efficiency of the world food system could add to a **political backlash against free trade** policies at home and abroad. Farm consolidation would increase. "The higher energy costs," wrote DRI/McGraw-Hill, "together with the reduced domestic and export demand, could lead to a very severe decline in investment in agriculture, and a sharp increase in farm consolidation. Small farm numbers likely would decline much more rapidly than under baseline conditions, while investment even in larger commercial farms likely **would stagnate or decline**."

#### Agriculture is key to the economy

Journal of Commerce, December 31, 1998

U.S. agriculture prices have reached lows not seen in 10, 20 or even 30 years, while the costs of living, labor and machinery are at record highs. The only thing missing that was present 70 years ago is a stock-market plunge and massive unemployment. If this country continues to allow its agriculture to sink to Depression-era levels, how can it keep the stock market from tumbling, too? Think about the stock market's falling to levels of 30 years ago, say around 700, instead of flirting with 9,000. Impossible? In just over two years, cash grain prices have dropped over 70 percent from the high posted in July 1996. Hog prices also reflect a near-70 percent decline since 1990. Many things have contributed to this dramatic decline of commodity prices. Some have directly benefited the consumer, like lower petroleum prices that were passed on at the gas pump. However, this has not been the case with meats and other commodities in 1997 and 1998. Processors and retailers decided they could increase their margins rather than passing on the savings to the consumer (which would have cleaned up the oversupply). Supplies continue to build, benefiting only processors and retailers, not consumers. Free markets have been stymied. I am not trying to tell you we are heading for a sequel of the Great Depression. But why is the greatest production machine in the world, American agriculture, going through such difficult times? Why should a minority, those who produce the majority of our food, be subjected to cost inflation and price deflation at the same time? U. S. taxpayers coughed up $6 billion dollars this year to help the farmer. Along with next year's Freedom to Farm payments, the extra cash is helping us through the crisis. Thank you, it is just what we needed: another Band-Aid. Government policy for the past 60 years has been to intravenously feed farmers the ""antibiotic'' of farm subsidies and price supports. But the wound has never healed. The Freedom to Farm Act attempts to wean agriculture from subsidies and supports by initiating a ""withdrawal'' process. The problem is, other grain-producing countries around the world don't see it that way. They continue to subsidize their producers. The livestock producer gets no help from taxpayers. But if these prices continue, it is a pretty sure bet the banks holding his notes will get bailed out. We can make our products much more affordable to foreign buyers by devaluing the dollar. But, you say, that will cause inflation. Maybe investors should rethink inflation. Maybe a little inflation is much better than another Depression. If you look at government money-supply figures, it would appear that Washington may have started to print money (which, in hindsight, could have prevented the Great Depression). I hope this is the case. The enormous power of the hedge funds that continuously short commodity futures - the pricing mechanism of the world these days - is staggering. If agriculture dies an economic death, the rest of the economy is sure to follow. It is not too late, but we must act now. Please, help America's farmers sell our products outside our borders. We are dying out here.

### Ag – food wars

#### US export competitiveness key to global food security

Raisbeck 2003(David, Vice Chairman, Cargill, Incorporated Address to the World Agricultural Forum, The Role of Agriculture in the Global Economy, Online)

Today, U.S. agricultural exports top $50 billion a year. Six of its top ten customers are developing countries, and three-fourths of U.S. agricultural exports go to Asia and the Americas. There have been three transforming events during that half-century that reshaped this global agricultural market. The first was the formation of the European Community and the creation of its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The CAP’s generous farm supports took the EC from a 20-million-ton-per-year net grain importer in the 1960s to a 20-million-ton-per-year net grain exporter by the 1980s. The second transforming event was the collapse of the centrally planned economies, particularly the former Soviet Union. At their peak, the USSR and the PRC were importing 40-50 million tons of grain per year. Today those countries are net grain exporters. The third transforming event was the emergence of developing countries as commercial grain importers. They have absorbed the 80-plus million tons of grain imports erased by the other two events. While total world grain trade has grown little in the last few decades, these events have shifted grain trade patterns dramatically. Quite simply, the future for world grain trade depends upon the rate of growth in food demand in the developing world. This helps explain why agriculture is the linchpin of the Doha Round. Doha can shape for a generation the progress we make in merging agriculture into the rest of the global economy. And that progress will determine to a large extent how far we get in ending hunger and reducing poverty while protecting the environment. For many of the world’s people, agriculture remains a subsistence activity. Ninety percent of the food produced in the world is consumed within the country producing it, and most of that usage lies outside of the commercial system. A company like Cargill only begins to touch the food system as commercial production emerges and agricultural products flow to urban centers and into international markets. But as commercial food trade emerges, new opportunities arise to eliminate hunger and enhance food security. The first opportunity is to lower food costs. Access to low-cost imports helps keep food costs down, especially for the poor who often spend 70 percent or more of their personal income to eat. Second, food trade creates choice. Trade offers variety; it also provides access to foods year round that often can be grown locally only on a seasonal basis. And, it provides efficient local farmers new marketing opportunities. The result is higher living standards for those able to participate. Finally, food trade provides more reliable access to supplies at lower cost. Crops often fluctuate 25 percent from one year to the next within a growing region. Global production, however, typically fluctuates less than three percent annually, as good crops in some places offset poor crops elsewhere. Moreover, storing food typically costs 20 percent or more of its value annually, even ignoring waste, pests, quality losses and the like. Most foods can be shipped halfway around the world for 10 percent of their value, or half the cost of storage. In other words, food trade lowers costs, widens choices and provides more reliable access to supplies. Each is important in eliminating hunger. But, food trade cannot play this role effectively in the face of large market access barriers. The major problem limiting agriculture’s role in the global economy is that agricultural trade barriers on average are ten times higher than industrial trade barriers, and many agricultural barriers are prohibitively restrictive. Unless these barriers are brought down dramatically on all agricultural products in all countries, the global food system needed to end hunger will not develop adequately. We will lose an important opportunity to reduce food insecurity, perhaps for a generation. Eliminating hunger, however, is not just about cost, choice and access to supplies; it also is about the ability to pay. Reducing poverty is a major key to ending hunger. Today, about half the world’s population – 3 billion people – live in abject poverty. Roughly three-fourths of these poor people live in rural areas dependent upon agriculture. No country that has raised the majority of its people out of poverty has done so without attacking the causes of rural poverty. In fact, agricultural development is a necessary trigger for broader, sustainable economic development for most countries. Agricultural development stimulates self-sustaining growth in two principal ways. First, through rising productivity it increases the incomes of farmers. Second, it releases labor from subsistence farming that can be employed in manufacturing or service activities. Agribusiness companies want to bring poverty-reducing tools to farmers in developing countries. We can offer more productive inputs; we can provide practical finance; we can reach out to new market opportunities; we can show farmers ways to lower or manage risks. But we cannot do these things alone. They require public investments in physical infrastructure and well-functioning marketing systems. They also require an economic climate that welcomes investment, as capital flows to where it’s needed and wanted. This does not mean “special incentives.” Rather, it means creating a predictable, level playing field in which competition through price and service determines success. Like ending hunger, reducing poverty requires that current high levels of agricultural protection come down. Subsidized competition and trade-distorting domestic supports in developed countries must be curbed. But market access barriers must be brought down everywhere. Forty percent of global agricultural trade already is among developing countries themselves. Most of the future growth in demand will be in developing countries, so they must join in as full partners in the creation of a more open global food system. It is the surest route to reducing poverty in all countries. Frankly, the proposed Harbinson text on the modalities for the agricultural negotiation is disappointing on this score. It offers developing countries a program of “special and differential treatment” that largely is a series of exceptions to and exemptions from reform. In their own best interests, developing countries should resist this temptation to be excluded from reform. They should insist on disciplining developed-country subsidy practices, and the least developed countries may deserve longer transition periods. But, developing countries refusing to lower their own market access barriers will prove a prescription for perpetuating poverty, not reducing it. The third area in which agricultural liberalization can help is in protecting fragile environmental resources. The pressures of hunger and poverty often result in agricultural practices in low-income countries that harm the environment in two ways: by exhausting the soil’s productivity rather than replenishing it; and by forcing agriculture to expand to new lands rather than to use the most highly productive lands better. These pressures will only intensify over time. Food demand will continue to rise as global population increases. Most of that population growth will be concentrated in developing countries. Higher per capita incomes and accelerating urbanization in the developing world will only further intensify agriculture’s use of scarce land and water resources. Unless productivity per acre, per dollar of investment and per hour of work rises, agriculture will continue to expand into more virgin areas, strain limited water resources and exhaust overworked soils. This again is an area where agribusiness can help, if conditions permit the growth of the commercial sector of agriculture. But, many poor countries currently pursue policies that discourage farmers from increasing their productivity. Examples include: overvalued exchange rates, which limit exports; under investment in rural infrastructure, which raises marketing costs; and uncertain land title and commercial dispute settlement systems, which deter risk taking. It is these policies that could be left unreformed if “special and differential treatment” for developing countries heads down the wrong path. Feeding a growing and more prosperous global population in a more environmentally sustainable way can only be achieved by adopting productivity- and efficiency-enhancing technologies. And adopting better technologies is directly linked to the opening of trading opportunities that can generate cash for reinvestment and market opportunities for expanded output. So, from a commercial perspective, the world’s hopes for eliminating hunger, reducing poverty and protecting fragile environments ride in important ways on the success of the Doha Agenda. Is the world ready to create an open food system obeying the same kinds of rules that govern a more open industrial economy? Progress will require commitments of several kinds. First, developed countries must be prepared to grant greater access to their own markets to all countries, not just a select few. Developed countries also must find less trade-distorting ways to support rural incomes, and they must end the practice of subsidizing their exports. But developing countries need to embrace a similar vision of openness; nearly half of current global food trade, and virtually all of its growth potential, is among developing countries themselves. Second, the developed world needs to help developing countries build up their capacity to participate in a global economy and to ensure that the poor gain from globalization. Rich countries have pledged to reduce global hunger dramatically. Donor countries and institutions seem prepared to reverse the decline in aid going to rural development. And companies are prepared to invest in creating and expanding commercial opportunities for developing country entrepreneurs. If appropriately supported by agricultural trade liberalization, such investment flows can make the prospects of the poor in Africa and South Asia resemble more closely the gains made by the poor in parts of East Asia over the last 20 years. Finally, attitudes toward new technologies, especially agricultural biotechnology, need to be reexamined. New technologies can raise agricultural productivity and human nutrition at an affordable cost. It would be unfortunate if developing countries were denied these tools by trade barriers disguised as safety or marketing regulations unsupported by sound science. We already have seen food aid rot on loading docks while millions go malnourished because of such fears. A saner, more responsible path is needed. Trade, aid and technology are tools that can enlarge agriculture’s role in the global economy. They do so by expanding commerce, increasing productivity and leveling the competitive playing field. But that’s neither the goal nor the payoff. **The real benefit from enlarging agriculture’s role in the global economy is the greater food security, economic development and environmental sustainability it will bring to the world’s poor**.

#### Loss of food supply leads to war

Wallensteen 1986 (Peter; Uppsala University; “Global resources and international conflict” p. 14)

To secure a reliable supply of food remains a basic requirement for any society. For many societies, grains such as wheat or rice meet this requirement. Greater or lesser fractions of these staple food products are used by different countries to produce meat, luxury drinks, automotive fuels, and other products that go beyond basic human needs. A threat to the supply of the basic staple food requirements of a country is likely to lead to conflict. Such threats could arise in many ways, notably through the political manipulation of access to food (e.g. via an embargo), through environmental degradation (e.g., via soil erosion), or through competition among conflicting land-use or consumption interests (e.g., between nomadic and sedentary populations).

#### Rising food prices starve one billion and triggers riots and civil disintegration

Christian Science Monitor April 3, 1996

If food prices continue to rise, both sides agree, the hardest hit will be the world's poorest billion people, who subsist on less than a dollar a day and for whom continuing price increases could have catastrophic consequences. Behind food shortages and higher prices lies the risk of political instability in poor nations. When prices go up, governments are held accountable. The result could be urban food riots like those that have challenged civil order in countries ranging from Egypt to Zambia.

#### Kills billions

Brown 2005 (Lester, President – Earth Policy Institute, People and the Planet, “Falling Water Tables 'Could Hit Food Supply'”, 2-7 http://www.peopleandplanet.net/doc.php?id=2424)   
Many Americans see terrorism as the principal threat to security, but for much of humanity, the effect of water shortages and rising temperatures on food security are far more important issues. For the 3 billion people who live on 2 dollars a day or less and who spend up to 70 per cent of their income on food, even a modest rise in food prices can quickly become life-threatening. For them, it is the next meal that is the overriding concern."

### 2nc Agriculture – Competiveness

#### EPA regulations kill US agriculture competiveness

Lieberman 2010 (Ben, Senior Policy Analyst, Energy and Environment “EPA's Global Warming Regulations: A Threat to American Agriculture” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/04/epas-global-warming-regulations-a-threat-to-american-agriculture)

Although global warming legislation looks less likely for the foreseeable future (though the President and some Senators are trying to revive it), there is an ongoing attempt to impose this agenda via regulations. The EPA regulations that would apply to stationary sources pose a threat to American agriculture. Pursuant to a 2007 Supreme Court decision, the EPA has authority to regulate carbon dioxide emissions from motor vehicles under the Clean Air Act. In January, the EPA concluded that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare. The first substantive regulations, on car and truck greenhouse gas emissions, were promulgated on April 1. However, now that carbon dioxide is a regulated pollutant for motor vehicles, all the other provisions of the Clean Air Act--including those targeting stationary sources--will also apply, because they impose non-discretionary requirements for all regulated pollutants. Any source emitting 250 tons of carbon dioxide (CO2), an easily met threshold, would be subject to the statute's tough requirements. Overall, a number of onerous permitting and other provisions would apply to a million or more entities that use fossil fuels--small businesses, commercial properties, and agricultural operations.[4] Of particular concern to the American Farm Bureau is Title V, the Clean Air Act's operating permits program, as well as the pre-construction permitting program known as Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD).[5] According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Title V would apply to "dairy facilities with over 25 cows, beef cattle operations of over 50 cattle, swine operations with over 200 hogs, and farms with over 500 acres of corn."[6] The compliance burden would be daunting. The EPA puts the first-year cost of each Title V permit at $46,500 and PSD at $84,500.[7] The EPA has tried to avoid the impact on small businesses and farms (at least temporarily) by increasing the threshold for CO2 emissions from 250 to 25,000 tons, the so-called tailoring rule, which the EPA claims would spare 37,351 farms and ranches from Title V and 299 from PSD.[8] However, such a regulatory rewrite of the Clean Air Act is on shaky legal ground, and in any event the agency conceded that it would start regulating smaller sources in six years.[9] Thus, those 37,000-plus farms would come under these costly and burdensome programs in 2016, if not sooner. In addition, the agency holds open the possibility of regulating emissions in other ways, as yet unspecified, that could be applicable to farms.[10] In some respects, EPA regulations would be even worse for farmers than cap and trade. Cap-and-trade legislation would have targeted energy companies and not individual farmers, though the higher energy costs would have been passed on to them. But EPA regulations would be directly imposed on farmers, imposing tremendous paperwork and compliance burdens as well as energy cost increases comparable to those inflicted by cap and trade. Such unilateral action would also put American agriculture at a competitive disadvantage relative to the rest of the world. No other country has contemplated imposing anything like the EPA's regulatory scheme on its farmers. Thus, the EPA's regulations would make it harder for American farmers to compete in international markets because they would face higher operating costs.

#### Domestic US Ag production is key to Heg

Pickford 2008 (Andrew, holds positions of Mannkal Fellow at Mannkal Economic Education Foundation and Project Consultant at the Committee for Economic Development of Australia in Western Australia, Masters of Studies in Strategic Affairs from the Australian National University, Research Manager of Future Directions International, Australia's Center for Strategic Analysis, “The Rise of Agri-Powers”)   
Agricultural powers—those self sufficient in food and fabric—once were unambiguously regarded as strategic powers. This has remained true throughout history: powers which were not agricultural powers could never sustain strategic power. Now, once again, a new set of nations is likely to emerge in the 21st century with significant regional, if not global, influence demonstrably based on their agricultural capacity and their ability to match capital, productive land and emerging technology on a scale which was not possible in the past. These emerging ‘agri-powers’ are benefiting from trends making agricultural commodities more strategically important, and will gain from having a significant agricultural base.

#### Heg sovles nuclear war

Khalilzad 1995 (Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND analyst, “Losing the Moment,” WASHINGTON QUARTERLY, Spring 1995, LN.)

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or

### Ag – Competiveness Ext

#### Quick changes hurt competitiveness

Hart 2003 (Chad, Iowa Ag Review, U.S. Agriculture and the Value of the Dollar, http://www.card.iastate.edu/iowa\_ag\_review/summer\_03/article5.aspx)

Roughly 20 percent of U.S. agricultural production is exported to other countries. So **our competitiveness in export markets is crucial to the stability and growth of U.S. agriculture.** One of the fundamental factors in our competitiveness in export markets is the currency exchange rate. The currency exchange rate is the ratio of the value of a nation's currency to the value of another nation's currency. Many factors affect exchange rates, including the countries' macroeconomic policies, fiscal situation, and expected economic growth. Changes in the exchange rate affect our agricultural trade competitiveness because they indicate relative changes in the prices for traded goods in other countries. Nearly half of the change in the real value of U.S. agricultural exports can be attributed to changes in exchange rates.

#### Ag dependence guts US willpower and national strength – triggers US pacifism

Eighty-Seven Acres 2007 (“Is the US Outsourcing Its Agriculture, Too?” http://shroudedindoubt.typepad.com/eightyseven\_acres/2007/08/is-the-us-outso.html)  
Foods would not disappear from our supermarkets; but they would be imported and bear stamps saying, as many do today, Produce of Chile, Produce of Mexico, Produce of Brazil, Produce of China. And so on. What would the United States look like, should this scenario come to pass? Basically, we would look like Britain. We would be nearly completely urbanized, with no functioning rural society and rural culture with its own means of support. Agriculture would largely disappear like heavy manufacturing. The farming that remains would be a tiny industry, servicing niche markets. We would import nearly all of our food. We would not be able to feed ourselves as a nation. We would be a high tax, service, welfare state, with a population most of whom would have no experience of business ownership and no experience of producing real goods. We would, I submit, cease to be an independent people. Is this what we want America to be? It strikes me as a serious weakening of the national strength. It would make us as vulnerable to external pressures as our import of foreign oil or our import of manufactured goods from China. Like European nations, we would be afraid of most everything and would make a virtue of our fear by calling it pacifism. The world is much too dangerous for us to be thrown into this position.

### Ag – Economy Scenario

#### Ag competitivness key to agricultural economy

ERS 8 (Economic Research Service, USDA, Overview, http://www.ers.usda.gov/Emphases/Competitive/overview.htm)

Food and agricultural systems operate in a highly competitive global context, and **the United States is a major player in these international markets**—the U.S. share of the global market for agricultural goods averages just under 20 percent. Since U.S. farms produce far beyond domestic demand for many crops, maintaining a competitive agricultural system is critical to ensuring the **economic viability of U.S. agriculture**. At the same time, U.S. agriculture is a diverse economic sector. Differences in commodity type, farm size, operator and household characteristics, and even goals for farming affect the competitiveness of individual operations and ultimately of the sector as a whole.

#### Key to the US economy

Business Line 2000 (R. J. Venkateswaran, Agriculture: Blooming in US, withering in India, <http://www.hinduonnet.com/businessline/2000/06/09/stories/040903ju.htm>)

**AGRICULTURE PLAYS a vital role in the economies of the US** and India. But while Washington vigorously promotes its development and diversification, New Delhi remains indifferent to it. The importance of agriculture to the US economy is clear from the fact that it has now emerged the world's largest exporter of farm products. According to official US statistics, agricultural exports in 1999 amounted to $49 billions. The agricultural tra de surplus that year was about $11 billions. Agricultural exports support nearly 750,000 American jobs on and off the farm. Exports represent nearly a quarter of total US agricultural production. Trade-dependent agricultural jobs pay more than average wages and support a range of professions in the urban and rural areas. Each dollar in exports generates another $1.28 in allied economic activities such as processing, packaging, shipping and financ ing. Washington State ranks eighth in US agricultural exports. It sold $1.7 billions worth of farm products around the world in 1998. The State's reliance on agricultural exports rose from 26 per cent of farm cash receipts in 1991 to 32 per cent in 1999. Addressing farmers in Seattle in December 1999, the US President, Mr. Bill Clinton, highlighted the importance of agriculture to the US economy: ``Farmers are the life-blood of our country. They are better off at what they do than any group of people on earth. But we cannot preserve family farmers unless we sell more of what we grow to more people around the world because the structure we have, to make a living, has to produce a lot more food than all of us can consume.'' The crucial role of agriculture was also emphasised by Mr. Rich Romenger, Deputy Secretary of the US Department of Agriculture, in his address to the World Congress of Young Farmers in Orlando on February 22, 2000. He said that at present produce from on e of every three acres planted in the US was exported. **American agriculture would be crippled without access to world markets. And world markets would be severely hampered if they did not have access to the US** consumer. The US' agricultural imports from around the world totalled nearly $38 billions in 1999.

#### Extinction

Bearden 2000 (T.E. Fellow Alpha Foundation’s Institute for Advaned Study & Director, Association of Distinguished American Scientists June 12 “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How to Solve It Quickly,” Adas Position Paper: Solution To The Energy Crisis, [www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc](http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc))

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions.  Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released.  As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {2} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response.  Or suppose a desperate China whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States attacks Taiwan.  In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary.  The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed.  Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible.  As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed .  The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

### Economy Ext

#### Ag support key to export

Allen 1996 (Gray, Managing Editor of Almond Facts, http://www.bluediamond.com/growers/govt/engine.cfm)

In an ideal world where everyone played by the same rules, it probably would not be necessary for the U.S. government to become involved in promoting the sales of private firms' products, but **this is not an ideal world**. Every country engaged in international trade has policies and programs to help it compete more effectively, and to expand its share of the world market. The European Union (EU) and other foreign competitors heavily outspend the U.S. in this respect. Without a strong commitment from our government to U.S. agricultural export programs, America's farmers and workers will be at a **substantial disadvantage in world trade**.

#### US Ag export key to economy

Allen 1996 (Gray, Managing Editor of Almond Facts, http://www.bluediamond.com/growers/govt/engine.cfm)

The underlying issue is: "How important, really, are almond exports - and farm exports, generally - to America's economic well-being?"  The answer is: "**Extremely important**. Agricultural exports create jobs and **fuel economic growth**." Each $1 billion in farm exports supports nearly 20,000 jobs in the United States - jobs in production, processing, packaging, transportation, and related industries and services. California's billion-dollar almond industry creates some 20,000 jobs as well. Most of the jobs created by agricultural exports, some 60 percent, are in towns and cities. U.S. farm exports in 1996 are expected to top $60 billion for a total of 1.3 million jobs owed to farm exports. These jobs create tax revenues **that exceed the federal government's program costs**. Exports are also vital to rural America. In 1995, farm shipments abroad accounted for over 23 percent of gross farm receipts derived from the marketplace - nearly 1 in 4 farm dollars. In the almond industry, exports account for 7 in 10 farm dollars!

### Ag – Food Wars Scenario

#### US export competitiveness key to global food security

Raisbeck 2003(David, Vice Chairman, Cargill, Incorporated Address to the World Agricultural Forum, The Role of Agriculture in the Global Economy, Online)

Today, U.S. agricultural exports top $50 billion a year. Six of its top ten customers are developing countries, and three-fourths of U.S. agricultural exports go to Asia and the Americas. There have been three transforming events during that half-century that reshaped this global agricultural market. The first was the formation of the European Community and the creation of its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The CAP’s generous farm supports took the EC from a 20-million-ton-per-year net grain importer in the 1960s to a 20-million-ton-per-year net grain exporter by the 1980s. The second transforming event was the collapse of the centrally planned economies, particularly the former Soviet Union. At their peak, the USSR and the PRC were importing 40-50 million tons of grain per year. Today those countries are net grain exporters. The third transforming event was the emergence of developing countries as commercial grain importers. They have absorbed the 80-plus million tons of grain imports erased by the other two events. While total world grain trade has grown little in the last few decades, these events have shifted grain trade patterns dramatically. Quite simply, the future for world grain trade depends upon the rate of growth in food demand in the developing world. This helps explain why agriculture is the linchpin of the Doha Round. Doha can shape for a generation the progress we make in merging agriculture into the rest of the global economy. And that progress will determine to a large extent how far we get in ending hunger and reducing poverty while protecting the environment. For many of the world’s people, agriculture remains a subsistence activity. Ninety percent of the food produced in the world is consumed within the country producing it, and most of that usage lies outside of the commercial system. A company like Cargill only begins to touch the food system as commercial production emerges and agricultural products flow to urban centers and into international markets. But as commercial food trade emerges, new opportunities arise to eliminate hunger and enhance food security. The first opportunity is to lower food costs. Access to low-cost imports helps keep food costs down, especially for the poor who often spend 70 percent or more of their personal income to eat. Second, food trade creates choice. Trade offers variety; it also provides access to foods year round that often can be grown locally only on a seasonal basis. And, it provides efficient local farmers new marketing opportunities. The result is higher living standards for those able to participate. Finally, food trade provides more reliable access to supplies at lower cost. Crops often fluctuate 25 percent from one year to the next within a growing region. Global production, however, typically fluctuates less than three percent annually, as good crops in some places offset poor crops elsewhere. Moreover, storing food typically costs 20 percent or more of its value annually, even ignoring waste, pests, quality losses and the like. Most foods can be shipped halfway around the world for 10 percent of their value, or half the cost of storage. In other words, food trade lowers costs, widens choices and provides more reliable access to supplies. Each is important in eliminating hunger. But, food trade cannot play this role effectively in the face of large market access barriers. The major problem limiting agriculture’s role in the global economy is that agricultural trade barriers on average are ten times higher than industrial trade barriers, and many agricultural barriers are prohibitively restrictive. Unless these barriers are brought down dramatically on all agricultural products in all countries, the global food system needed to end hunger will not develop adequately. We will lose an important opportunity to reduce food insecurity, perhaps for a generation. Eliminating hunger, however, is not just about cost, choice and access to supplies; it also is about the ability to pay. Reducing poverty is a major key to ending hunger. Today, about half the world’s population – 3 billion people – live in abject poverty. Roughly three-fourths of these poor people live in rural areas dependent upon agriculture. No country that has raised the majority of its people out of poverty has done so without attacking the causes of rural poverty. In fact, agricultural development is a necessary trigger for broader, sustainable economic development for most countries. Agricultural development stimulates self-sustaining growth in two principal ways. First, through rising productivity it increases the incomes of farmers. Second, it releases labor from subsistence farming that can be employed in manufacturing or service activities. Agribusiness companies want to bring poverty-reducing tools to farmers in developing countries. We can offer more productive inputs; we can provide practical finance; we can reach out to new market opportunities; we can show farmers ways to lower or manage risks. But we cannot do these things alone. They require public investments in physical infrastructure and well-functioning marketing systems. They also require an economic climate that welcomes investment, as capital flows to where it’s needed and wanted. This does not mean “special incentives.” Rather, it means creating a predictable, level playing field in which competition through price and service determines success. Like ending hunger, reducing poverty requires that current high levels of agricultural protection come down. Subsidized competition and trade-distorting domestic supports in developed countries must be curbed. But market access barriers must be brought down everywhere. Forty percent of global agricultural trade already is among developing countries themselves. Most of the future growth in demand will be in developing countries, so they must join in as full partners in the creation of a more open global food system. It is the surest route to reducing poverty in all countries. Frankly, the proposed Harbinson text on the modalities for the agricultural negotiation is disappointing on this score. It offers developing countries a program of “special and differential treatment” that largely is a series of exceptions to and exemptions from reform. In their own best interests, developing countries should resist this temptation to be excluded from reform. They should insist on disciplining developed-country subsidy practices, and the least developed countries may deserve longer transition periods. But, developing countries refusing to lower their own market access barriers will prove a prescription for perpetuating poverty, not reducing it. The third area in which agricultural liberalization can help is in protecting fragile environmental resources. The pressures of hunger and poverty often result in agricultural practices in low-income countries that harm the environment in two ways: by exhausting the soil’s productivity rather than replenishing it; and by forcing agriculture to expand to new lands rather than to use the most highly productive lands better. These pressures will only intensify over time. Food demand will continue to rise as global population increases. Most of that population growth will be concentrated in developing countries. Higher per capita incomes and accelerating urbanization in the developing world will only further intensify agriculture’s use of scarce land and water resources. Unless productivity per acre, per dollar of investment and per hour of work rises, agriculture will continue to expand into more virgin areas, strain limited water resources and exhaust overworked soils. This again is an area where agribusiness can help, if conditions permit the growth of the commercial sector of agriculture. But, many poor countries currently pursue policies that discourage farmers from increasing their productivity. Examples include: overvalued exchange rates, which limit exports; under investment in rural infrastructure, which raises marketing costs; and uncertain land title and commercial dispute settlement systems, which deter risk taking. It is these policies that could be left unreformed if “special and differential treatment” for developing countries heads down the wrong path. Feeding a growing and more prosperous global population in a more environmentally sustainable way can only be achieved by adopting productivity- and efficiency-enhancing technologies. And adopting better technologies is directly linked to the opening of trading opportunities that can generate cash for reinvestment and market opportunities for expanded output. So, from a commercial perspective, the world’s hopes for eliminating hunger, reducing poverty and protecting fragile environments ride in important ways on the success of the Doha Agenda. Is the world ready to create an open food system obeying the same kinds of rules that govern a more open industrial economy? Progress will require commitments of several kinds. First, developed countries must be prepared to grant greater access to their own markets to all countries, not just a select few. Developed countries also must find less trade-distorting ways to support rural incomes, and they must end the practice of subsidizing their exports. But developing countries need to embrace a similar vision of openness; nearly half of current global food trade, and virtually all of its growth potential, is among developing countries themselves. Second, the developed world needs to help developing countries build up their capacity to participate in a global economy and to ensure that the poor gain from globalization. Rich countries have pledged to reduce global hunger dramatically. Donor countries and institutions seem prepared to reverse the decline in aid going to rural development. And companies are prepared to invest in creating and expanding commercial opportunities for developing country entrepreneurs. If appropriately supported by agricultural trade liberalization, such investment flows can make the prospects of the poor in Africa and South Asia resemble more closely the gains made by the poor in parts of East Asia over the last 20 years. Finally, attitudes toward new technologies, especially agricultural biotechnology, need to be reexamined. New technologies can raise agricultural productivity and human nutrition at an affordable cost. It would be unfortunate if developing countries were denied these tools by trade barriers disguised as safety or marketing regulations unsupported by sound science. We already have seen food aid rot on loading docks while millions go malnourished because of such fears. A saner, more responsible path is needed. Trade, aid and technology are tools that can enlarge agriculture’s role in the global economy. They do so by expanding commerce, increasing productivity and leveling the competitive playing field. But that’s neither the goal nor the payoff. **The real benefit from enlarging agriculture’s role in the global economy is the greater food security, economic development and environmental sustainability it will bring to the world’s poor**.

#### That leads to food wars resulting in World War 3

Calvin 1998 (William, theoretical neurophysiologist at the University of Washington, Atlantic Monthly, January, The Great Climate Flip-Flop, Vol 281, No. 1, p. 47-64)

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands -- if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem -- and could lead to a Third World War -- but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

### Ag – Food Wars Ext

#### Loss of food supply leads to war

Wallensteen 1986 (Peter; Uppsala University; “Global resources and international conflict” p. 14)

To secure a reliable supply of food remains a basic requirement for any society. For many societies, grains such as wheat or rice meet this requirement. Greater or lesser fractions of these staple food products are used by different countries to produce meat, luxury drinks, automotive fuels, and other products that go beyond basic human needs. A threat to the supply of the basic staple food requirements of a country is likely to lead to conflict. Such threats could arise in many ways, notably through the political manipulation of access to food (e.g. via an embargo), through environmental degradation (e.g., via soil erosion), or through competition among conflicting land-use or consumption interests (e.g., between nomadic and sedentary populations).

#### Rising food prices starve one billion and triggers riots and civil disintegration

Christian Science Monitor April 3, 1996

If food prices continue to rise, both sides agree, the hardest hit will be the world's poorest billion people, who subsist on less than a dollar a day and for whom continuing price increases could have catastrophic consequences. Behind food shortages and higher prices lies the risk of political instability in poor nations. When prices go up, governments are held accountable. The result could be urban food riots like those that have challenged civil order in countries ranging from Egypt to Zambia.

#### Kills billions

Brown 2005 (Lester, President – Earth Policy Institute, People and the Planet, “Falling Water Tables 'Could Hit Food Supply'”, 2-7 http://www.peopleandplanet.net/doc.php?id=2424)   
Many Americans see terrorism as the principal threat to security, but for much of humanity, the effect of water shortages and rising temperatures on food security are far more important issues. For the 3 billion people who live on 2 dollars a day or less and who spend up to 70 per cent of their income on food, even a modest rise in food prices can quickly become life-threatening. For them, it is the next meal that is the overriding concern."

### A2 fed regulations key

#### Local and state solutions

Jonathan H. Adler (Associate Professor of Law and Associate Director. Center for Business Law & Regulation, Case Western Reserve University School of Law) January, 2005 Judicial Federalism and the Future of Federal Environmental Regulation 90 Iowa L. Rev. 377

As discussed above, n520 the application of Commerce Clause restrictions to other environmental statutes would not result in the same curtailment of federal regulatory authority insofar as such statutes, like the Surface Mining Con-trol and Reclamation Act n521 or Clean Air Act, n522 target economic activity. Yet even if the Court's federalism doctrines were to disembowel much of the existing federal regulatory structure, it is simply not true that this would leave "many environmental harms to be dealt with by state tort law." n523 The federal government is hardly the nation's sole environmental regulator. To the contrary, most environmental monitoring and enforcement occur at the state and local level, n524 and there is no a priori reason to assume that states would be unable or unwilling to increase their environmental efforts were federal regulation not already in place. n525 Judge Wilkinson's concern is even more misplaced because those environmental concerns most likely to be [\*455] found beyond Congress's reach are those most likely to be regulated by state and local governments. Indeed, most such environmental concerns are so regulated already, albeit in cooperation with federal efforts. n526 While limiting federal regulatory authority will necessarily affect existing federal regulatory programs, it need not result in a significant decline in environmental quality. Indeed, if responded to properly, limitations on federal regulatory authority could actually improve environmental performance insofar as it fosters greater reliance on more efficient and effective approaches to environmental protection. n527 First, just as constitutional constraints on federal authority limit federal protection, such constraints also limit the federal government's ability to impose environmental harm. Sec-ond, in many instances alternatives to federal environmental protection can be just as, if not more, protective of environmental values. Reducing the scope of federal environmental regulation produces greater opportunities for the adoption and implementation of such non-federal efforts. Third, direct regulation is not the federal government's only means of advancing environmental values. Even if the Supreme Court were to impose highly restrictive federalism constraints on federal regulatory power, including the use of conditional spending under Dole, the federal government would retain substantial authority to advance environmental protection.

### A2 species loss

#### New species fill the void.

Richard Kerr 10/7/1994 Science 28

In the immediate aftermath of an extinction, some taxa – groups of animals such as species or genera – flourish, then gradually fade. Others that had apparently vanished can reappear, Lazarus-like. In the turmoil, new groups may gain ascendancy, filling ecological niches left empty by the extinction and displacing other survivors to create a new ecological order (See box on p.29).

#### No spillover to other species.

Thomas Gale Moore 1998 Climate of fear, why we shouldn’t worry about global warming 98-9

Nevertheless, the loss of a class of living beings does not typically threaten other species. Most animals and plants can derive their nutrients or receive the other benefits provided by a particular species from more than a single source. If it were true that the extinction of a single species would produce a cascade of losses, then the massive extinctions of the past should have wiped out all life. Evolution forces various life forms to adjust to change. A few may not make the adaptation but others will mutate to meet the new conditions. Although a particular chain of DNA may be eliminated through the loss of species, other animals or plants adapting to the same environment often produce similar genetic solutions with like proteins. It is almost impossible to imagine a single species that, if eliminated, would threaten us humans. Perhaps if the E. coli that are necessary for digestion became extinct, we could no longer exist. But those bacteria live in a symbiotic relationship with man and, as long as humans survive, so will they. Thus any animal that hosts a symbiotic species need not fear the loss of its partner. As long as the host remains, so will parasites and symbiotic species.

#### Their impact is non-falsifiable and politically motivated.

John Charles Kunich )Judge Advocate specializing in environmental law, United States Air Force, Colorado Springs, Co) Spring, 1994 SPECIES & HABITAT CONSERVATION: THE FALLACY OF DEATHBED CONSERVATION UNDER THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT 24 Envtl. L. 501

It is undisputed that, as one expert puts it, "Our ignorance of the natural world is enormous," and that, as we struggle with our response to the plight of our fellow organisms on this planet, "if we do not even know who the players are, our understanding of how well they are playing is far more deficient." 43 It has been estimated that the ratio of unknown to known species may be as high as 21 to 1, with 30 million undescribed species versus 1.4 [\*517] million that have been identified and taxonomically categorized by man. 44 The skeptics argue that the apocalyptic vision of a gigantic extinction spasm is based more on ideology than on science. In this view, although estimates of total species range as high as 100 million, anything in excess of the 1.4 million actually identified is mere guesswork. If no one knows how many species exist, how can anyone know how many are going extinct? 45 If traces of the alleged extinction victims are never discovered, no one will be able to determine whether they became extinct or never existed at all. According to Patrick Kangas of the University of Maryland, the "whole business is unfalsifiable, and everyone in science knows what a mess unfalsifiable theories are." 46

#### Ocean life adapts too quickly to die out.

Sherwood B. Idso, Craig D. Idso, Keith E. Idso 2003 http://www.atmos.washington.edu/2004Q4/211/extinction.pdf

The authors studied changes in assemblages of nearshore reef fishes in the Southern California Bight over the period 1974-93. Near the beginning of this period, during 1976-77, the mean surface temperature of the region rose by nearly 1°C above the mean of the previous 15 years, coincident with a change in the basic state of the atmosphere-ocean climate system of the North Pacific Ocean. Thereafter “dominance shifted from cold-affinity species to those with affinity for warmer water” as “abundances of Northern species declined and those of Southern species increased.” This finding is much like the findings of many of the studies we have already considered. Species tend to “go with the flow” of changing climatic conditions (especially marine species), shifting their ranges and often creating new biotic associations with other species. In all instances, however, there are no indications of anything that would support the CO2 -induced global warming extinction hypothesis, in that the range shifts do not lead to the demise of any of the species involved nor, in most cases, even to decreases in the sizes of their populations.

#### Permian extinction disproves their impact.

Greg Easterbrook 1995 A Moment on the Earth 101-2

The greatest known loss of Earth life was the Permian extinction that occurred roughly 250 million years ago. At that time as many as 96 percent of the life-forms on Earth fell extinct. If you believe the current ordering of nature gloried and worthy of reverence, then you must believe the Permian extinction was a splendorous event. Without it the species and ecological wonders we now seek to preserve would never have come into being. Some other set of creatures and wonders would exist, to be sure. But there might be, say, no dolphins or whales: the Permian extinction was particularly hard on aquatic life. There might be no bear, no frogs, no otter, no songbirds, no flowering plants, no old-growth forests, no taiga, no Madagascan lemur.

# EPA – defense

### A2 Emissions – Multiwarrant

#### EPA regulations will not solve – 1.) not go far enough, 2.) global emitters overwhelm, and 3.) we are past the tipping point

Wittes 2007 (Fellow and Research Director in Public Law, Governance Studies at the Brookings Institute “The Supreme Court’s EPA Ruling Isn’t As Important As You Think” http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2007/0416governance\_wittes.aspx)

What the Clean Air Act doesn't say, however, is what relationship such regulation should have to other efforts to reduce carbon emissions or, indeed, how such regulation would work. Carbon, after all, is not your typical pollutant. Vehicles are only one source of it—and not even the biggest source. And the problem is not regional, or even national, but global. Getting the pound of flesh the act requires from new domestic vehicles, "the greatest degree of emission reduction achievable ... giving appropriate consideration to cost, energy, and safety factors," won't do anything to fix the overall problem if other sectors within the economy—and, indeed, other economies—don't pony up their own emissions reductions on a far grander scale. Even then, it might not help. For if the worst warming theories are right, the requisite reductions may be impossible to reconcile with a modern economy. Even worse, we may already have blown by the tipping point beyond which we cannot escape the catastrophic consequences of climate change. In other words, only the most comprehensive of regulatory approaches has a chance. The Clean Air Act is certainly not that with respect to carbon. It is concerned chiefly with classic industrial pollution, and it doesn't even purport to answer the basic policy questions that lie beneath the carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas problem: What are our regulatory goals and strategies here? Should we be trying to level off emissions? Control their rate of increase? Bring the total concentration in the atmosphere down? Any of these is a plausible ambition for regulation, but the law compels none of them.

### Emissions exts

#### 1. Extend Wittes 07 – EPA regulations are not strong enough to make an impact on the domestic level or be able to balance other coutries emissions. The card concludes that all efforts are futile because we have already pasted the tipping point for global warming.

#### 2. Regulations too weak – can’t stop coal burning

Mernit 2010 (Judith, contributor to Writers on the Range, an op-ed service of High Country News “EPA ineffective in curbing greenhouse gases” http://www.codyenterprise.com/news/opinion/article\_c5f57578-0178-11e0-a42a-001cc4c002e0.html)

There are many greenhouse gases to worry about - methane, nitrous oxide, and the hydro-chlorofluorocarbons that fuel air conditioners. But the one that's used the most and lingers the longest is carbon dioxide. And carbon dioxide, unlike sulfur dioxide or mercury, can't be scrubbed, absorbed or flushed away. One day it might be possible to capture and sequester it, but the technology to do that remains in its expensive infancy. So the only way to dramatically reduce carbon emissions is to prohibit burning coal, which the Environmental Protection Agency can't do. Instead, federal regulators will work with state authorities to come up with realistic new construction permits, factoring in the cost and feasibility of what will mostly consist of improvements to plant efficiency. In states like Wyoming, where state law forbids regulating greenhouse gases, the federal government will take over permitting with the state's cooperation. (Only Texas has refused to develop a state plan or accept federal interference, which means that if Texans want to build a new coal plant after Jan. 2, they will do so in violation of federal law.) The sad truth is that the EPA rule is too anemic to make much difference: It won't halt new construction, and neither will it do much about the carbon content of the atmosphere, which is careening fast toward 400 parts per million, the highest in tens of millions of years.

#### 3. Other countries over whelm and sunspots mean regulations do not solve

Rahn 1-25 (Rahn is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and chairman of the Institute for Global Economic Growth. “Obama’s Regulatory Reform Test” Cato Institute http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=12731)

The Obama Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has ruled that carbon dioxide is a pollutant and, as a result, has been holding up the permitting of new power and manufacturing plants. If this continues, it will cause a significant drop in U.S. economic growth and job creation, yet it will have no measurable benefit. China, India and many other countries are rapidly increasing CO2 emissions, overwhelming whatever actions the United States may take. Even if all new CO2 emissions were stopped globally, it would be decades before there would be even a minor effect on global temperatures. Now, new research is indicating that sunspot activity is much more important than CO2 when it comes to influencing the earth's temperature. The EPA ban is nothing more than national economic suicide. Let us see if Mr. Obama has the courage to tell the EPA to stop. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has just issued a proposed regulation that would have an enormous cost on the U.S. economy with no benefit. Specifically, it is demanding that U.S. banks report the amount of interest they pay foreign nationals to their governments. The U.S. long ago decided not to tax interest earned by foreign investors in order to attract their money. Well-qualified, independent economists have estimated this will cost the United States in lost foreign investment roughly $100 billion a year and many thousands of jobs. This will make foreign tax collectors happy, even in corrupt countries, at the expense of U.S. jobs. If the IRS does not immediately withdraw this proposed regulation, it will show it pays no attention to Mr. Obama's words or does not care what he says. If Mr. Obama is serious about regulatory reform, he will immediately instruct the EPA and the IRS to drop their no-benefit, job-killing proposals. If these proposals are still hanging out there a month from now, that will reveal that he is all talk and no action.

#### 4. Warming is inevitable

#### A. Recent Studies Prove

Washington Post 2008 (“Carbon Is Building Up in Atmosphere Faster Than Predicted” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/09/25/AR2008092503989.html)  
Moreover, new scientific research suggests Earth is already destined for a greater worldwide temperature rise than previously predicted. Last month, two scientists from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography and the University of California at San Diego published research showing that even if humans stopped generating greenhouse gases immediately, the world's average temperature would "most likely" increase by 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of this century. Writing in the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, they based their calculations on the fact that new air-quality measures worldwide are reducing the amount of fine particles, or aerosols, in the atmosphere and diminishing their cooling effect. The IPCC has warned that an increase of between 3.2 and 9.7 degrees Fahrenheit could trigger massive environmental changes, including major melting of the Greenland ice sheet, the Himalayan-Tibetan glaciers and summer sea ice in the Arctic. The prediction that current emissions put the planet on track for a temperature rise of more than 11 degrees Fahrenheit, Le Quéré said, means the world could face a dangerous rise in sea level as well as other drastic changes. Richard Moss, vice president and managing director for climate change at the World Wildlife Fund, said the new carbon figures and research show that "we're already locked into more warming than we thought." "We should be worried, really worried," Moss said. "This is happening in the context of trying to reduce emissions." The new data also show that forests and oceans, which naturally take up much of the carbon dioxide humans emit, are having less impact. These "natural sinks" have absorbed 54 percent of carbon dioxide emissions since 2000, a drop of 3 percent compared with the period between 1959 and 2000.

#### B. Deforestation

Howden 2007 (Daniel, “Deforestation: The Hidden Cause Of Global Warming”, deputy foreign editor of The Independent, http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/deforestation-the-hidden-cause-of-global-warming-448734.html)  
The accelerating destruction of the rainforests that form a precious cooling band around the Earth's equator, is now being recognised as one of the main causes of climate change. Carbon emissions from deforestation far outstrip damage caused by planes and automobiles and factories. The rampant slashing and burning of tropical forests is second only to the energy sector as a source of greenhouses gases according to report published today by the Oxford-based Global Canopy Programme, an alliance of leading rainforest scientists. Figures from the GCP, summarising the latest findings from the United Nations, and building on estimates contained in the Stern Report, show deforestation accounts for up to 25 per cent of global emissions of heat-trapping gases, while transport and industry account for 14 per cent each; and aviation makes up only 3 per cent of the total. "Tropical forests are the elephant in the living room of climate change," said Andrew Mitchell, the head of the GCP. Scientists say one days' deforestation is equivalent to the carbon footprint of eight million people flying to New York. Reducing those catastrophic emissions can be achieved most quickly and most cheaply by halting the destruction in Brazil, Indonesia, the Congo and elsewhere. No new technology is needed, says the GCP, just the political will and a system of enforcement and incentives that makes the trees worth more to governments and individuals standing than felled. "The focus on technological fixes for the emissions of rich nations while giving no incentive to poorer nations to stop burning the standing forest means we are putting the cart before the horse," said Mr Mitchell.

### A2 Emissions – China

#### Regulations fail - china is an alt cause. New regulations will crush US jobs and economy

Hutchinson 2-4 (Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Texas) serves on the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee. “EPA rules: Bad policy, bad time” Politico http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=3EC6C1CC-90A5-49F3-B332-A07D001E963E)

Since late last year, the Environmental Protection Agency has been rolling out new federal climate regulations that would have the same effects as the job-destroying cap-and-trade policy that Congress rejected last year. EPA has seized control over parts of several state air programs, empowering the agency to run them federally. EPA has also signaled that additional burdensome regulations are on the horizon. Implementation of these new rules would have devastating economic consequences for families and employers, send U.S. jobs overseas even as unemployment continues to hover above 9 percent and impose federal edicts on states. This is the wrong policy at the worst time, and I plan to fight these overbearing regulations. One of the administration’s key agenda items during the 111th Congress was passing cap-and-trade legislation. The goal was to purposely increase the price of traditional forms of carbon-based energy — such as coal, gas and oil — so that consumers would respond by using less. This misguided proposal passed the House by a narrow margin. The Senate, however, refused to consider a bill that would financially burden Americans and crush energy-dependent jobs. So the cap-and-trade proposal effectively died in that Congress. Now EPA is bypassing Congress with its own backdoor climate regulations, sending the clear message that it intends to impose the cap-and-trade program on Americans — one way or another. EPA’s backdoor climate regulations are likely to drive up the cost of energy in America. And everyone pays. Families, commuters, truckers, farmers and fliers — who now face gas and diesel prices that are significantly higher than last year — are likely to be hit even harder with steep energy costs. Employers are also likely to shoulder the burden of rising energy expenses — especially manufacturers and producers of energy-intensive products such as glass, steel, cement and transportation fuels. In response, they may be forced to lay off workers and pass on the higher costs to consumers. Farmers, confronted with higher production costs from more expensive fuel, could also face costly new regulations on livestock and dairy production, increasing food prices for our families. The terrible irony is that none of EPA’s planned actions are likely to have any impact on world temperatures. Greenhouse gas emissions are a worldwide issue, with China now emitting more than the United States. EPA scientists confirm that if the United States acts alone, without similar steps by other countries, like China, that refuse to curb their carbon output, it will produce no measurable change in world temperatures. Essentially, EPA wants to threaten our nation with millions of lost U.S. jobs and trillions of dollars in higher costs for the American people — in exchange for absolutely no improvement in the climate. There is wide opposition to EPA’s regulatory power grab. We must put the Obama administration on notice that we will exhaust all options to protect Americans from costly new EPA climate regulations in the 112th Congress. I intend to support a number of the legislative efforts planned by my colleagues to thwart these actions. I look forward to the work of Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.), the ranking member on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, and Rep. Fred Upton (R-Mich.), the House Energy and Commerce Committee chairman, as well as that of Sen. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.), which I also intend to support. I also appreciate the efforts of Sen. John Rockefeller (D-W.Va.), the Senate Commerce Committee chairman, to delay the regulations so their full impact can be assessed. I, too, stand ready to protect the American people from this threat. If bills to stop EPA climate regulations in the House and Senate this spring do not succeed, I plan to pursue a similar effort through the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve. The needs of American workers and families give us no choice but to succeed in passing legislation. President Barack Obama, in his State of the Union address, talked about a more competitive America. I can imagine few greater ways to hurt America’s competitiveness than allowing the EPA to proceed with backdoor climate regulations. As for his export goals, our biggest export under EPA’s proposals will be U.S. jobs to China. This is a threat to America we must stop this year. I look forward to working with my colleagues to lead the fight.

### China exts

#### 1. Extend Hutchinson 2-4 – EPA regulations will have no effect on a global scale especially since China is the largest emitter of green house gases. The only effect regulations will have is a negative effect on the US economy increasing energy prices and decreasing jobs.

#### 2. More evidence

Lieberman 2009 (Lieberman is a Senior Policy Analyst in Energy and the Environment in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation. “Proposed Global Warming Regulations Will Do More Harm Than Good” The Heritage Foundation, October 29th 2009 http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/Proposed-Global-Warming-Bills-and-Regulations-Will-Do-More-Harm-Than-Good)

The Threat of Regulation to Spur Legislation EPA administrator Lisa Jackson has candidly admitted that one of the goals of the highly problematic regulatory proposal is to spur on legislation: "Legislation is so important because it will combine the most efficient, most economy-wide, least costly, least disruptive way to deal with carbon dioxide pollution," she recently stated, adding that "we get further faster without top-down regulation."[[9]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/Proposed-Global-Warming-Bills-and-Regulations-Will-Do-More-Harm-Than-Good" \l "_ftn9" \o ") While the regulations would be disruptive to the economy, the legislation currently in Congress would be very damaging as well. The Heritage Foundation's analysis of the economic impacts of Waxman-Markey found $393 billion in lost gross domestic product each year, nearly $3,000 in annual energy costs for a household of four, and over a million net job losses.[[10]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/Proposed-Global-Warming-Bills-and-Regulations-Will-Do-More-Harm-Than-Good" \l "_ftn10" \o ") The Kerry-Boxer Senate bill was introduced with many details missing, but it appears to be at least as costly. Both the regulatory and the legislative approaches unilaterally target American emissions and leave the rest of the world off the hook; thus, it would accomplish little. Climate scientist Chip Knappenberger estimates that, even assuming continued man-made global warming, the Waxman-Markey bill would reduce the earth's future temperature by no more than 0.2 degrees Celsius by 2100[[11]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/Proposed-Global-Warming-Bills-and-Regulations-Will-Do-More-Harm-Than-Good" \l "_ftn11" \o ")--an amount probably too small to verify and certainly too small to matter. The proposed regulations would be just as ineffective. Rather than settle for the least bad of two undesirable options, there is a better approach to the issue: Do not pursue any problematic policy, regulatory or legislative. H.R. 391, sponsored by Marsha Blackburn (R-TN), would eliminate any EPA authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. It is currently the subject of a discharge petition, which would allow it to come to a vote before the full House. Remove the Threat Rather than respond to the threat of problematic regulation by enacting problematic legislation, Congress should remove the regulatory threat and then debate various global warming legislative proposals on their merits. The merits of costly cap-and-trade proposals are highly dubious, but they are not made any better by the specter of EPA regulation.

#### 3. China’s CO2 emissions means stabilizing atmospheric CO2 is impossible

GCC 2008 (Green Car Congress’ mission is to provide timely, high-quality editorial about the full spectrum of energy options, technologies, products, issues and policies related to sustainable mobility “New Analysis Concludes China CO2 Emissions Growing More Rapidly Than Expected” http://www.greencarcongress.com/2008/03/new-analysis-co.html)  
The growth in China’s carbon dioxide emissions is far outpacing previous estimates, making the goal of stabilizing atmospheric greenhouse gases much more difficult, according to a new analysis by economists at the University of California, Berkeley, and UC San Diego. The authors of the study, Maximillian Auffhammer, UC Berkeley assistant professor of agricultural and resource economics, and Richard Carson, UC San Diego professor of economics, based their findings upon pollution data from China’s 30 provincial entities. Previous estimates, including those used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, say the region that includes China will see a 2.5 to 5% annual increase in CO2 emissions, the largest contributor to atmospheric greenhouse gases, between 2004 and 2010. The new UC analysis puts that annual growth rate for China to at least 11% for the same time period. The study is scheduled for print publication in the May issue of the Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, but is now online. The researchers’ most conservative forecast predicts that by 2010, there will be an increase of 600 million metric tons of carbon emissions in China over the country’s levels in 2000. This growth from China alone would overshadow the 116 million metric tons of carbon emissions reductions pledged by all the developed countries in the Kyoto Protocol. (The protocol was never ratified in the United States, which was the largest single emitter of carbon dioxide until 2006, when China took over that distinction, according to numerous reports.) Put another way, the projected annual increase in China alone over the next several years is greater than the current emissions produced by either Great Britain or Germany. Based upon these findings, the authors say current global warming forecasts are “overly optimistic,” and that action is urgently needed to curb greenhouse gas production in China and other rapidly industrializing countries. Auffhammer said this paper should serve as an alarm challenging the widely held belief that actions taken by the wealthy, industrialized nations alone represent a viable strategy towards the goal of stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide. Making China and other developing countries an integral part of any future climate agreement is now even more important. It had been expected that the efficiency of China’s power generation would continue to improve as per capita income increased, slowing down the rate of CO2 emissions growth. What we’re finding instead is that 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.

### A2 Emissions – Delay

EPA regulations get delayed – kills solvency

Lashof 1-13(Dan, Dangerous delaying tactics, Grist, p. http://www.grist.org/article/2011-01-13-dangerous-delaying-tactics)

The biggest problem with legislating delays in action on carbon pollution -- whether one year or two -- is that provisions like these are like roaches: once they get into your house they are **nearly impossible to exterminate**. Take the case of vehicle fuel efficiency standards. Congress passed a one-year delay in updating passenger car standards in 1995. **The delay was extended five times**. Because the standard was already overdue for an update and because the delay provision barred the Department of Transportation from doing any work to prepare for future updates, car standards ended up stuck in neutral for a total of 21 years. This stagnation literally bankrupted the U.S. auto industry, which was unprepared to compete when consumers turned away from gas guzzling SUVs as fuel prices started to rise in second half of the last decade. We can expect a similar outcome if this story is repeated with pollution standards for power plants, refineries, and other big polluters. America's nascent clean energy industry could end up needing a bailout that would make the auto bailout pale by comparison. And no bailout could heal the damage done to our atmosphere.

### Delay exts

#### 1. Extend Lashof 1-13 – Legislative delays will destroy solvency by continouly putting off regulations for multiple years.

#### 2. Delay will prevent future scientific consensus and additional action critical to solve climate change

Sheppard 2010 (Kate, covers energy and environmental politics in Mother Jones' Washington bureau, “The Chamber of Commerce vs. Climate Science” http://motherjones.com/politics/2010/02/chamber-commerce-vs-climate-science?page=2)   
Legally, the chamber and its allies don't have much of a case. In the 2007 case Massachusetts v. EPA, the Supreme Court found that greenhouse gases could be covered under the Clean Air Act if they are determined to threaten human health. Their ruling required the EPA to investigate whether carbon emissions did in fact pose a health risk. After the agency's scientists reached that conclusion, the EPA was automatically required to regulate the sources of greenhouse gases—otherwise the agency would be breaking the law. And because the EPA's directive is based on a scientific assessment, not a policy preference, it will be extremely hard to overturn, said Michael Gerrard, director of the Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia Law School. "These petitions are a real long-shot," he said. "The appellate courts tend to give a large degree of deference to the technical judgments of expert agencies, especially when they are based like this one is on voluminous studies." In addition, the EPA won't actually enforce regulations on the biggest emitters, like power plants and refineries, until 2011. That means the plaintiffs can't prove they've suffered any harm from the EPA's decision, said John Pendergrass, senior attorney at the Environmental Law Institute, who described the lawsuits challenging the endangerment finding as "premature." So if the odds of this gambit succeeding are so low, then why is the chamber gearing up for a costly lost cause? The goal of the suit "is political obfuscation," argues Bill Snape, senior counsel at the Center for Biological Diversity. That is, the chamber's critics believe that the business lobby group hopes to once again muddy the public understanding of climate change by seeking a high-profile forum in which it can argue that the science isn't settled. "This is part of a media and political strategy. It's not a legal strategy," said David Bookbinder, chief climate counsel at Sierra Club, which has intervened in support of the EPA, along with several other environmental groups and 16 states, many of them litigants in the case that originally prompted the agency's action. The EPA's opponents couldn't have chosen a better time to argue that the science of global warming is still up for debate, thanks to the recent "ClimateGate" emails scandal, and the revelation that an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report contained flawed data. In reality, the emails released in the so-called ClimateGate flap showed climate scientists behaving unprofessionally over dissenting views, but nothing in the messages discounted the underlying science of climate change, which has been reaffirmed by thousands of peer-reviewed studies from scientists around the world. And although the IPCC's errors have raised questions about the timing and severity of specific anticipated climate events, they have not altered the overwhelming body of evidence and widespread scientific consensus that the planet is warming due to the burning of fossil fuels. Nevertheless, a number of the legal challenges to the EPA seek to exploit these controversies for maximum PR advantage. Texas Gov. Rick Perry, for instance, claimed in a press conference announcing his state's suit that the finding is "based on the tainted data of an agenda-driven international panel." Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli II accused the agency of introducing "job-destroying regulations based on unverifiable and unrepeatable so-called science." And the challenge from the Competitive Enterprise Institute, FreedomWorks, and other free-market groups alleges that the hacked emails scandal "has severely undermined EPA's alleged justification for regulating carbon dioxide." For its part, the chamber claims that it's not attacking the EPA's scientific assessment. Yet its announcement of the lawsuit did just that—charging that the agency failed to perform "careful analysis of all available data and options" before releasing the "flawed" finding. And in its public comments submitted in advance of the release of the endangerment finding last year, the chamber also disputed the science of climate change, suggesting, among other things, that rising temperatures might actually be beneficial for humans, and that any resulting problems could be addressed by the increased use of air conditioners. The barrage of lawsuits against the EPA comes as an increasing number of lawmakers in Congress from both parties are moving to attempt to block the agency from cracking down on greenhouse gas emissions. Leading the charge is Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), who, with the help of industry lobbyists, has filed a resolution of disapproval that, if signed into law, would nullify the endangerment finding. This rarely used parliamentary maneuver already has 40 cosponsors, including Democratic Sens. Blanche Lincoln (Ark.), Ben Nelson (Neb.), and Mary Landrieu (La.). A bipartisan trio of representatives introduced the same measure in the House in late February. While EPA administrator Lisa Jackson has pushed back the enforcement of regulations on the largest emissions sources until 2011, she also has made it clear that rules are coming, whether the EPA's adversaries like it or not. "The law of the land found that greenhouse gases are pollutants, and they ordered EPA to make a determination," Jackson told the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee in late February. "I believe I have no choice but to follow the law." But even if the attempts to block the agency ultimately fail, the lawsuits have given opponents of regulation another platform to attack the science and delay action on climate change further. Says Snape of the Center for Biological Diversity, "If the goal of these lawsuits is to muck up the works, well, unfortunately they're getting a little bit of traction."

#### 3. Massive delays to EPA regulations – No enforcement in the meantime

Jay 2010 (Alexa, Climate Science Watch, Climategate lives on in federal court challenges to EPA greenhouse gas regulations, “‘Climategate’ lives on in federal court challenges to EPA greenhouse gas regulations” http://www.climatesciencewatch.org/2010/11/16/climategate-lives-on-in-federal-court-challenges-to-epa-greenhouse-gas-regulations/)   
With all hopes for passage of climate and clean energy legislation in the Senate long gone and the deadline for EPA regulation of greenhouse gases fast approaching, the showdown on climate has moved to the courts. A number of legal challenges have put EPA’s ability to regulate at stake, with 20 states now standing with EPA and environmental groups in the battle against industry associations, limited government advocacy groups, and 17 other states. In their attempt to forestall regulation, many petitioners are using the strategy of once again calling into question the scientific assessment that triggered EPA’s statutory obligation to regulate greenhouse gases, but the agency has so far held its ground. EPA determined in December 2009 that climate change caused by GHG emissions endangers human health and welfare, triggering regulation under the Clean Air Act. This finding was based on an agency evaluation of the robust scientific literature demonstrating unequivocal human influence on the climate system. This Technical Support Document drew primarily from assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the U.S. Climate Change Science Program (CCSP), the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), and the National Research Council (NRC). The agency received ten petitions for reconsideration of the finding from fossil fuel interests, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, anti-regulatory ideologue NGOs, and the state governments of Texas and Virginia. According to the EPA, the petitions generally challenged the scientific basis of the Endangerment Finding by citing materials from the ‘Climategate’ e-mail hack that allegedly undermined the validity of the global temperature record, a “small number of actual or alleged errors” in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, and a “limited number of new studies that have been published in the literature.” In July 2010, EPA rejected all petitions, defending the science supporting the Endangerment Finding as “robust, voluminous, and compelling,” and provided roughly 360 pages of response and technical detail “concerning every significant claim and assertion made by the petitioners.” EPA concluded that “the petitioners’ arguments and evidence are inadequate, generally unscientific, and do not show that the underlying science supporting the Endangerment Finding is flawed, misinterpreted by EPA, or inappropriately applied by EPA.” As EPA moved towards GHG regulation in the wake of Massachusetts v. EPA, industry and ideologically oriented anti-regulatory forces warned that if EPA went ahead with regulation, they would drown the process in litigation. That scenario is now coming to pass, with more than 80 cases challenging different aspects of EPA’s actions currently moving through the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, which has jurisdiction over challenges to the Clean Air Act. The following actions are being attacked from a number of angles: (1) Endangerment Finding: EPA’s determined that GHG emissions from moving vehicles are reasonably likely to threaten human health and welfare and thus must be regulated under the Clean Air Act. (2) Tailpipe Rule: Based on the Endangerment Finding, EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) took coordinated steps to set GHG emissions standards for light duty vehicles for model years 2012-2016. These standards were finalized on April 1, 2010 and will go into effect on January 2, 2011. EPA and NHTSA have also announced their intention to begin developing further standards for GHGs and fuel economy for light duty vehicles and new standards for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. (3) Timing or Triggering Rule: EPA interpreted the Clean Air Act to determine that the promulgation of a rule for mobile sources triggers a statutory obligation to regulate stationary sources within the same time frame. The current standard for regulation of air pollutants is 100 tons for some facilities and 250 tons for others. Because these thresholds were not designed with GHG regulation in mind, they were adjusted through the Tailoring Rule, and will take effect on January 2, 2011. (4) Tailoring Rule: On May 13, 2010 EPA issued final rulemaking on thresholds for GHG emissions from stationary sources, which will take effect for the nation’s largest emitters (power plants, refineries, cement production facilities, etc.) on January 2, 2011. EPA raised the threshold for emissions to exempt small emitters from regulation and avoid excessive regulatory burden. Without the tailoring rule, about 6 million facilities would be subject to regulation. Because these cases will not reach resolution before regulation takes effect on January 2, 2011, petitioners from some of the cases have filed motions to stay all or part of EPA’s regulations while the litigation proceeds, arguing that that rulemaking is already causing “ongoing and imminent irreparable harm” to their economic interests before the regulatory regime has had a chance to be overturned in court.

### A2 Emissions – Transportation

#### EPA regulations fail to reduce transporation emisions – not solve warming

RPC Energy Facts 2010 (“Gas Tax Ineffective at Reducing Imports, Lowering Emissions” Senate Reports on Senate.Gov http://rpc.senate.gov/public/?a=Files.Serve&File\_id=82523b9f-04dc-4c3f-afe4-04716d0872f9)

Americans are eager to reduce oil imports, and most think we should reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in a common sense way. Unfortunately, the Obama Administration is pushing EPA regulations that would function as a hidden tax on Americans while climate bill proponents are drafting a new proposal to apply a cap-and-trade system to utilities and industrial sources and put a new tax on gasoline and diesel.1 Those supporting these approaches agree that higher energy prices are necessary to force Americans to change how they use energy. A recent study indicates, however, that this approach would fail to reduce transportation related greenhouse gas emissions or to stem oil imports significantly unless the price of gasoline were to rise above $7 per gallon. Supporters of “pricing carbon” acknowledge that raising the price of energy is essential to reduce emissions by encouraging Americans to use less energy. Treasury Secretary Geithner said, “increase[ing] the cost of energy… is necessary if you’re going to change how people use energy.”2 Congressman Waxman, chief sponsor of a House bill to price carbon, noted that if you reduce emissions, the price of energy will go up.3 Office of Management and Budget Director Orszag testified (while head of the Congressional Budget Office) that price increases would encourage people and businesses “to make investments and behavioral changes that reduced CO2 emissions.”4 President Obama, on the campaign trail in 2008, noted that Americans need to change their lifestyles: “We can’t drive our SUVs and eat as much as we want and keep our homes on 72 degrees at all times.”5 The problem for climate bill proponents is that the demand for gasoline does not change much without massive price increases. The Belfer Center at Harvard University recently published a policy brief examining GHG emissions reduction proposals. The brief concluded that “reducing… emissions from the transportation sector 14% below 2005 levels by 2020 may require gas prices greater than $7/gallon by 2020.”7 The underlying study on which the brief was based did not even try to model the 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions the President has called for by 2050.8 The study concluded that reducing emissions in transportation is expensive, which is consistent with government modeling9 showing that an economy-wide cap-and-trade system produces few emissions reductions in transportation compared with industry and utilties. Because American families need to drive to get to work and school and may not have easy alternatives to driving, significant gasoline price increases are necessary to change driving habits. The Secretary of Transportation insisted last year that, “with so many people out of work, the last thing we really want to [propose] is raising the gas tax.”10 When originally discussing the proposed new gas tax with the media, Congressional aides said the revenues “could help electrify the U.S. transportation sector”11 or be used for other programs, but would not be rebated to families who could pay $7,000 more per year in gasoline costs. Aside from reducing GHG emissions, proponents of climate legislation also claim that such a bill would reduce oil imports.13 In its transportation taxes scenario, the study predicts that a gas tax starting at $.50 per gallon in 2010 and increasing gradually to $3.36 per gallon in 2030 would reduce net crude oil and petroleum product imports by 1.5 million barrels per day (bpd) below forecasted levels by 2030.14 Total imports are approximately 13 million bpd today.15 In contrast, the Energy Information Agency says drilling in a small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) could yield up to 1.45 million bpd of oil, and the outer continental shelf off the lower 48 states has 18 billion barrels of recoverable oil.16 Drilling in ANWR would also bring in tens or even hundreds of billions of dollars in royalties and various tax revenues for the federal government and the state of Alaska.17 Climate bill proponents have instead made clear their preference to reduce imports by making gasoline more expensive—it could cost more than $7 per gallon if they want transportation emissions to be reduced pro rata—rather than drilling in ANWR.18 Democrats want to increase prices to address global warming and reduce oil imports, but their plan of a new energy tax, whether in the form of EPA regulations or legislation, is too costly and will not work. Instead, Congress should improve the environment without raising prices19 and should reduce imports by increasing domestic energy production.

### Transportation Ext

#### 1. Extend RPC 10 – EPA regulations will not reduce transportation emissions. Prefer our evidence because it cites studies.

#### 2. EPA regulations will increase driving

Heritage Foundation 2010 (“EPA’s Fuel Efficiency Standards: Bad News for the Consumer” http://blog.heritage.org/2010/04/02/epa%E2%80%99s-fuel-efficiency-standards-bad-news-for-the-consumer/)

We’re lucky to have the government looking out for us. But what they forgot to mention were some of the unintended consequences of fuel efficiency standards. Mandating more miles-per-gallon increases the cost of buying a new car and makes them less safe. While the administration acknowledged higher sticker prices for vehicles, they may have underestimated those increases. Last year, President Obama said consumers would be better off paying $1,300 more for a new car because they will save $2,800 through better gas mileage. Jim Kliesch of Union of Concerned Scientists calls these estimates “completely realistic” in an Autoweek.com article, but other estimates place the price hikes at $1,800 for small cars and $8,000 for large pickups. Sandra Stojkovski of See More Systems, which specializes in systems engineering, “projects the sticker of a compact car will go up $1,800 to $2,000. The price of a mid-sized car is likely to increase $4,500 to $6,000, she says. Outfitting a full-sized pickup with a diesel, rather than a gasoline-powered V-8, and other new equipment could cost $9,000.” Megan McArdle adds, “It will reduce our carbon emissions, but not by as much as advertised, because more fuel efficient cars make driving cheaper, so people will do more of it. This “rebound” effect robs about 25% of gains, and also means more congestion, and more wear-and-tear on roads.”

### 2nc unemployment

#### EPA regulations cause massive unemployment

Kreutzer and Campbell 8. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

Number of Jobs Declines. The loss of economic output is the proverbial tip of the economic iceberg. Below the surface are economic reactions to the leg islation that led up to the drop in output. Employ­ment growth slows sharply following the boomlet of the first few years. Potential employment (or the job growth that would be implied by the demand for goods and services and the relevant cost of capital used in production) slumps sharply. In 2015, regu lation-induced employment losses exceed 500,000; and they exceed that level for the remainder of the investigated period. Non-farm job losses peak at more than 800,000. Indeed, in no year after the boomlet does employment under the ANPR outperform the base line economy where these proposed regulations never become law. For manufacturing workers, the news is grim indeed. Employment will already be in decline due to increased labor-saving productivity: Our baseline shows that even with out additional job-killing regula tions, manufacturing employment will drop by more than 980,000 jobs. The ANPR accelerates this decrease substantially: Employ ment in manufacturing declines by an additional 22.6 percent or 2,880,000 jobs beyond the baseline losses. By 2029, several specific areas of the manufacturing industry will experience particularly harsh employment losses: Durable-manufacturing employ ment will decrease by 28 percent; Machinery-manufacturing job losses will exceed 57 percent; Textile-mills employment will decrease by 27.6 percent; Electrical-equipment and -appli ance employment will decrease by 22 percent; Paper and paper-product jobs will decrease by 36 percent; and Plastic and rubber products employment drops 54 percent. All employment declines described are in addi tion to those that occur in the baseline projections.

#### high unemployment guarantees economic crash.

WRAY 9. [L. Randall, PhD, Prof of Economics @ UMKC, Senior Research Scholar @ Levy Economics Institute, “When all else has failed, why not try job creation” -- http://neweconomicperspectives.blogspot.com/2009/11/when-all-else-has-failed-why-not-try.html]

The US continues to hemorrhage jobs even as some purport to see “green shoots”. All plausible projections show that unemployment will rise even if our economy begins to grow. Personally, I think those green shoots will die this winter because the stimulus package is far too small and because the financial system is going to crash again. The longer we wait to actually address the unemployment problem, the worse are the prospects for a real recovery. In his recent piece, Paul Krugman writes: Just to be clear, I believe that a large enough conventional stimulus would do the trick. But since that doesn’t seem to be in the cards, we need to talk about cheaper alternatives that address the job problem directly. Should we introduce an employment tax credit, like the one proposed by the Economic Policy Institute? Should we introduce the German- style job-sharing subsidy proposed by the Center for Economic Policy Research? Both are worthy of consideration. The point is that we need to start doing something more than, and different from, what we’re already doing. And the experience of other countries suggests that it’s time for a policy that explicitly and directly targets job creation.

### 2nc manufacturing

#### REGULATIONS COLLAPSE THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR

Kreutzer and Campbell 8. [David W., Ph.D.,Senior Policy Analyst for Energy Economics and Climate Change, and Karen A., Ph.D., Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics, Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, CO2-Emission Cuts: The Economic Costs of the EPA's ANPR Regulations, http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/cda08-10.cfm]

Nevertheless, the net impact on a CO2-con strained economy is negative, since GDP is never higher than in the baseline scenario. Higher energy costs decrease the use of carbon-based energy in the production of goods, incomes fall, and demand for goods subsides. GDP declines in 2020 by $332 billion, in 2025 by $528 billion, and in 2029 by $632 billion. The aggregate income loss for the 20-year period is $6.8 trillion. All figures have been adjusted for inflation to reflect 2008 prices. This slowdown in GDP is seen more dramatically in the slump in manufacturing output. Again, the manufacturing industry benefits from the initial investment in new energy production and energy-efficient capital, but the manufacturing sector's declines are sharp thereafter. Indeed, by 2029, manufacturing output in this energy-sensitive sector will be 27 percent below what it would be if the ANPR proposals are never applied. In 2029, the manufacturing output is $1.48 trillion less than the baseline output; that is, when compared to the economic world without the CAA regulation of CO2. This is equivalent to losing more than 80,000 manufacturing firms. Aggregate manufacturing loss from 2010 to 2029 is $10.9 trillion.

### Manufacturing impact – auto industry

#### AUTO INDUSTRY MANUFACTURING KEY TO CONVENTIONAL READINESS.

Gallagher 6 (Paul -- an economic analyst and editor for Executive Intelligence Review -- EIR – June 9th -- http://www.larouchepub.com/eirtoc/2006/eirtoc\_3325.html)

Auto production plants which are being idled in the United States this year and next—a total of nearly 80 million square feet of capacity full of very diverse and capable machine tools—are also being rapidly sold off at auctions, and their unmatched machine-tool capabilities lost to the national economy. Rather than simply being "idled" with the possibility of workforces returning and work resuming, these plants are disappearing under auctioneers' hammers almost as fast as they are shut down. A list of 65 major auto plants shutting down, and their capacities which may be lost, was featured in EIR, May 12, 2006 and in the LaRouche PAC pamphlet, Economic Recovery Act of 2006. The pattern of auctions, of which two examples are shown here, makes clear that the automakers and major auto supply producers, seeing at least 65-70 of their plants as unutilized capacity, do not plan or expect that capacity to come back into use for production of automobiles; rather, underutilization will continue to grow by outsourcing under conditions of rampant globalization. The pattern also presents a challenge to Congress to act fast to save this huge unutilized chunk of the auto sectors' machine-tool design and production capability, and use it for missions more urgent to the nation's economy than producing cars and light trucks to fill the ranks of lengthening traffic jams across the country. Lyndon LaRouche has proposed, and his LaRouche PAC is mobilized to get through Congress, a Federal Public Corporation to adopt the capacity the automakers are discarding, and use it to help build a new national infrastructure from high-speed rail lines to electric power. `No Longer Required' EIR's investigation shows that three major auto plants, closed within six months or less, were auctioned off in their entirety in the second half of May; and a fourth auction, in late April, sold off machinery for production of electrical systems from four different plants of Delphi Corporation: in Rochester, New York; Athens, Alabama; and Dayton and Moraine, Ohio. The complete plant contents auctioned were the General Motors transmission plant in Muncie, Indiana, hammered away in a three-day sale May 16-18; the metal stamping and machining plant known as "Chrysler machine," sold off in Toledo, Ohio on May 24-25; and the Delphi electrical systems plant in Irvine, California, auctioned on May 23. The Toledo plant's auction sale notice is shown in the illustration, marked "no longer required" by Chrysler. The featured machines in the sale included some of the largest and most capable metal presses used in the auto industry. The case of Muncie Manual Transmissions LLC, "one of the largest gear manufacturers in North America," is shown here in the auction company's brochure. Its illustrations make clear that most of the machines in this plant are quite new, built and bought since 1995. Virtually all of its machinery was auctioned off from May 16-18. "The building will be empty now," said one person present, and GM's plan is to demolish it immediately. That plant has some 600,000 square feet of production space, and had 300 remaining production workers before being closed. The workforce had recently used about 500 major machine tools in the plant; many had a replacement value of $500,000-1,000,000 each. All sold, according to the auction brochure, and the entire plant full of machinery apparently brought about $30 million. So a rough estimate might be that the machine tools were sold for 15 cents on the dollar of their replacement value for production. It is no secret that the purchasers at these auctions include other U.S. firms, scrap outfits, and foreign firms employing machine tools, including for production for export to the United States. People in the business indicate that the pace of these sales has been brisk for more than a decade; but the size of the auctions has definitely grown in the past two years or so, with large plants like this going under the hammer. "We also see a lot of aerospace tools" from Boeing and other companies, said one. As for the city of Muncie, it has been told to hope that the GM jobs that were lost, will be matched by new jobs gained—from a Sallie Mae "center for debt management"! Machine tools and productive skills will be "no longer required" there. Dissipation of Bankrupt's Assets In Delphi's case, a full 25 out of its 33 auto parts and supply plants in the country are on the management's list to close down or sell; in addition, others, like the Irvine electrical systems plant, have been closed in recent months. The management under CEO Steve Miller, who was brought in last year to declare the company bankrupt, are flouting the principles of bankruptcy by hiding the accounts of the company's outsourced foreign operations (already 75% of its total work!) while bankrupting and trying to liquidate only the U.S. capacity. On May 28, calls to the lawyers for parties contesting Delphi's filing in New York Federal bankruptcy court, found that with the exception of the UAW's lawyer, none of those attorneys was aware that the productive assets of the "bankrupt" company were being auctioned off. Sources say that the UAW has attempted to protest and stop the auctions of Delphi's plant and equipment in the court, but has been unable to do so. The attorney representing Delphi's shareholders said that the actions would not be permitted unless Delphi had sought and received permission from Judge Robert Drain to sell the machines. None of the attorneys knew whether Delphi had gotten Drain's approval, nor could this be learned from the judge's clerk. In any case, it is clear that the intention of Delphi's management is "globalization by bankruptcy," and that critical productive machinery of the "bankrupt" company is being dissipated—a violation of at least the spirit of the law—through auctions to other firms, other divisions, and other countries, because it does not intend to emerge from bankruptcy to produce again in the United States. And vital high-technology productive machine tools and other capacity of the U.S. national economy, essential for producing the infrastructure of productivity, are being lost. Had Congress already acted along the legislative lines LaRouche is calling for, this capacity could have been purchased by a Federal Public Corporation and saved for use in the critical purposes of building a new national economic infrastructure, and creating skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled employment. Another month's set of U.S. auto sales reports came in on June 2 and showed the urgent need to diversify the "product" of the auto industrial sector in this way, as it will not come back to building more autos for sale. Ford's U.S. sales through May are 3.3% below a year ago; Daimler-Chrysler's, 4.1% down; Ford-Volvo's 6.3% down; GM's, 4.6% down; Nissan's, 8.4% down. Toyota, Hyundai, and Mazda's sales are still up for the year, but the overall national trend is down. Total sales of cars and light trucks fell from a 16.7 million annual rate last May, to a 16.3 million rate this May, and the annual sales rate for January-May 2006 as a whole, is only 16.4 million units, compared to 16.9 million for all of 2005, and 17.1 million in 2004. Use It or Lose It International Association of Machinists president Thomas Buffenbarger charged in a Washington, D.C. speech May 15, "We have lost the ability to manufacture the means of our prosperity," and now Congress has given away "the ability of this country to defend itself" by outsourcing its machine-tool production in aerospace-defense and auto. Every week that Congress delays emergency legislation to save this remaining industrial power, more of it is lost, irretrievably. Auto skilled trades workers, machinists, and others among America's dwindling base of industrial production workers, realize that the loss of machine-tool and other skilled engineering employment in the United States, could end technological progress in our economy, and ruin our national security. In LaRouche PAC's one-hour documentary DVD on retooling and saving the auto industry, "Auto and World Economic Recovery," the auto unionists and Midwest elected officials interviewed all stressed the potential threat: The United States could find itself in a war, needing new munitions and related industrial production, with effectively all of our machine-tool design and production capability exported to other nations. These nations may not be allies, in part because of their exploitation by the very same low-wage outsourcing which made them the repositories of the machine tools now being auctioned off from Rochester, Toledo, and Irvine.

#### READINESS CHECKS NUCLEAR CONFLICT WITH CHINA AND OTHERS.

Record 95 (JEFFREY prof , Department of Strategy and International Security @ USAF Air War College -- Parameters, Autumn, pp. 20-30. http://www.carlisle.army.mil/USAWC/parameters/1995/record.htm

In terms of training, sustainability, and weaponry, it is always better to be ready and modern than unready and obsolete. What Congress does not look at, because it is constitutionally incapable of doing so in a coherent fashion, is the broader and far more critical question: Ready for what? What exactly should we expect our military to do? Against whom do we modernize? Have we correctly identified future threats to our security and the proper forces for dealing with those threats? Are we breathlessly and blindly pursuing modernization for its own sake, or are we tying it in with the quality and pace of hostile competition? These are the questions I would like to address. Informed line-item judgments on readiness and modernization hinge on informed judgments at the level of strategy, whose formulation is the responsibility of the Executive Branch. Our present strategy portends an excessive readiness for the familiar and comfortable at the expense of preparation for the more likely and less pleasant. Introducing Realism Into Our Assessments The basis of present strategy is the Administration's Bottom-Up Review, a 1993 assessment of US force requirements in the post-Soviet-threat world. The assessment concluded, among other things, that the United States should maintain ground, sea, and air forces sufficient to prevail in two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies. For planning purposes the assessment postulated another Iraqi invasion of Kuwait (and Saudi Arabia's eastern province) and another North Korean invasion of South Korea--two large and thoroughly conventional wars fought on familiar territory against familiar Soviet-model armies. Congressional and other critics rightly point to disparities between stated requirements for waging two major wars concurrently and the existing and planned forces that would actually be available. Shortfalls are especially pronounced in airlift, sealift, and long-range aerial bombardment. Critics also note that the Bottom-Up Review more or less ignores the impact of Haiti- and Somalia-like operations on our capacity to fight another Korean and another Persian Gulf war at the same time. Few in Congress or elsewhere, however, have questioned the realism of the scenario. How likely is it that we would be drawn into two major wars at the same time? What are the opportunity costs of preparing for such a prospect? The prospect of twin wars has been a bugaboo of US force planners since the eve of World War II--the only conflict in which the US military was in fact called upon to wage simultaneously what amounted to two separate wars. Chances for another world war, however, disappeared with the Soviet Union's demise. Moreover, two points should be kept in mind with respect to World War II. First, the two-front dilemma came about only because of Hitler's utterly gratuitous declaration of war on the United States just after Pearl Harbor--a move that has to go down as one of the most strategically stupid decisions ever undertaken by a head of state. Had Hitler instead declared that Germany had no quarrel with the United States, and therefore would remain at peace with it, President Roosevelt would have been hard put to obtain a congressional declaration of war on Germany, or, with one, to pursue a Germany-first strategy. Second, during World War II the United States was compelled to pursue a win-hold-win strategy against Germany and Japan, respectively, even though we spent 40 percent of the GNP on defense, placed 12 million Americans under arms, and had powerful allies (unlike Germany or Japan). We sought to--and did--defeat Germany first, while initially remaining on the strategic defense in the Pacific. In the decades since 1945, US planners persisted in postulating scenarios involving at least two concurrent conflicts, even though we have never had the resources to wage two big wars at the same time. Recall that the Vietnam conflict was a "half-war" in contemporary US force planning nomenclature. More to the point, our enemies have without exception refused to take advantage of our involvement in one war to start another one with us; not during the three years of the Korean War, the ten years of the Vietnam War, or the eight months of the Persian Gulf crisis of 1990-91. States almost always go to war for specific reasons independent of whether an adversary is already at war with another country. This is especially true for states contemplating potentially war-provoking acts against the world's sole remaining superpower. In none of the three major wars we have fought since 1945 did our enemies, when contemplating aggression, believe that their aggressive acts would prompt war with the United States. If prospects for being drawn into two large-scale conventional conflicts at the same time are remote, prudence dictates maintenance of sufficient military power to deal quickly and effectively with such conflicts one at a time. And for this we are well prepared. Our force structure remains optimized for interstate conventional combat, and it proved devastating in our last conventional war, against Saddam Hussein's large--albeit incompetently led--Soviet-model forces. Though most national military establishments in the Third World, which today includes much of the former Soviet Union, are incapable of waging large-scale conventional warfare, the few that are or have the potential to do so are all authoritarian states with ambitions hostile to US security interests. Among those states are Iran, Iraq, Syria, a radicalized Egypt, and China. Russia can be excluded for probably at least the next decade. Russia's conventional military forces have deteriorated to the point where they have great difficulty suppressing even small insurrections inside Russia's own borders. The humiliating performance of the Russian forces in Chechnya reveals the extent to which draft avoidance, demoralization, disobedience, desertion, political tension, professional incompetence, and the virtual collapse of combat support and combat service support capabilities have wrecked what just a decade ago was an army that awed many NATO force planners. China is included not just as a potential regional threat but as a potential global threat. We need to be wary of today's commonplace notion that the United States is the last superpower, that we will never again face the kind of global and robust threat to our vital security interests once posed by the Soviet Union, and before that, the Axis Powers. The present planning focus on regional conflict should not blind us to the probable emergence over the next decade or two of at least one regional superpower capable of delivering significant numbers of nuclear weapons over intercontinental distances and of projecting conventional forces well beyond their national frontiers. China comes first to mind. China's vast and talented population and spectacular economic performance could provide the foundation for a military challenge in Asia of a magnitude similar to that posed by the growth of Japanese military power in the 1930s. Our capacity for large-scale interstate conventional combat is indispensable to our security. It served us well in Korea and the Persian Gulf, where we continue to have vital interests threatened by adversaries who have amassed or are seeking to amass significant, and in the case of North Korea, vast amounts of conventional military power.

### Manufacturing impact - econ impact

#### the impact is economic collapse

VARGO 3. [Franklin, National Association of Manufacturers, “CHINA'S EXCHANGE RATE REGIME AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY” Federal News Service, 10-1, Lexis]

I would like to begin my statement with a review of why manufacturing is vital to the U.S. economy. Since manufacturing only represents about 16 percent of the nation's output, who cares? Isn't the United States a post-manufacturing services economy? Who needs manufacturing? The answer in brief is that the United States economy would collapse without manufacturing, as would our national security and our role in the world. That is because manufacturing is really the foundation of our economy, both in terms of innovation and production and in terms of supporting the rest of the economy. For example, many individuals point out that only about 3 percent of the U.S. workforce is on the farm, but they manage to feed the nation and export to the rest of the world. But how did this agricultural productivity come to be? It is because of the tractors and combines and satellite systems and fertilizers and advanced seeds, etc. that came from the genius and productivity of the manufacturing sector. Similarly, in services -- can you envision an airline without airplanes? Fast food outlets without griddles and freezers? Insurance companies or banks without computers? Certainly not. The manufacturing industry is truly the innovation industry, without which the rest of the economy could not prosper. Manufacturing performs over 60 percent of the nation's research and development. Additionally, it also underlies the technological ability of the United States to maintain its national security and its global leadership. Manufacturing makes a disproportionately large contribution to productivity, more than twice the rate of the overall economy, and pays wages that are about 20 percent higher than in other sectors. But its most fundamental importance lies in the fact that a healthy manufacturing sector truly underlies the entire U.S. standard of living -because it is the principal way by which the United States pays its way in the world. Manufacturing accounts for over 80 percent of all U.S. exports of goods. America's farmers will export somewhat over $50 billion this year, but America's manufacturers export almost that much event month! Even when services are included, manufacturing accounts for two-thirds of all U.S. exports of goods and services. If the U.S. manufacturing sector were to become seriously impaired, what combination of farm products together with architectural, travel, insurance, engineering and other services could make up for the missing two-thirds of our exports represented by manufactures? The answer is "none." What would happen instead is the dollar would collapse, falling precipitously -- not to the reasonable level of 1997, but far below it -and with this collapse would come high U.S. inflation, a wrenching economic downturn and a collapse in the U.S. standard of living and the U.S. leadership role in the world. That, most basically, is why the United States cannot become a "nation of shopkeepers."

### Manufacturing impact - heg impact

#### MANUFACTURING IS KEY TO HEG – innovation, leadership, readiness.

VARGO 3. [Franklin, National Association of Manufacturers, “CHINA'S EXCHANGE RATE REGIME AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY” Federal News Service, 10-1, Lexis]

I would like to begin my statement with a review of why manufacturing is vital to the U.S. economy. Since manufacturing only represents about 16 percent of the nation's output, who cares? Isn't the United States a post-manufacturing services economy? Who needs manufacturing? The answer in brief is that the United States economy would collapse without manufacturing, as would our national security and our role in the world. That is because manufacturing is really the foundation of our economy, both in terms of innovation and production and in terms of supporting the rest of the economy. For example, many individuals point out that only about 3 percent of the U.S. workforce is on the farm, but they manage to feed the nation and export to the rest of the world. But how did this agricultural productivity come to be? It is because of the tractors and combines and satellite systems and fertilizers and advanced seeds, etc. that came from the genius and productivity of the manufacturing sector. Similarly, in services -- can you envision an airline without airplanes? Fast food outlets without griddles and freezers? Insurance companies or banks without computers? Certainly not. The manufacturing industry is truly the innovation industry, without which the rest of the economy could not prosper. Manufacturing performs over 60 percent of the nation's research and development. Additionally, it also underlies the technological ability of the United States to maintain its national security and its global leadership. Manufacturing makes a disproportionately large contribution to productivity, more than twice the rate of the overall economy, and pays wages that are about 20 percent higher than in other sectors. But its most fundamental importance lies in the fact that a healthy manufacturing sector truly underlies the entire U.S. standard of living -because it is the principal way by which the United States pays its way in the world.

#### GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

KHALILZAD 95. [ZALMAY, Zalmay, Rand Corporation, The Washington Quarterly]

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

# Obama bad – iran strikes good

### Obama Bad 1nc – Iran Strikes Module

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

Chemi Shalev (Israeli journalist and political analyst) 12-27-2011 <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/west-of-eden/will-a-u-s-attack-on-iran-become-obama-s-october-surprise-1.403898>

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

# Iran Strikes Good – internals

### Losing = strikes

#### Obama will strike Iran if he starts to lose the election- prefer our evidence- media reports underestimate this risk

J. D. Longstreet is a thirty-year veteran of the broadcasting business, as an “in the field” and “on-air” news reporter (contributing to radio, TV, and newspapers) and a conservative broadcast commentator. 1-14-2012 <http://www.federalobserver.com/2012/01/14/war-clouds-continue-to-gather/>

So when will this war begin. Well, let me put it this way: The Iranians should carefully watch Obama’s poll numbers. If those numbers continue their slide downwards, the Iranians are going get the heck bombed out of them. Americans are extremely reluctant to change Presidents in the middle of a war. Obama knows this and is expected to act accordingly. Some conservative writers and commentators expect that war in the Middle East is currently scheduled for October 2012. That would be the famed “October Surprise.” On the other hand, those in my camp believe the Iranians, in all their hyped-up passion, will do something stupid like firing on a tanker or a US warship or aircraft, or even worse, make an attempt to close the Straits of Hormuz by sewing it with mines and other hazards to maritime traffic. That would be the spark that would bring down the considerable wrath of that naval armada lying off their shores. Then there are the Israelis. They have had enough of Iran’s threats and Iran’s war on Israel by proxy. Israel’s secret war of sabotage in Iran can only deliver limited success at delaying and derailing Iran’s race to build or acquire a nuclear bomb. Israel could decide, at any moment, that enough is enough and launch their fighter-bombers and cruise missiles at Iran’s nuclear facilities. Even if it only buys a few months or a couple of years of breathing space for Israel, it is becoming clear there is no other way to effectively deter Iran from building their coveted Islam Bomb. The situation in the Middle East today is far, far, more dangerous than the US media is reporting. A single spark will ignite a devastating war that will affect practically every nation on earth to some degree or other. Those of us who continue to sound the warning bell of a huge war in the Middle East are being compared to the boy Peter in the story of “Peter and the Wolf.” An article at Haaretz.com noted that those who make such public comparisons seem always to leave out the end of Aesop’s famous tale of the boy who called wolf too much. In the end, the wolf actually DID come — and the sheep were slaughtered. (SOURCE) So, with that ending in mind, I have no concern about continually pointing to those dark, foreboding, clouds gathering in the east. Since the mainstream media seems to be ignoring a certain war to protect Obama’s prospects in the coming election, someone must stand as a watchman on the ramparts and sound the alarm when clouds of dust from the approaching armies of the enemy is sighted and when the sound of distant war drums is heard. Today those dust clouds are clearly seen over the horizon and the pounding of the drums can be heard in the distance — and we are sounding the alarm.

#### October surprise possible- election fate and Jewish vote determine strikes

Paul R. Pillar (visiting professor at Georgetown University for security studies) 3-7-2012 <http://consortiumnews.com/2012/03/07/an-israeli-october-surprise-on-obama/>

The greatest danger the United States (and any peace-loving person in the Middle East) currently faces is that Barak and Prime Minister Netanyahu will spring an October surprise (or a surprise in any month between now and the first Tuesday of November) in the form of an armed attack on Iran. [For more on a historical precedent, see Consortiumnews.com’s “The CIA/Likud Sinking of Jimmy Carter.”] A key consideration for them is the possibly different reactions of a U.S. president facing a fight for reelection (while also facing that political muscle represented at the convention center) and a newly reelected president who knows he never would be running for anything again.

#### Obama will strike Iran if he gets behind in the polls- sees it as his get out of jail free card

Jeremy Slate, Bachelor's Degree in Judaism and Catholic Theology, and a Master's Degree in European History, 2-12-2012 <http://www.jeremyrslate.com/2012/02/art-of-october-surprise.html>

This time of year we are all looking for surprises. However, this Christmas season, I would like you consider a different type of surprise; an October Surprise. This probably conjures up mental images of ghosts, Goblins and pumpkins, but this line of thinking is completely off track. Typically, elections in the US take place the Tuesday after the first Monday in November; making events in October politically expedient. It is fitting the first October Surprise was conducted by Richard Nixon, a very "surprising" individual. Nixon is involved in two October Surprises, the second, in 1972, coining the phrase. In 1968, peace was a real possibility in Vietnam. It caused democrat, Hubert Humphrey to surge past Nixon in the polls. Nixon advisory, Henry Kissinger, spoke to the North Vietnamese, causing them to walk away from the peace treaty. Nixon would benefit again from Vietnam in 1972, when 12 days before the election, peace was announced, once again propelling Nixon to victory. Reagan had his own October Surprise fears due to Jimmy Carter in 1980. Carter believed the Iranian hostages safe return would cement his own campaign. The surprise was not to be; the hostages were not released until January 20, 1981, the day of Reagan's inauguration. In the 2000 election, George W. Bush almost lost the election due to October accusations of DWI. An October 2004 reduction of Saudi oil prices helped to cement Bush's reelection campaign. This is very interesting because there is a new October Surprise on the way. Barack Obama fears he will not win his reelection bid, seeing we is losing to "generic republican" in the polls. Mr. Obama has an ace in the hole, an October Surprise. The United States and Iran have been doing a lot of posturing. There was even a recent Daily Caller article blaming Iran for 9/11. Apparently, that card worked so well with Iraq and Afghanistan, so its being played again with Iran. Obama's Keynesian policies have failed and he is looking for a get out of jail free card. General Wesley Clark warned citizens in 2003 that the ultimate goal of the US was open war with Iran. Obama would even sway some of the war hungry Neo-Cons to his side. Israel will go to war with Iran around August, and the US will come in October to aid. It is important that it happens in October, so the media has no time to cover the story. A sitting president has never lost a reelection campaign during a time of war.

#### More ev

Jason Ditz Antiwar.com, 2-17-2012 <http://news.antiwar.com/2012/02/17/obama-officials-iran-sanctions-will-fail-leading-to-war/>

The new reports come just one day after Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta conceded that Iran isn’t actually developing a nuclear weapon, and DIA chief Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess said that Iran was unlikely to start any war on their own. Officials say Obama has been telling Israel he wants to “give sufficient time” to the current round of sanctions before starting the war, though they say that in the end the result will start be a war because Iran is “behaving like sanctions don’t matter.” It does seem to have pushed back the start of the war a bit, however, as Panetta had previously predicted Israel would launch an attack between April and June, but Obama advisors are now calling September or October the “sweet spot.” This could mean a literal October surprise, with President Obama either starting a huge war with Iran just ahead of the 2012 presidential election, or having Israel do so and jumping in immediately thereafter. Such a timing for the war could be seen as politically desirable for the president, with several of the Republican candidates condemning him for not being more hawkish against Iran, and likely to center a foreign policy debate on his not starting this particular war.

### A2 Obama Will Never Strike

#### Obama willing to do it for political reasons- private comments and recent statements

News Max, 12-31-2011 <http://www.newsmax.com/InsiderReport/October-Surprise-Against-Iran/2011/12/31/id/422683>

Recent statements from the Obama administration have led at least one Israeli observer to suspect that the president is preparing for an attack on Iran — and political considerations would dictate an assault in October. Writing in the Israeli newspaper Haaretz, Chemi Shalev notes that on Dec. 16, Obama switched his rhetoric from "a nuclear Iran is unacceptable" to the assertive "we are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons." On Dec. 19, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, who had previously warned about the pitfalls of an attack on Iran, declared that the United States "will take whatever steps necessary to deal with" the Iranian nuclear threat. The next day, Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "My biggest worry is that [the Iranians] will miscalculate our resolve." Shalev observes that with the withdrawal of American troops from Iraq, there is no longer fear that an attack on Iran would endanger U.S. forces there. And he discloses that people who have heard Obama speak about Iran in closed sessions believe he would order an attack if he is convinced that a nuclear-armed Iran poses a clear danger to America's national security.

#### Advisors are pushing and campaign knows boost will happen

Jeffrey T. Kuhner is a columnist at The Washington Times and president of the Edmund Burke Institute. 3-9-2012 <http://www.worldnewstribune.com/2012/03/09/obamas-october-surprise/>

Is President Obama planning to launch military strikes against Iran in order to ensure re-election? Is there an October surprise being hatched by the White House? All the signals are: yes. Recently, Mr. Obama told an audience at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee’s (AIPAC) annual policy conference in Washington, D.C. that a nuclear-armed Iran is “unacceptable.” He said that all options—including military force — are “on the table.” And he warned Teheran’s mullahs not to “call my bluff.” In short, the clouds of war are looming on the horizon. Yet, at the same time, Mr. Obama is strongly pressuring Israel not to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. The administration argues that diplomacy, sanctions and covert operations are starting to take their toll on the Islamic Republic. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has warned Mr. Obama that Jerusalem cannot wait much longer; Iran is about to enter the “zone of immunity” where it will acquire the capacity to build a nuclear weapons program — crossing the threshold whereby the ayatollahs cannot be stopped from getting the bomb. Mr. Obama has assured Mr. Netanyahu not to worry; America will destroy Iran’s nuclear program if necessary. The president vowed at AIPAC that “I have Israel’s back.” He doesn’t. Mr. Obama is playing a cynical game, using the existential fate of the Jewish state as a political trump card to guarantee his re-election in November. He is the most anti-Israel president in U.S. history. Mr. Obama doggedly opposed the sanctions imposed on Iran — especially, on its central bank. The only reason he begrudgingly signed on was because they were embedded as part of the defense bill. Yet, he now claims credit for their impact. He has repeatedly called for diplomatic engagement with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. In 2009, when millions of pro-democracy protesters poured onto the streets of Tehran and other Iranian cities to protest the rigged elections, Mr. Obama did the unthinkable: He remained silent. He refused to lift a finger or say a word of encouragement to help the brave democrats seeking to overthrow the clerical fascist regime. Mr. Ahmadinejad is the Hitler of our time. He has repeatedly called for the destruction of Israel, pledging to wipe the Jewish state off the map. The Iranian strongman is a radical Shi’ite revolutionary, who hopes to erect a world Muslim empire on the ashes of the Jews. In short, he is not just the mortal enemy of Israel — and the West — but a genocidal madman. Mr. Obama’s dithering and feckless diplomacy has given the mullahs the one thing they desperately crave: time. They are running out the clock in order to achieve an Islamic bomb. Instead of stopping them, Mr. Obama has only emboldened their nuclear ambitions. Moreover, the administration has called for Israel to enter peace talks with the Palestinians based on a return to the pre-1967 borders. This would effectively force Jerusalem to accept territorial boundaries that would leave it defenseless against any future Palestinian or Arab invasion. Mr. Obama also withdrew support for Egypt’s pro-American dictator, Hosni Mubarak. The result is that the Muslim Brotherhood has come to power. Mr. Mubarak was many things — venal, corrupt and brutal. But he kept the peace with Israel and helped to advance America’s national interests in the region, especially, in fighting Islamic terrorists. This has now changed. The Muslim Brotherhood aims to forge a Sunni theocracy, transforming Egypt into an anti-Semitic, anti-Western hotbed. Hence, under Mr. Obama’s leadership, the Jewish people find themselves encircled by dangerous Islamists. Providing Mr. Obama with control over Israel’s future is like trusting Dracula with a blood bank. It is an act of folly. Mr. Obama refuses to give Israel the green light to launch military strikes on Iran. Israeli intelligence officials admit that, privately, the White House has warned Mr. Netanyahu that in the event of an attack Israel — and not Iran — will be blamed by the administration. In short, Mr. Obama is trying to tie Mr. Netanyahu’s hands, coercing him to wait for Washington to take decisive action. The record, however, is clear: sanctions have not — and will not — work. Russia and China continue to prop up Teheran. Moreover, the mullahs are not driven by economic considerations; a messianic theocracy is not concerned about growth rates or improving living standards. It cares about cementing its grip on power. A bomb will ensure the survival of the Islamic Republic. It will be untouchable. This is why a regional showdown is inevitable. Mr. Obama is blatantly attempting to maximize his political capital. He is hoping to keep the charade of diplomacy and sanctions going until the summer or early fall. And then, when he believes Iran is on the cusp of going nuclear, Mr. Obama will order an American — not Israeli — air strike on Teheran’s key facilities. The result will be a temporary boost in his popular approval, as Americans rally around their commander-in-chief. It will make Mr. Obama look decisive, strong and presidential. It will propel him to victory, riding a wave of patriotic emotion.

# Iran Strikes Good – impact

### Laundry List

#### Stikes solve proliferation and prevent Israel strikes that would spark a global war

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

STRIKE NOW OR SUFFER LATER Attacking Iran is hardly an attractive prospect. But the United States can anticipate and reduce many of the feared consequences of such an attack. If it does so successfully, it can remove the incentive for other nations in the region to start their own atomic programs and, more broadly, strengthen global nonproliferation by demonstrating that it will use military force to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. It can also head off a possible Israeli operation against Iran, which, given Israel's limited capability to mitigate a potential battle and inflict lasting damage, would likely result in far more devastating consequences and carry a far lower probability of success than a U.S. attack. Finally, a carefully managed U.S. attack would prove less risky than the prospect of containing a nuclear-armed Islamic Republic -- a costly, decades-long proposition that would likely still result in grave national security threats. Indeed, attempting to manage a nuclear-armed Iran is not only a terrible option but the worst. With the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq winding down and the United States facing economic hardship at home, Americans have little appetite for further strife. Yet Iran's rapid nuclear development will ultimately force the United States to choose between a conventional conflict and a possible nuclear war. Faced with that decision, the United States should conduct a surgical strike on Iran's nuclear facilities, absorb an inevitable round of retaliation, and then seek to quickly de-escalate the crisis. Addressing the threat now will spare the United States from confronting a far more dangerous situation in the future.

#### Strikes prevent global nuclear war, nuclear terrorism, and proliferation

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

Some states in the region are doubting U.S. resolve to stop the program and are shifting their allegiances to Tehran. Others have begun to discuss launching their own nuclear initiatives to counter a possible Iranian bomb. For those nations and the United States itself, the threat will only continue to grow as Tehran moves closer to its goal. A nuclear-armed Iran would immediately limit U.S. freedom of action in the Middle East. With atomic power behind it, Iran could threaten any U.S. political or military initiative in the Middle East with nuclear war, forcing Washington to think twice before acting in the region. Iran's regional rivals, such as Saudi Arabia, would likely decide to acquire their own nuclear arsenals, sparking an arms race. To constrain its geopolitical rivals, Iran could choose to spur proliferation by transferring nuclear technology to its allies -- other countries and terrorist groups alike. Having the bomb would give Iran greater cover for conventional aggression and coercive diplomacy, and the battles between its terrorist proxies and Israel, for example, could escalate. And Iran and Israel lack nearly all the safeguards that helped the United States and the Soviet Union avoid a nuclear exchange during the Cold War -- secure second-strike capabilities, clear lines of communication, long flight times for ballistic missiles from one country to the other, and experience managing nuclear arsenals. To be sure, a nuclear-armed Iran would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. But the volatile nuclear balance between Iran and Israel could easily spiral out of control as a crisis unfolds, resulting in a nuclear exchange between the two countries that could draw the United States in, as well.

### 2nc Terrorism

#### Failure to strike incites terrorism

Krauthammer, 2004 (Charles-Phd. Oxford, McGill, Harvard. Pulitzer Prize.) New York Daily News, July 23

There are only two things that will stop the Iranian nuclear program: revolution from below or an attack on its nuclear facilities.The country should be ripe for revolution. But the mullahs are very good at police-state tactics. The long-awaited revolution is not happening. Which makes the question of preemptive attack all the more urgent. Iran will go nuclear during the next presidential term. If nothing is done, a fanatical terrorist regime openly dedicated to the destruction of the "Great Satan" will have both nuclear weapons and the terrorists and missiles to deliver them. All that stands between us and that is either revolution or preemptive strike. Both of which, by the way, are far more likely to succeed with 146,000 American troops and highly sophisticated aircraft standing by just a few miles away - in Iraq.

#### The impact is extinction

Alexander 2003 (Yonah, Director, Inter-University for Terrorism Studies, Jerusalem Post, 8-25, Lexis)

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically the international community's failure, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threat to the survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than as a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned to witness the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al-Qaida terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military centers. Likewise Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Accords of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack. Why are the US and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism, continually shocked by terrorist surprises? There are several reasons: \* A misunderstanding of the manifold factors contributing to the expansion of terrorism, such as the absence of a universal definition of terrorism; \* The religionization of politics; \* Double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear that we have entered an Age of Super-Terrorism - biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear, and cyber - with its serious implications for national, regional, and global security concerns. Two myths in particular must be debunked immediately if an effective counterterrorism strategy can be developed; for example, strengthening international cooperation. THE FIRST illusion is that terrorism can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated completely, provided the root causes of conflicts - political, social, and economic - are addressed. The conventional illusion is that terrorism used by "oppressed" people seeking to achieve their goals is justified. Consequently, the argument advanced by so-called freedom fighters - "give me liberty and I will give you death" - is tolerated, if not glorified. This traditional rationalization of "sacred" violence often conceals the fact that the real purpose of terrorist groups is to gain political power through the barrel of the gun, in violation of fundamental human rights of the noncombatant segment of societies. For instance, Palestinian religious movements, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and secular entities, such as Fatah's Tanzim and the Aksa Martyrs Brigade, wish not only to resolve national grievances such as settlements, the right of return, and Jerusalem, but primarily to destroy the Jewish state. Similarly, Osama bin Laden's international network not only opposes the presence of American military in the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq; its stated objective is to "unite all Muslims and establish a government that follows the rule of the Caliphs." The second myth is that initiating strong action against the terrorist infrastructure - leaders, recruitment, funding, propaganda, training, weapons, operational command and control - will only increase terrorism. The argument here is that law enforcement efforts and military retaliation will inevitably fuel more brutal revenge acts of violence. Clearly, if this perception continues to prevail, particularly in democratic societies, the danger is that such thinking will paralyze governments into inaction, thereby encouraging further terrorist attacks. Past experience provides useful lessons for a realistic strategy. The prudent application of force has demonstrated that it is an effective tool in deterring terrorism in the short and long terms. For example, Israel's targeted killing of Mohammed Sider, the Hebron commander of the Islamic Jihad, defused a ticking bomb. The assassination of Ismail Abu Shanab, a top Hamas leader in the Gaza Strip, directly responsible for several suicide bombings including the latest bus attack in Jerusalem, disrupted potential terrorist operations. Similarly, the US military operation in Iraq eliminated Saddam Hussein's regime as a state sponsor of terror. Thus it behooves those countries victimized by terrorism to understand a cardinal message communicated by Sir Winston Churchill to the House of Commons on May 13, 1940: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory however long and hard the road may be: For without victory there is no survival."

### US prevents Israel strikes

#### Israel will strike Iran if we don’t – official statements and war game-planning.

Kenneth Katzman (Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs) June 9 2011, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32048.pdf

Some experts express greater concern over the potential for a strategic strike on Iran by Israel as compared to strikes by the United States. The debate over this possibility increased following the publication by the September 2010 issue of The Atlantic magazine of an article by Jeffrey Goldberg entitled “Point of No Return.”64 As noted in the piece, Israeli officials view a nuclear armed Iran as an existential threat and have repeatedly refused to rule out the possibility that Israel might strike Iran’s nuclear infrastructure. Speculation about this possibility increased in March and April 2009 with statements by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to The Atlantic magazine stating that “You don’t want a messianic apocalyptic cult controlling atomic bombs.” This and other Israeli comments generated assessments by then CENTCOM Commander General Petraeus that Israel might well decide to launch a strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities. Adding to the prospects for this scenario, in mid-June 2008, Israeli officials confirmed reports that Israel had practiced a long-range strike such as that which would be required. Taking a position similar to that of the George W. Bush Administration, senior U.S. officials visited Israel throughout 2010 (including Vice President Biden in March 2010) in part to express the view that the Obama Administration is committed to strict sanctions on Iran—with the implication that Israeli military action should not be undertaken. Others say that Israeli urgency has abated as of the end of 2010 because of shared U.S.-Israeli assessments that an Iranian nuclear weapons capability is not imminent.

#### It’s not just rhetoric

New York Times, ’12 (February 5, “When Talk of War Transcends Idle Chatter” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/06/world/middleeast/in-israel-talk-of-attacking-iran-transcends-idle-chatter.html?adxnnl=1&ref=nuclearprogram&adxnnlx=1329620457-bMam3RNWOIts2Gt51v4wew>)

The standard view has been that successful attacks rely on secrecy and surprise, so the more talk there is about an operation, the less likely it will occur. One year ago, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu seemed to support that theory. He told foreign journalists that Iran briefly stopped working on a nuclear weapon only once, in 2003, because that was when the United States attacked Iraq, and Iran feared it might be next. “The paradox,” Mr. Netanyahu said then, “is that if there is a credible military option, you won’t have to use it.” In other words, the more noise you make about war, the less likely you will have to resort to it. But few who have spent time with [Israel](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/israel/index.html?inline=nyt-geo)’s decision makers in recent months have come away believing that the talk of a military assault is merely a well-scripted act of public diplomacy. It is that, to be sure, but there is more. It is also a window into the government’s thinking. Israel believes that its threats to attack Iran have been the catalyst that has pushed much of the world to agree to harsh sanctions on Iran’s energy and banking sectors, sanctions that otherwise would not have been agreed to. It believes further that the Iranian economy is fragile and the popularity of the Tehran government is low, so that there is a small chance the sanctions could force a change of policy or a political crisis in Iran. But Israel’s top leaders also worry that the sanctions are too late and that, in the end, a military assault is the only way to accomplish their goal — stopping Iran from obtaining [nuclear weapons](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/atomic_weapons/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). So the talk in this crisis is not made instead of action, but in addition to it — and perhaps as a prelude to it.

### Israel stries bad – global war

#### Preemptive strikes by Israel will unleash a global nuclear war.

J. Adams 1997 “THE SHOCK!: War In The Middle East?”, May 3, http://www.gold-eagle.com/gold\_digest/anon504.html

Israel is increasingly concerned by Iran's development of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles. Iran has had a long-running, aggressive program to develop chemical, biological and nuclear weaponry and now the Iranians, according to the London Telegraph, "have....taken delivery of a consignment of the North Korean Nudong surface-to-surface missiles which would enable them to launch attacks against Israel". I doubt Tel Aviv will be patient in acting to mitigate the emerging threat of mass destruction from the radical regime in Teheran. And now, as both the U.S. and Europe are aligning against Iran in response to prior terrorism that is being linked back to Iran's leaders, an opportunity may be emerging for Tel Aviv to launch a debilitating preemptive attack against Iran's growing military prowess that was recently flaunted in wargames code-named the "Road To Jerusalem". (That Israel is willing to take such preemptive action is revealed by previous preemptive Israel strikes against the Arab powers as they were preparing to attack the Jewish State in the 1950's and 1960's.) Even if Israel isn't about to set-off a regional Middle Eastern war with a preemptive strike against Iran and/or Syria, the odds are war is going to erupt there one way or another in the near-future. Clearly the hard-line Arab states like Syria and Iran are getting ready to unleash a massive attack against the Jewish State, so it's not going to take much to ignite the region into a catastrophe of mass destruction. Inevitably, this will lead to a global nuclear war that Russia, now openly allied with China, has been preparing to unleash on the West.

#### Israel will strike iran- will spark middle east conflagration

Novakeo 2006 “NUCLEAR ILLUSION: ISRAEL & THE IRANIAN OIL BOURSE REALITY”, January, http://www.etherzone.com/2006/nova020606.shtml

There is little doubt that Israel will attempt to destroy Iran's nuclear facilities. It will be similar to Israel's raid on Iraq's Osirak nuclear facility in 1981, but on a much larger scale. This massive first strike by Israel deep into Iranian territory would most likely quickly degenerate into a major conflict with the potential to drag other Muslim nations into the conflagration and into another general Middle Eastern war.

#### Israel preemptive attack will destabilize the Middle East and accelerate the Iranian nuclear weapons program

Shlomo Brom (Senior Research Associate at Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies) 2005 “IS THE BEGIN DOCTRINE STILL A VIABLE OPTION FOR ISRAEL?”, GETTING READY FOR A NUCLEAR-READY IRAN, October, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub629.pdf

The United States has to take into account the possibility of an Israeli preemptive strike against the Iranian nuclear facilities when considering its policy options. First, such an attack, especially if it did not achieve its planned objectives, would have a destabilizing effect on the Middle East. It could lead to acceleration of the Iranian program and to a chain of violent clashes between Iran and Israel. The United States should prepare contingency plans for such an event that include actions aimed at deterring Iran from destabilizing the Middle East, and the necessary political reactions, including prevention of initiatives aimed at a show of support for Iran internationally from such organizations as the UN. The United States has an interest in knowing the Israeli intentions and affecting them. That can be achieved only through an open, detailed, and continuous dialogue between the two nations.

### Israel strikes bad – terrorism

#### Israel strikes will spark Iranian nuclear terrorism around the world

Kuwait News Agency 1/12/2007 “Israeli strike on Iran to have dire consequences -- Think-tank”, http://www.kuna.net.kw/NewsAgenciesPublicSite/ArticleDetails.aspx?id=1717759&Language=en

KUN0059 4 GEN 0480 KUWAIT /KUNA-QRE1 POL-UK-ISRAEL-WARNING Israeli strike on Iran to have dire consequences -- Think-tank LONDON, March 12 (KUNA) -- Israel will face "dire and far-reaching" consequences if it launches military action to knock out Iran's nuclear programme, a leading British international affairs think-tank warned Monday. A report by the Royal Institute for International Affairs, known as Chatham House, in central London, said an Israeli operation to cripple Iran's nuclear facilities through air strikes was possible, although "extremely risky". But it warned that Iran could retaliate with massive ballistic missile attacks on Israeli cities such as Tel Aviv or Haifa with "substantial" loss of life. The report by Yossi Mekelberg, an associate fellow of Chatham House's Middle East programme, said Israel would also face widespread international condemnation and further isolation in the Middle East region. "An Israeli military operation against Iran would hurt Israel's long-term interests. It would be detrimental to Israel's overall security and the political and economic consequences would be dire and far-reaching", it said. The report said that Israeli leaders would prefer to see a diplomatic solution to the crisis over Iran's nuclear programme. However, in the face of calls by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to wipe Israel off the world map, it warned that the Israelis may feel compelled to act if they believed Tehran was close to developing a nuclear bomb. "Israeli decision-makers face a combination of extreme hatred expressed by the Iranian leadership, a call for the removal of the Jewish state, and the development of military capabilities which could potentially inflict a fatal blow on Israel," it said. "Moreover, a greater danger to Israel and to other Western countries is the transfer of knowledge and technology to terrorist groups by rogue elements within the Iranian regime, which might end in a non-conventional terrorist attack." Apart from launching missile strikes against Israel, the Iranians could respond to any attack by striking American targets in the region or sponsoring terrorist attacks against Israeli or US interests around the world. While air strikes might delay Iran's nuclear programme for a while, they could also have "grave consequences" for Israel's long-term ability to secure its position in the region. "Any military operation against Iran, as well as involving many casualties, would enhance the appeal of extremism in the Muslim world, inside and outside Iran, at the expense of the moderates." In conclusion, the report said "Moderates, even if far from subscribing to Iranian policies and ideology, would be put in an untenable position, which would force many to oppose any aggressor, especially Israel, which attacks a Muslim country and to rally around that country." (end) he.mt KUNA 121609 Mar 07NNNN

# Iran Strikes Good – A2 escalation

### A2 Escalation/Iran Retaliation

#### Iran retaliation will stay limited – multiple factors prevent escalation

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

SETTING THE RIGHT REDLINES The fact that the United States can likely set back or destroy Iran's nuclear program does not necessarily mean that it should. Such an attack could have potentially devastating consequences -- for international security, the global economy, and Iranian domestic politics -- all of which need to be accounted for. To begin with, critics note, U.S. military action could easily spark a full-blown war. Iran might retaliate against U.S. troops or allies, launching missiles at military installations or civilian populations in the Gulf or perhaps even Europe. It could activate its proxies abroad, stirring sectarian tensions in Iraq, disrupting the Arab Spring, and ordering terrorist attacks against Israel and the United States. This could draw Israel or other states into the fighting and compel the United States to escalate the conflict in response. Powerful allies of Iran, including China and Russia, may attempt to economically and diplomatically isolate the United States. In the midst of such spiraling violence, neither side may see a clear path out of the battle, resulting in a long-lasting, devastating war, whose impact may critically damage the United States' standing in the Muslim world. Those wary of a U.S. strike also point out that Iran could retaliate by attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, the narrow access point to the Persian Gulf through which roughly 20 percent of the world's oil supply travels. And even if Iran did not threaten the strait, speculators, fearing possible supply disruptions, would bid up the price of oil, possibly triggering a wider economic crisis at an already fragile moment. None of these outcomes is predetermined, however; indeed, the United States could do much to mitigate them. Tehran would certainly feel like it needed to respond to a U.S. attack, in order to reestablish deterrence and save face domestically. But it would also likely seek to calibrate its actions to avoid starting a conflict that could lead to the destruction of its military or the regime itself. In all likelihood, the Iranian leadership would resort to its worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe, only if it felt that its very existence was threatened. A targeted U.S. operation need not threaten Tehran in such a fundamental way. To make sure it doesn't and to reassure the Iranian regime, the United States could first make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government. It could then identify certain forms of retaliation to which it would respond with devastating military action, such as attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, conducting massive and sustained attacks on Gulf states and U.S. troops or ships, or launching terrorist attacks in the United States itself. Washington would then need to clearly articulate these "redlines" to Tehran during and after the attack to ensure that the message was not lost in battle. And it would need to accept the fact that it would have to absorb Iranian responses that fell short of these redlines without escalating the conflict. This might include accepting token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships in the region -- several salvos over the course of a few days that soon taper off -- or the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels. To avoid the kind of casualties that could compel the White House to escalate the struggle, the United States would need to evacuate nonessential personnel from U.S. bases within range of Iranian missiles and ensure that its troops were safely in bunkers before Iran launched its response. Washington might also need to allow for stepped-up support to Iran's proxies in Afghanistan and Iraq and missile and terrorist attacks against Israel. In doing so, it could induce Iran to follow the path of Iraq and Syria, both of which refrained from starting a war after Israel struck their nuclear reactors in 1981 and 2007, respectively.

#### Even if that fails – US can deescalate quickly and no regional war

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

Even if Tehran did cross Washington's redlines, the United States could still manage the confrontation. At the outset of any such violation, it could target the Iranian weapons that it finds most threatening to prevent Tehran from deploying them. To de-escalate the situation quickly and prevent a wider regional war, the United States could also secure the agreement of its allies to avoid responding to an Iranian attack. This would keep other armies, particularly the Israel Defense Forces, out of the fray. Israel should prove willing to accept such an arrangement in exchange for a U.S. promise to eliminate the Iranian nuclear threat. Indeed, it struck a similar agreement with the United States during the Gulf War, when it refrained from responding to the launching of Scud missiles by Saddam Hussein.

#### Conflict is inevitable, Strikes NOW prevent war – Iran can’t retaliate

Babbin, 2006 ***(***Jed, served as a deputy undersecretary of defense in the George H.W. Bush administration “Iran Showdown”, The American Spectator, http://www.spectator.org/dsp\_article.asp?art\_id=9310)

THE WAR WITH IRAN WILL have to be foughtand we will, of course, defend Israel as best we can. But much bloodshed can be avoided, and Iran's nuclear objective put out of reach if we seize the advantage we gave up to Saddam in the UN. Surprise is a strategic advantage we must retain.The alternative to a large war, which no one speaks about, is a surprise attack against Iran mounted before Israel acts, and before the predicted Iranian nuclear test happens. Such an attack wouldemploy several unconventional weapons at once and could -- if managed properly -- be over before Iran knows it has begun. The world must know that we have done it. But after, not before. It may be that Iran's Chinese allies are doing more than helping develop its missiles. It may be that Iran's Russian trading partner is doing more than providing defenses against air attack. But neither is likely to be providing Iran with the means of effectively defending against our other capabilities. It could, and should, be made one dark night. B-2 stealth bombers, each carrying twenty ground-penetrating guided munitions, can destroy much of Iran's nuclear facilities and government centers. Some might carry reported electro-magnetic pulse weapons that can destroy all the electronic circuits that comprise Iranian missiles, key military communications and computer facilities. And it may be that we have the ability to attack Iran's military and financial computer networks with computer viruses and "Trojan horses" that will make it impossible for Iran to function militarily and economically.Our strategy must be implemented before Ahmadinejad can test his nukes. Whether that test can happen next month or next year is immaterial.The time for us to act is now.

### No Escalation – large powers

#### Large powers will back down

Babbin, 2006(Jed, served as a deputy undersecretary of defense in the George H.W. Bush administration “Iran Showdown”, The American Spectator, http://www.spectator.org/dsp\_article.asp?art\_id=9310)

THE WAR WITH IRAN WILL have to be foughtand we will, of course, defend Israel as best we can. But much bloodshed can be avoided, and Iran's nuclear objective put out of reach if we seize the advantage we gave up to Saddam in the UN. Surprise is a strategic advantage we must retain.The alternative to a large war, which no one speaks about, is a surprise attack against Iran mounted before Israel acts, and before the predicted Iranian nuclear test happens. Such an attack wouldemploy several unconventional weapons at once and could -- if managed properly -- be over before Iran knows it has begun. The world must know that we have done it. But after, not before. It may be that Iran's Chinese allies are doing more than helping develop its missiles. It may be that Iran's Russian trading partner is doing more than providing defenses against air attack. But neither is likely to be providing Iran with the means of effectively defending against our other capabilities. It could, and should, be made one dark night. B-2 stealth bombers, each carrying twenty ground-penetrating guided munitions, can destroy much of Iran's nuclear facilities and government centers. Some might carry reported electro-magnetic pulse weapons that can destroy all the electronic circuits that comprise Iranian missiles, key military communications and computer facilities. And it may be that we have the ability to attack Iran's military and financial computer networks with computer viruses and "Trojan horses" that will make it impossible for Iran to function militarily and economically.Our strategy must be implemented before Ahmadinejad can test his nukes. Whether that test can happen next month or next year is immaterial.The time for us to act is now.

### No Escalation – China

#### China won’t get drawn in

Barnett, 2-13-12 (Thomas P.M. Barnett is Chief Analyst at Wikistrat and contributor to Esquire, “The New Rules: The Coming War with Iran” <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11458/the-new-rules-the-coming-war-with-iran>)

But China will not go to the mattresses on Iran's behalf, any more than big-talking Russia will. In truth, a regime-toppling war in Iran will overwhelmingly work to China's long-term benefit, just like it did in Iraq. In the short run, Beijing will end up paying more for the product. But money is not China's problem -- supply is, and an Iran opened back up to global investment and Western technology would soon re-emerge as a far larger source of both oil and gas. So yes, expect Beijing to make all of its usual obstructionist moves, and then cry crocodile tears when the regime finally falls, because the Chinese will invariably clean up on both the reconstruction process and the improved energy export flows.

#### China won’t get drawn in

Washington Observer, ’06 (“China and Russia Must Make Their Choices Against Iran’s Aspiration To Go Nuclear” January 25, http://68.165.165.202/en/document.cfm?documentid=33&charid=3)

"Nobody can stop the United States if it wants to take military action against Iran," said Amirahmadi. "It's true that trade between China and Iran is increasing rapidly. But it's incomparable with China-U.S. trade, so China will not turn hostile against the United States on behalf of Iran. Even though Iran is abundant in petroleum deposits," continued Amirahmadi, "it won't make an impact on world oil prices in a long run. China is an important buyer of Iran's petroleum, while the United States is not. The United States does not have to buy Iran's oil. But oil is crucial to Iran's national income. Therefore, it is impossible for Iran to use oil to force the United States and Europe to sit down for negotiation."

### No Escalation – Russia

#### Russia won’t get drawn in

MOS News, ’06 (“Russia to remain neutral in case of U.S.-Iran conflict” http://regimechangeiran.blogspot.com/2006/04/russia-to-remain-neutral-in-case-of-us.html)

Russia’s military will not intervene on one side or the other, should the current Iran crisis lead to an armed conflict, the chief of the Russian general staff said, AFP reported Thursday. [READ MORE](http://regimechangeiran.blogspot.com/2006/04/russia-to-remain-neutral-in-case-of-us.html)  
“You are asking which side Russia will take. Of course Russia will not, at least I as head of the general staff will not, suggest the use of force on one side or the other. Just as with Afghanistan,” General Yury Baluevsky told reporters, referring to the 2001 U.S.-led intervention to oust the Taliban.

### No Escalation – General

#### Strikes won’t escalate

Barnett, ‘12 (Thomas P.M. Barnett is Chief Analyst at Wikistrat and contributor to Esquire, February 13, “The New Rules: The Coming War with Iran” <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11458/the-new-rules-the-coming-war-with-iran>)

Virtually all of America's strategic allies and rivals will ultimately forgive our involvement because, in the end, each will benefit: China and India, from Iran's resurrection as an energy exporter; Turkey, [from Iran's diminution as a regional leader](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/9556/turkey-iran-walk-a-fine-line-on-syria" \t "_blank); and the rest of the world, from the Persian Gulf being spared from a lengthy period of unstable nuclear brinkmanship. Only Russia stands to lose outright, but that has been true regarding virtually every good thing that has happened in this world for the past two decades, and Moscow cannot do anything about it, save for beating down a tiny neighbor now and then. Of course, Beijing and Moscow will regret the precedent of yet another Western-led regime-change effort targeting a fellow authoritarian state. But since this war will be conducted prior to Iran's weaponization of its nuclear capacity, the enduring rule-set regarding nuclear weapons being off-limits will be preserved.

### No Escalation – Iran

#### Iran wouldn’t retaliate and no impact if they did

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

To make sure it doesn't and to reassure the Iranian regime, the United States could first make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government. It could then identify certain forms of retaliation to which it would respond with devastating military action, such as attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, conducting massive and sustained attacks on Gulf states and U.S. troops or ships, or launching terrorist attacks in the United States itself. Washington would then need to clearly articulate these "redlines" to Tehran during and after the attack to ensure that the message was not lost in battle. And it would need to accept the fact that it would have to absorb Iranian responses that fell short of these redlines without escalating the conflict. This might include accepting token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships in the region--several salvos over the course of a few days that soon taper off--or the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels. To avoid the kind of casualties that could compel the White House to escalate the struggle, the United States would need to evacuate nonessential personnel from U.S. bases within range of Iranian missiles and ensure that its troops were safely in bunkers before Iran launched its response. Washington might also need to allow for stepped-up support to Iran's proxies in Afghanistan and Iraq and missile and terrorist attacks against Israel. In doing so, it could induce Iran to follow the path of Iraq and Syria, both of which refrained from starting a war after Israel struck their nuclear reactors in 1981 and 2007, respectively. Even if Tehran did cross Washington's redlines, the United States could still manage the confrontation. At the outset of any such violation, it could target the Iranian weapons that it finds most threatening to prevent Tehran from deploying them. To de-escalate the situation quickly and prevent a wider regional war, the United States could also secure the agreement of its allies to avoid responding to an Iranian attack. This would keep other armies, particularly the Israel Defense Forces, out of the fray. Israel should prove willing to accept such an arrangement in exchange for a U.S. promise to eliminate the Iranian nuclear threat. Indeed, it struck a similar agreement with the United States during the Gulf War, when it refrained from responding to the launching of Scud missiles by Saddam Hussein.

### A2 US-Russian Relations

#### Strikes won’t hurt US-Russian relations

Sokov ’06 (Nikolai,- Senior research associate at the Center for Nonproliferation studies, he worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I negotiations “The Prospects of Russian Mediation of the Iranian Nuclear Crisis” http://cns.miis.edu/pubs/week/060217.htm

If the United States undertakes a military action against Iran, Russia will most likely remain on the sidelines much as it did during the 2003 war in Iraq: it will not support Iran in any way, but will not support the United States either. Instead, it will try to deny the United States the sanction of the UN Security Council and will strongly condemn US actions. The impact of such an operation on US-Russian relations - barring the above-mentioned appearance of US bases in the South Caucasus - will be short-lived, however, and, as before, Russia will rather quickly return to the status quoante in its attitude toward the United States.

#### US-Iran policy is not important to Russia – strikes won’t collapse relations

Yaphe and Lutes ’05 (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

That is not to say that Russia is cavalier about Iranian intentions. Moscow continues to monitor Tehran’s behavior for signs of greater ambition and possible mischief. Generally, though, while Russia might object to solutions that rely on the use of force, it is unlikely to become a true obstacle to U.S. policy in the region. Russia also is unlikely ever to become a major player in dealing with an Iranian nuclear program and would probably be more reactive than proactive. Russia could play a useful role in the general framework of the international community’s response to the crisis. In doing so, Russia is more likely to use the international legal framework than to adopt a position that could leave senior policymakers vulnerable to domestic charges of caving in to U.S. pressure. For example, Russia’s agreement with Iran on spent nuclear fuel ran against U.S. policy preferences but emphasized compliance with Russian obligations under the NPT. Perhaps one collateral benefit of the agreement is that it underscores the point that Iran does not need to develop its own full nuclear fuel cycle. Russian behavior in the runup to Operation *Iraqi Freedom* could be indicative of its reaction to a future crisis involving Iran. Unwilling to jeopardize its bilateral relations with the United States or Europe, Russia would probably adopt a “wait-and-see” attitude and watch the debate unfold among allies on both sides of the Atlantic. Russia would likely shy away from a leadership position in that debate, insisting instead on keeping the issue confined to the UN–NPT framework. This would give Moscow a major decisionmaking role, shield its equities vis-à-vis the United States and Europe, maximize its leverage on Iran, and neutralize domestic anti-American sentiments.

### A2 US-Sino Relations

#### China won’t break US-Sino relation in response to any Iran crisis

Yaphe and Lutes ’05 (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

China is another great power with growing interest in Iran and the Gulf. Its reactions to a nuclear-armed Iran are likely to be similar to Chinese responses in other post–Cold War international crises, such as the Gulf War, Kosovo, the Korean nuclear crisis, and the Iraq war. China would seek to protect its equities in the crisis region, emphasize international procedures that give it a veto or a strong voice, support peaceful diplomatic resolution of the crisis, and oppose any use of force against Iran. In our judgment, China’s focus would remain on protecting its national sovereignty, avoiding negative precedents, and preserving regional stability in order to maintain favorable conditions for Chinese economic development. If possible, China would pursue these objectives while maintaining good relations with the United States and other major powers.

### A2 US-Arab Relations

#### Strikes won’t deck US-Arab relations, they will side with us

Yaphe and Lutes ’05 (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

Gulf Arab leaders say they are more worried that the United States is determined to pursue military confrontation with Iran, which would pose an increasing danger to their security and well being. They worry about the risk of a region-wide war between the United States, their security partner and guarantor, and Iran, their largest and most powerful neighbor. If this occurred, it would be the fourth major regional conflict since 1980, when Baghdad invaded Iran.33 They profess not to be worried about “democracy” in Iraq or a nuclear-armed Iran, and they urge Washington to open a dialogue with Iran, not rush to create democracy in Iraq, and to consult with their leaders. Gulf elites acknowledge that they are consumers rather than providers of security and that in the event the United States were to go to war with Iran, they would have no choice but to side with it. There is no apparent public debate on this issue.

#### Arab states will value cooperation with the US more than differences over Iran, plus they fear a nuclear Iran

Yaphe and Lutes ’05 (Judith S.,- is a senior fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, specializes in political analysis and strategic planning on Iran, Colonel Charles D,- USAF, is a senior military fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, where he focuses on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counterterrorism, military strategy, and strategic concept development)

In the end, the GC states believe they need a protector from outside the region to survive. They believe that their only strategic option is to side with the United States. Despite a professed dislike of the Bush administration, unease with Iraq, and unhappiness with the direction of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and Persian Gulf region, there is consensus among these Gulf Arabs that only the United States can be counted on to protect them, and that Iran—with or without nuclear weapons—is and will always be a constant strategic worry.

### A2 Backlash Turns

#### US can minimize political fallout and avoid international crisis

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

Washington could also reduce the political fallout of military action by building global support for it in advance. Many countries may still criticize the United States for using force, but some -- the Arab states in particular -- would privately thank Washington for eliminating the Iranian threat. By building such a consensus in the lead-up to an attack and taking the outlined steps to mitigate it once it began, the United States could avoid an international crisis and limit the scope of the conflict.

### A2 Overstretch

#### Won’t Cause Overstretch – Your Evidence Only Assumes Ground Forces

INW, ’06 (Iran Nuclear Watch, 10/18, http://irannuclearwatch.blogspot.com/2006/10/cacnp-briefing-on-us-policy-options.html)

This is the second favorite approach of American Neoconservatives. Many mistakenly believe that the U.S. is too tied down in Iraq to carry out a successful military strike against Iran. While our ground forces may be overextended, our Navy and Air Force would have no problem carrying out this operation.

### A2 Civilian Casualties

#### Civilian casualities will be limited

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

Washington would also be able to limit civilian casualties in any campaign. Iran built its most critical nuclear plants, such as the one in Natanz, away from heavily populated areas. For those less important facilities that exist near civilian centers, such as the centrifuge-manufacturing sites, U.S. precision-guided missiles could pinpoint specific buildings while leaving their surroundings unscathed. The United States could reduce the collateral damage even further by striking at night or simply leaving those less important plants off its target list at little cost to the overall success of the mission. Although Iran would undoubtedly publicize any human suffering in the wake of a military action, the majority of the victims would be the military personnel, engineers, scientists, and technicians working at the facilities

#### The alternative to strikes is prolif or strikes later, comparatively worse options

Beres ‘07 (Louis Rene, professor @ the University of Purdue, May 8, pg. http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20070508/cm\_csm/yberes)

A more important reservation about preemption involves tactical difficulties. Due to delays, the success of strikes against certain key Iranian targets may already be in doubt. Worse, such strikes would probably entail high civilian casualties because Iran has deliberately placed sensitive military assets amid civilian populations – an international crime called "perfidy." But further delay will only multiply the number of casualties from any future operation, or – in the worst-case scenario – allow Iran to become fully nuclear.

### A2: Oil Shocks

#### No economic crisis or oil shock

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

SETTING THE RIGHT REDLINES The fact that the United States can likely set back or destroy Iran's nuclear program does not necessarily mean that it should. Such an attack could have potentially devastating consequences -- for international security, the global economy, and Iranian domestic politics -- all of which need to be accounted for. To begin with, critics note, U.S. military action could easily spark a full-blown war. Iran might retaliate against U.S. troops or allies, launching missiles at military installations or civilian populations in the Gulf or perhaps even Europe. It could activate its proxies abroad, stirring sectarian tensions in Iraq, disrupting the Arab Spring, and ordering terrorist attacks against Israel and the United States. This could draw Israel or other states into the fighting and compel the United States to escalate the conflict in response. Powerful allies of Iran, including China and Russia, may attempt to economically and diplomatically isolate the United States. In the midst of such spiraling violence, neither side may see a clear path out of the battle, resulting in a long-lasting, devastating war, whose impact may critically damage the United States' standing in the Muslim world. Those wary of a U.S. strike also point out that Iran could retaliate by attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, the narrow access point to the Persian Gulf through which roughly 20 percent of the world's oil supply travels. And even if Iran did not threaten the strait, speculators, fearing possible supply disruptions, would bid up the price of oil, possibly triggering a wider economic crisis at an already fragile moment. Cont… Finally, the U.S. government could blunt the economic consequences of a strike. For example, it could offset any disruption of oil supplies by opening its Strategic Petroleum Reserve and quietly encouraging some Gulf states to increase their production in the run-up to the attack. Given that many oil-producing nations in the region, especially Saudi Arabia, have urged the United States to attack Iran, they would likely cooperate.

#### No impact - US and Europe strategic reserves check

Akleh, 2006 (Dr. Elias, Arab writer from a Palestinian descent) “Iran is The Next Battle Field”, March 5,

http://www.amin.org/eng/uncat/2006/mar/mar5-0.html)

The US expects this invasion to take less than 100 days. To avoid the expected oil crisis due to the shut-off of Iranian oil the American administration is planning to use its strategic petroleum reserve that has a supply of oil equals to about 175 days worth of Iranian production. Europe will also use its own strategic oil reserve. These reserves would be replenished with fresh oil after controlling Khuzestan. This war would give US total control of the largest three oil resources of the world; Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran. The Dollar’s global hegemony would be restored, and participating European countries would have some share of the cake.

#### Iran wont shut down oil facilities

Roberts, 1-17 (Paul Craig, wrote the Kemp-Roth bill and was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and Contributing Editor of National Review. He is author or coauthor of eight books. He has held numerous academic appointments, including the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University and Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. He has contributed to numerous scholar journals and testified before Congress on 30 occasions. He has been awarded the U.S. Treasury's Meritorious Service Award and the French Legion of Honor. http://baltimorechronicle.com/2007/011707Roberts.shtml)

The former national security official believes that Bush will be able to claim victory over Iran, because Iran will avoid responding militarily. Iran will not use its Russian missiles to sink our aircraft carriers, to shut down oil facilities throughout the Middle East, or to destroy US headquarters in the “green zone” in Baghdad. Instead, Iran will adopt the posture of another Muslim victim of US/Israeli aggression and let the anger seep throughout the Muslim world until no pro-US government is safe in the Middle East.

### A2 Straits of Hormuz

#### US Strikes can stop Iranian control of the strait

The American Thinker, 2006 (“Iran – to bomb or not to bomb?”, http://www.americanthinker.com/articles.php?article\_id=5210)

First, as Doug Hanson pointed out in his Washington Times piece “The mullahs’ war games,” Iran has fortified the island of Abu Musa in the Straits of Hormuz and possesses the capacity to halt the passage of oil tankers through the straits. This would have an immediate and possibly catastrophic impact on oil supplies, prices and the world economy in general. This being the case, the U.S. would probably flatten Abu Musa as well as any Iranian mainland military facilities having the capability to strike shipping in the Gulf, and do so at the same time we launch strikes against the Iranian nuclear facilities. This seems an absolute necessity.

#### Iran won’t close the straits – economic suicide

[**Schake**](http://www.hoover.org/bios/schake.html) ’07 (Kori,- research fellow at the Hoover Institution “Dealing with A Nuclear Iran” http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/6848072.html)

Iran could also disrupt the flow of oil by closing the Straits of Hormuz or attacking Gulf platforms or shipping. As Edward Luttwak points out, “all of the offshore oil- and gas-production platforms in the gulf, all the traffic of oil and gas tankers originating from the jetties of the Arabian peninsula and Iraq, are within easy reach of the Iranian coast.” However, this, too, seems improbable beyond a short duration, since oil accounts for 80 percent of the Iranian economy. Attacks on gcc oil facilities are a greater likelihood, since they would increase the value of Iranian oil, but if gcc states were not involved in or supporting the strikes against Iran, such attacks would have long-term detrimental consequences for Iran’s relations with the gcc states.

#### Iran Won't Shut Off Strait Of Hormuz -That'd Guarantee The Demise Of The Regime

Bergman 5/19/2006 (Ilan, author, "Tehran Rising: Iran's Challenge to the United States," and vice president of the America Foreign Policy Council, Defense Forum Foundation Luncheon Presentation: "Taking on Tehran: America's Options," Federal News Service, l/n)

I'll give you an example. Iran has the ability to shut off the flow of oil from the Strait of Hormuz through the Strait of Hormuz from the Persian Gulf. That's two-fifths of world energy traffic on any given day. That would obviously cause prices to spike through the roof, but it's also the quickest, easiest, and most efficient way to make India, Japan, the European Union, Russia, and China regime changers, because if that happens the first logical assumption that businessmen in all those places will make is this regime in its current form cannot be trusted to control oil, even if this crisis subsides. And unlike us, the Russians and the Chinese have no problem with dealing forcefully with economic meddlers. So I don't necessarily think that that's a threat. What I do think that the Iranians are gaming very well is our degree of aversion to rising prices. I think they know that if they rattle that energy saber pretty heftily, and often, and do war games, and test Russian equipment off of freighters and things like that, we get very nervous and we begin to deter ourselves from having these discussions. So like you said, there's not a lot of discussion about that, and that's precisely

# Obama Bad – Iran Strikes good – A2 ans

### Strikes good – comparative

#### On balance strikes are best – critics underestimate current risks and turns rely on flawed assumptions

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

But skeptics of military action fail to appreciate the true danger that a nuclear-armed Iran would pose to U.S. interests in the Middle East and beyond. And their grim forecasts assume that the cure would be worse than the disease -- that is, that the consequences of a U.S. assault on Iran would be as bad as or worse than those of Iran achieving its nuclear ambitions. But that is a faulty assumption. The truth is that a military strike intended to destroy Iran’s nuclear program, if managed carefully, could spare the region and the world a very real threat and dramatically improve the long-term national security of the United States.

### A2 alternatives – sanctions/international deal

#### Iran prolif coming soon – only striking *Soon* solves – all alternatives have failed

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

DANGERS OF DETERRENCE Years of international pressure have failed to halt Iran's attempt to build a nuclear program. The Stuxnet computer worm, which attacked control systems in Iranian nuclear facilities, temporarily disrupted Tehran's enrichment effort, but a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency this past May revealed that the targeted plants have fully recovered from the assault. And the latest IAEA findings on Iran, released in November, provided the most compelling evidence yet that the Islamic Republic has weathered sanctions and sabotage, allegedly testing nuclear triggering devices and redesigning its missiles to carry nuclear payloads. The Institute for Science and International Security, a nonprofit research institution, estimates that Iran could now produce its first nuclear weapon within six months of deciding to do so. Tehran's plans to move sensitive nuclear operations into more secure facilities over the course of the coming year could reduce the window for effective military action even further. If Iran expels IAEA inspectors, begins enriching its stockpiles of uranium to weapons-grade levels of 90 percent, or installs advanced centrifuges at its uranium-enrichment facility in Qom, the United States must strike immediately or forfeit its last opportunity to prevent Iran from joining the nuclear club.

### A2 They Rebuild

#### Iran can’t and won’t rebuild nuclear program after strikes

Kroenig, 12 (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

ANY TIME IS GOOD TIME Critics have another objection: even if the United States managed to eliminate Iran's nuclear facilities and mitigate the consequences, the effects might not last long. Sure enough, there is no guarantee that an assault would deter Iran from attempting to rebuild its plants; it may even harden Iran's resolve to acquire nuclear technology as a means of retaliating or protecting itself in the future. The United States might not have the wherewithal or the political capital to launch another raid, forcing it to rely on the same ineffective tools that it now uses to restrain Iran's nuclear drive. If that happens, U.S. action will have only delayed the inevitable. Yet according to the IAEA, Iran already appears fully committed to developing a nuclear weapons program and needs no further motivation from the United States. And it will not be able to simply resume its progress after its entire nuclear infrastructure is reduced to rubble. Indeed, such a devastating offensive could well force Iran to quit the nuclear game altogether, as Iraq did after its nuclear program was destroyed in the Gulf War and as Syria did after the 2007 Israeli strike. And even if Iran did try to reconstitute its nuclear program, it would be forced to contend with continued international pressure, greater difficulty in securing necessary nuclear materials on the international market, and the lurking possibility of subsequent attacks. Military action could, therefore, delay Iran's nuclear program by anywhere from a few years to a decade, and perhaps even indefinitely. Skeptics might still counter that at best a strike would only buy time. But time is a valuable commodity. Countries often hope to delay worst-case scenarios as far into the future as possible in the hope that this might eliminate the threat altogether. Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked -- most recently Iraq and Syria -- have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs. Thus, what appears to be only a temporary setback to Iran could eventually become a game changer.

#### Strikes solves kill key scientists and fear of another attack prevents future prolif

Rogers, 2006 (Paul, Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford and Global Security Consultant to Oxford Research Group “IRAN: CONSEQUENCES OF A WAR”, February)

Although the United States has a major problem of overstretch affecting its Army and Marine Corps, an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities would be undertaken almost entirely by the Air Force and the Navy. To have the maximum impact, it would be done by surprise, utilising land-based aircraft already in the region, long-range strike aircraft operating from the United States, the UK and Diego Garcia, and naval strike forces involving carrier-borne aircraft and sea-launched cruise missiles. At any one time, the US Navy keeps one aircraft carrier battle group on station in or near the Persian Gulf. Such groups rotate, and there are periods when two are on station, providing over 150 aircraft, together with several hundred cruise missiles.4 Similar numbers of land-based aircraft could be assembled with little notice, given the range of US bases in the region, and B 1B and B-2 bombers could operate from outside the region. In particular, the specialised facilities required to operate the stealth B-2 aircraft are now available at Fairford air base in Gloucestershire.5 Air strikes on nuclear facilities would involve the destruction of facilities at the Tehran Research Reactor, together with the radioisotope production facility, a range of nuclear-related laboratories and the Kalaye Electric Company, all in Tehran. The Esfahan Nuclear Technology Centre would be a major target, including a series of experimental reactors, uranium conversion facilities and a fuel fabrication laboratory. Pilot and full-scale enrichment plants at Natanz would be targeted, as would facilities at Arak (see Appendix 1).6 The new 1,000 MW reactor nearing completion at Bushehr would be targeted, although this could be problematic once the reactor is fully fuelled and goes critical some time in 2006. Once that has happened, any destruction of the containment structure could lead to serious problems of radioactive dispersal affecting not just the Iranian Gulf coast, but west Gulf seaboards in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. As well as the direct human effects, since these comprise the world’s most substantial concentration of oil production facilities, the consequences could be severe.7 All of the initial attacks would be undertaken more or less simultaneously, in order to kill as many of the technically competent staff as possible, therefore doing the greatest damage to longer-term prospects. This would be a necessary part of any military action and would probably extend to the destruction of university laboratories and technology centres that indirectly support the Iranian nuclear scientific and technical infrastructure. Such an aspect of the attack is not widely recognised outside of military planning circles but would be an essential component of the operation. Given that the aim is to set back Iranian nuclear potential for as long as possible, it would be essential to go well beyond the destruction of physical facilities that could be replaced quite rapidly. The killing of those with technical expertise would have a much more substantial impact on any efforts to redevelop nuclear capabilities. Furthermore, since such expertise is known to include foreign nationals, the killing of such people already working in the country would serve as a deterrent to the involvement of others in the future. Iran currently has limited air defences and a largely obsolete and small air force. Even so, defence suppression would be a major aspect of military action, primarily to reduce the risk of the killing or capture of US aircrew. It would involve the targeting of radar facilities and command and control centres, as well as Western Command air bases at Tehran, Tabriz, Hamadan, Dezful, Umidiyeh, Shiraz and Isfahan, and Southern Command air bases at Bushehr, Bandar Abbas and Chah Bahar.8 A particular concern for US forces is the continued deployment by Iran of 45 or more of the American F-14A Tomcat interceptors and their long-range AWG-9 radar equipment. 79 planes were originally procured before the fall of the Shah and around 30 are available operationally at any one time out of those still deployed.9 Research, development and production facilities for Iran’s medium-range ballistic missile programme would be priority targets, as would bases at which these mobile missiles are deployed. Because of their mobility, surprise would once again be essential. US forces have already used reconnaissance drones to map Iranian facilities and these, combined with satellite reconnaissance and a range of forms of electronic surveillance, have provided considerable information on the nuclear infrastructure and more general defence forces.

### A2 Multiple Locations

#### Strikes solve - Only Isfahan and Natanz Matter – prefer our evidence, it cites a consensus amongst experts

Brown, 2006(Drew “No easy military option to stop Iran, experts say”, Knight Ridder Newspapers,

http://www.nineronline.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2006/01/26/43d8fa1950455)

Many analysts say that in that case, an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would be relatively easy to carry out. With U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and with war planes and ships scattered throughout the Persian Gulf, U.S. forces essentially have Iran hemmed in on three sides. U.S. cruise missiles and stealth aircraft with precision-guided bombs likely would overwhelm Iran's air defenses. The key questions, however, are whether such an attack would be very effective and how Iran and the rest of the world would respond. Some experts say an attack would delay, not destroy, the Iranian program and would only reinforce Iran's efforts to develop nuclear weapons. Iran, taking lessons from the Israeli air attack that destroyed Iraq's nuclear facility at Osirak in 1981, has dispersed its atomic research and development facilities in dozens, if not hundreds, of locations above and below ground. Regardless of the total number of Iran's nuclear facilities, Isfahan and Natanz are the most important because they constitute the "two weak links" in Iran's program, Cliff Kupchan, an Iran expert and former State Department official in the Clinton administration said. Isfahan, a facility that converts uranium ore into uranium hexafluoride gas, could be bombed easily, said Kupchan, now at the New York-based Eurasia Group, a political risk advisory and consulting firm. The other, Natanz, is a research facility where experts are trying to master the technique of converting uranium hexafluoride gas into enriched uranium. Low levels of enriched uranium are used for civilian nuclear plants, and more highly enriched fuel is used in nuclear weapons. International inspectors found the facility after they were tipped off by an Iranian dissident group in 2002. Iran recently resumed research at Natanz and said it was for peaceful purposes, but analysts have expressed doubt because of Natanz's size and the fact that part of it has been constructed underground. During a 2003 visit, Iran advised International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohamed ElBaradei that it had almost completed construction of a pilot uranium enrichment plant at Natanz, according to a report by the Center for Nonproliferation Studies in Monterey, Calif. The test plant will consist of 164 centrifuges, machines that spin uranium hexafluoride gas at high speeds, but it isn't fully operational, according to a January report by the Institute for Science and International Security. The group said Iran would need six months to a year to complete the process needed for enrichment. Of greater concern at Natanz are underground chambers that are expected to house an estimated 50,000 gas centrifuges, enough to produce weapons-grade uranium for several nuclear weapons per year, according to experts. While it's unclear what other capacities exist at the site, "what is obvious is that the pilot facility is above ground and would be easy to take out," Kupchan said. Bombing the facilities at the two locations "would set the Iranians back by two to three years," he said. "It wouldn't be that hard to do," said Kupchan. "You'd be picking a helluva fight, though. Iran is a sophisticated country with a very sophisticated leadership. It has a range of retaliatory options that are extremely unpleasant."

#### US Air Force can handle multiple locations

Inbar, 2006 (Efraim, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN” March, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html)

While Iran has spread out its nuclear facilities and built a large part of the nuclear complex underground in order to protect it from conventional air strikes, technological advances in penetration of underground facilities and increased precision might allow total destruction. The difficulties in dealing a severe military blow to the Iranian nuclear program are generally exaggerated.[[38]](http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html#_edn38) A detailed analysis of the military option is beyond the scope of this paper, but the American military definitely has the muscle and the sophistication needed to perform a preemptive strike in accordance with its new strategic doctrine, as well as the capability for a sustained air campaign, if needed to prevent the reparation and reconstruction of the facilities targeted.

### A2 Can’t find

#### Intelligence solves – multiple reasons secret facilities are unlikely and Iran won’t be able to rebuild after

Kroenig, 12 (Matthew, professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran)

A FEASIBLE TARGET A nuclear Iran would impose a huge burden on the United States. But that does not necessarily mean that Washington should resort to military means. In deciding whether it should, the first question to answer is if an attack on Iran's nuclear program could even work. Doubters point out that the United States might not know the location of Iran's key facilities. Given Tehran's previous attempts to hide the construction of such stations, most notably the uranium-enrichment facilities in Natanz and Qom, it is possible that the regime already possesses nuclear assets that a bombing campaign might miss, which would leave Iran's program damaged but alive. This scenario is possible, but not likely; indeed, such fears are probably overblown. U.S. intelligence agencies, the IAEA, and opposition groups within Iran have provided timely warning of Tehran's nuclear activities in the past -- exposing, for example, Iran's secret construction at Natanz and Qom before those facilities ever became operational. Thus, although Tehran might again attempt to build clandestine facilities, Washington has a very good chance of catching it before they go online. And given the amount of time it takes to construct and activate a nuclear facility, the scarcity of Iran's resources, and its failure to hide the facilities in Natanz and Qom successfully, it is unlikely that Tehran has any significant operational nuclear facilities still unknown to Western intelligence agencies.

#### Satellite and other Intel is accurate - strikes can target and destroy nuclear ambitions

Sevakis, 2006 (Dennis, wrtier for the American thinker, flew fighter jets for the USAF “Iran – to bomb or not to bomb?”, Feb. 1st http://www.americanthinker.com/articles.php?article\_id=5210)

In contrast to the facilities required to produce biological and chemical weapons, nuclear fuel cycle and reprocessing plants are not easily hidden nor built surreptitiously during the dark hours of the diurnal cycle. Detection by satellite of such projects is a near certainty. These facilities are large, expensive and**,** if hidden, still visible during the construction cycle. You can’t have a major construction site without roads, excavation debris, and a whole lot of activity. To have the building of a nuclear materials processing facility remain undetected would demand a very slow “ship in a bottle” approach to both the excavation and plant construction. Possible, but hardly likely. Also, buried facilities are not necessarily undetectable. The U.S. has long had the capability to map subsurface geological features using ground penetrating radar. Similar technology will be used to map planetary subsurface features from the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter. These underground “maps” were used to program guidance and flight path information into cruise missiles before the advent of the GPS system. Unlike surface soil and sand, the sub-surface features are stable and unlikely to be affected by natural forces or human activity. This mode of guidance may still be a backup to GPS and/or inertial systems. We may have the whole country of Iran subterraneanly scouted. A nuclear plant buried under the sand would probably already be on the charts. If a plant is buried in a mountain, well, I don’t believe we have any sensors up to that task. But the Iranians still had to build it. And that would have been extremely expensive and time consuming with the construction cycle still subject to detection. We probably know where the entrances are located. The Iranians and their foreign enablers still have to get themselves and materials in and the product out. Even if one cannot destroy a facility, denying access can be just as effective and may be easier. We can certainly obliterate any surface facilities. We’ve shown ourselves to be quite adept at that task while minimizing, though not eliminating, collateral damage. The deeply buried bits? Well, supposedly we’ve cancelled the development our mini-nuke, super-bunker-buster bomb program. However, that doesn’t necessarily mean we don’t have any.

### A2 Underground Bunkers

#### US Air Force can handle it

Inbar, 2006 (Efraim, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN” March, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html)

While Iran has spread out its nuclear facilities and built a large part of the nuclear complex underground in order to protect it from conventional air strikes, technological advances in penetration of underground facilities and increased precision might allow total destruction. The difficulties in dealing a severe military blow to the Iranian nuclear program are generally exaggerated.[[38]](http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/jv10no1a7.html#_edn38) A detailed analysis of the military option is beyond the scope of this paper, but the American military definitely has the muscle and the sophistication needed to perform a preemptive strike in accordance with its new strategic doctrine, as well as the capability for a sustained air campaign, if needed to prevent the reparation and reconstruction of the facilities targeted.

### A2 Iran Air Defense

#### A US air strike against Iran would easily and quickly overwhelm Iranian defenses.

Rogers ’06 (Paul,- Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford and Global Security Consultant to Oxford Research Group. *Iran: Consequences of a* War. http://www.iranbodycount.org/analysis/#pr.)

Iran currently has limited air defences and a largely obsolete and small air force. Even so, defence suppression would be a major aspect of military action, primarily to reduce the risk of the killing or capture of US aircrew. It would involve the targeting of radar facilities and command and control centres, as well as Western Command air bases at Tehran, Tabriz, Hamadan, Dezful, Umidiyeh, Shiraz and Isfahan, and Southern Command air bases at Bushehr, Bandar Abbas and Chah Bahar.8 A particular concern for US forces is the continued deployment by Iran of 45 or more of the American F-14A Tomcat interceptors and their long-range AWG-9 radar equipment. 79 planes were originally procured before the fall of the Shah and around 30 are available operationally at any one time out of those still deployed.9 Research, development and production facilities for Iran’s medium-range ballistic missile programme would be priority targets, as would bases at which these mobile missiles are deployed. Because of their mobility, surprise would once again be essential. US forces have already used reconnaissance drones to map Iranian facilities and satellite reconnaissance and a range of forms of electronic surveillance, have provided information on the nuclear infrastructure and more general defence forces. The attacks described so far would involve a strong element of surprise in relation to the core nuclear infrastructure and the air defence system, with these undertaken in a matter of hours. Up to a hundred sorties by strike aircraft, backed up by several hundred additional sorties by aerial refuelling, defence suppression and reconnaissance aircraft would be accompanied by two hundred or more cruise missile sorties. Following immediate bomb damage assessment, major targets would be revisited in the following days in parallel with attacks on less time-urgent targets. For US forces, the main period of intense military activity might extend over 4-5 days but could continue for several days more, depending on Iranian responses.

what they want.

# Iran Strikes Good – iran prolf

### A2 Sanctions Solve

#### Sanctions fail – religious and security motives outweigh

**Boot, ’12** (Max Boot is the Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, “A Powerful Case for Force Against Iran” January 9, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/01/09/case-for-force-against-iran/>)

The Obama administration seems to be enjoying some success in getting European states to embargo Iranian oil. That’s good news. The question, however, is whether this latest round of sanctions will convince Iran to do what previous sanctions have not done–i.e., convince it to forego nuclear weapons. I hope so, but hope isn’t a policy, and there is good reason for skepticism. In the first place, Iran will be able to sell its oil in Asia, to China, India, and even to U.S. allies such as Japan and South Korea. It may lose some money in the bargain, but it seems doubtful the loss of some oil revenue will be enough to dissuade the clerical regime from what it seems to view as a national, indeed religious, obligation. The mullahs know the Iranian Revolution will be far more secure–less prone to attack, more able to attack with impunity–if it has nukes, and past conduct indicates that it will not stop until it has them.

#### Sanctions fail and cause Iran to close the Strait of Hormuz

**Barzegar, ’12** (Kayhan Barzegar is Director of the Institute for Middle East Strategic Studies and Chair of the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Tehran, February 9, “Sanctions Won’t End Iran’s Nuclear Program” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/features/letters-from/sanctions-wont-end-irans-nuclear-program>)

The West's behavior is also counterproductive to talks because sanctions degrade Iran's political equality during nuclear negotiations. When in a weakened position, Iranians would likely not embark on meaningful negotiations. The fear of losing would unquestionably lead many in Tehran to refuse to enter talks to begin with. That is why every previous attempt by the West to step up pressure on Iran was met with Iranian attempts to put the relationship back on equal footing. For example, the Security Council's many resolutions against the nuclear program in the past six years led Iran to build approximately 8,000 more centrifuges, increase the degree of enrichment by 20 percent, establish a new nuclear site, and move many enrichment activities to a site at Fordo, which is far more hardened than other facilities against attack. Iran has also recently expressed its determination to use 20 percent indigenous enriched fuel in the Tehran Research Reactor in the near future. Iran's threat last month to shut down the Strait of Hormuz is another case in point. Many in the West have said that Tehran will not make good on those words because it cannot block its own oil exports. That is true, in part, but if sanctions put the country in an increasingly perilous economic situation, Iran may have no choice but to close the Strait and wreak havoc on the rest of the world economy in the hope of having sanctions lifted.

### A2 Containment Solves

#### Containment will crush hegemony and will fail

Matthew Kroenig (professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) February 2012 Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136917/matthew-kroenig/time-to-attack-iran

These security threats would require Washington to contain Tehran. Yet deterrence would come at a heavy price. To keep the Iranian threat at bay, the United States would need to deploy naval and ground units and potentially nuclear weapons across the Middle East, keeping a large force in the area for decades to come. Alongside those troops, the United States would have to permanently deploy significant intelligence assets to monitor any attempts by Iran to transfer its nuclear technology. And it would also need to devote perhaps billions of dollars to improving its allies' capability to defend themselves. This might include helping Israel construct submarine-launched ballistic missiles and hardened ballistic missile silos to ensure that it can maintain a secure second-strike capability. Most of all, to make containment credible, the United States would need to extend its nuclear umbrella to its partners in the region, pledging to defend them with military force should Iran launch an attack. In other words, to contain a nuclear Iran, the United States would need to make a substantial investment of political and military capital to the Middle East in the midst of an economic crisis and at a time when it is attempting to shift its forces out of the region. Deterrence would come with enormous economic and geopolitical costs and would have to remain in place as long as Iran remained hostile to U.S. interests, which could mean decades or longer. Given the instability of the region, this effort might still fail, resulting in a war far more costly and destructive than the one that critics of a preemptive strike on Iran now hope to avoid.

### A2 Negotiations Solve

#### Negotiations fail – uranium enrichment is a deal breaker

**Barzegar, ’12** (Kayhan Barzegar is Director of the Institute for Middle East Strategic Studies and Chair of the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Tehran, February 9, “Sanctions Won’t End Iran’s Nuclear Program” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/features/letters-from/sanctions-wont-end-irans-nuclear-program>)

With the recent European ban on importing Iranian oil, the West has ratcheted up its pressure on Tehran another notch. The United States argues that the goal is to bring Iran back to the negotiating table to ensure that it doesn't weaponize its nuclear program. From Iran's perspective, however, the West's purpose is not to talk but to stop Iran's enrichment of uranium altogether. Indeed, at the same time that it calls for talks, the West -- and especially the United States -- has continued to implement new sanctions. Many Iranians also believe that the United States is waging a covert war against their country and see the Stuxnet computer worm (which seemed to target industrial equipment in Iran's nuclear facilities) and recent assassinations of Iranian scientists as part of it. Washington's allegations in October 2011 that Tehran was involved in a plot against the Saudi ambassador to the United States -- and its subsequent violation of Iran's airspace with an unmanned drone -- have only reinforced Iranian unease. That ill feeling is an impediment to any serious talks between Iran and the West. Deteriorating U.S.-Iranian relations will weaken the consensus among Iranian decision-makers to go through with negotiations. They see talks as a part of a broader effort to make progress on all issues of common interest, including regional peace and security. But Iran's ability to enrich uranium at home remains the core matter. If the ruling elite suspect that Iran will be forced to give up uranium enrichment for civilian purposes, political leaders will simply reject further talks with the P5 plus 1, made up of the permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany. And the EU's signing on to oil sanctions last month has made rejection even more likely. Until now, the EU had been seen as something of a mediator, but now it seems to be pitted firmly against Iran. The West's behavior will also weaken support for the nuclear talks among the Iranian public. The harsher and broader sanctions become, the more impact they have on people's daily lives. Just after the EU announced its ban (which would go into effect in July of 2012), the Iranian parliament drafted legislation preemptively banning oil exports to Europe. Since then, students from different universities have banded together to lobby parliament to expedite the new law's approval. Further outrage would lead to increased tensions, making it even more difficult for the government to enter into any new talks.

### A2 Stuxnet

#### Stuxnet failed and future cyberattacks won’t work

**Farwell and Rohozinski, ’11** (James P. Farwell is an expert in strategic communication and information strategy who has served as a consultant to the US Department of Defense, the US Strategic Command and the US Special Operations Command, Rafal Rohozinski is the CEO of The SecDev Group and a Senior Scholar at the Canada Centre for Global Security, Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto, “Stuxnet and the Future of Cyber War” *Survival*, 53(1), February-March, pp. 23-40)

This approach comes at a cost. Despite its relative sophistication, Stuxnet was quickly and effectively disarmed. Within months its technical characteristics and components were well known. Iran was able to quickly harness the intellectual capital of the global computer security community through effectively crowdsourcing solutions to the worm, casting some doubt on the conventional wisdom and hype surrounding the efficacy of computer network attacks. Stuxnet’s rapid neutralisation also raises the question of why this approach, rather than a more stealthy or direct one, was chosen to target Tehran’s nuclear programme. The answer depends upon the strategic and political goals the Stuxnet attackers aimed to achieve.

### A2 Civilian Use Only

#### Nope it’s for bombs

**The Baltimore Sun, citing the IAEA, in 2011** (November 10, “Iran and the Bomb” <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-11-10/news/bs-ed-iran-nukes-20111110_1_stuxnet-iaea-report-nuclear-weapons>)

A report this week on Iran's suspected nuclear weapons program by the International Atomic Energy Agency leaves little doubt that country's ruling clerics remain determined to acquire the means to produce a bomb. That poses a dilemma for the Obama administration, which so far has tried to deter Iran's nuclear ambitions through diplomatic negotiations and targeted economic sanctions. But if the IAEA report is to be believed, that approach clearly isn't working. The IAEA investigators cited what they called compelling evidence that Iran has continued to pursue a range of advanced technologies that are needed to construct a nuclear weapon but that make little sense in the context of a civilian nuclear power program. Among them are designs for nuclear missile warheads, triggering devices for initiating a nuclear chain reaction and computer simulations of the complex processes involved in using conventional explosives to compress uranium fuel to the critical mass that causes it to detonate.

### A2 Deterrence solves

#### Deterrence fails and causes nuclear war

**Kroenig, ’11** (Matthew Kroenig is Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, former Special Adviser to the Secretary of Defense, and assistant Professor of Government at Georgetown University, “Kroenig’s Case for War with Iran” *Foreign Affairs*, December 27, <http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/27/kroenigs_case_for_war_with_iran?hidecomments=yes>)

Second, Walt systematically discounts the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran. Iran currently restrains its support for terrorists and proxy groups out of fear of U.S. or Israeli retaliation, but with a nuclear counter-deterrent it could be confident that it could avoid the worst forms of retaliation, allowing it to be more aggressive. Iran's nuclear program would likely fuel nuclear proliferation globally as: other countries in the region seek nuclear weapons to counter Iran, Iran itself becomes a nuclear supplier at risk of transferring uranium enrichment technology to budding nuclear programs in Latin America, Asia, and elsewhere, and the teetering nonproliferation regime is further weakened. Walt argues that we should not worry that Iran's proliferation will cause other states in the region to acquire nuclear weapons because these additional nuclear-armed states could help us deter a nuclear-armed Iran, but anyone else would rightly dismiss the idea that a Middle Eastern arms race is somehow good for U.S. national security. If Iran becomes more assertive internationally, we could see an even more crisis-prone Middle East. Walt wrongly asserts that my fear that Iran could threaten nuclear war to constrain U.S. military and political freedom of action in the Middle East is a "bizarre fantasy," but let's not forget the lessons of the Cold War. Remember the Cuban Missile Crisis? The United States was not a suicidal state, but we were willing to risk nuclear war to prevent the Soviet Union from forward-deploying nuclear weapons on the territory of its ally. Similarly, a nuclear-armed Iran could threaten nuclear war in response to any U.S. initiative in the Middle East. And, more importantly, any future crisis involving a nuclear-armed Iran could escalate, resulting in possible nuclear war between Iran and its neighbors or even Iran and the United States. Some might argue that deterrence will work, but such a statement betrays a misunderstanding of deterrence theory. As I explain in my forthcoming article in International Organization, in order for deterrence to work, there must be a real risk that any crisis could spin out of control and result in a nuclear exchange. My reading of the Cold War is not that mutually assured destruction leads to stability, but that we were incredibly lucky to avoid a nuclear war. Moreover, Walt is incorrect to claim that deterring and containing Iran would not add to U.S. defense burdens. When the United States has imposed deterrence regimes in the past we have dedicated great economic, military, and political resources to the task. Similarly, every serious plan for deterring and containing a nuclear-armed Iran (and for the additional steps that would be required to assure nervous allies and partners in the region) currently being proposed by think tanks in Washington calls for a massive increase in our commitments to the region. In short, opponents of a bombing campaign are not proponents of peace, but rather by default they are advocates for a multi-billion-dollar, decades-long U.S. commitment to the security of the Middle East that will likely buy us decreased influence, a more crisis-prone region, the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries, a Middle-Eastern nuclear scare every few years, and an increased risk of nuclear war.

**Deterrence fails – Iran hates Israel and regional prolif undermines stability**

**Lindberg, ’12** (Tod Lindberg is a research fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University and editor of *Policy Review*, February 20, “The Coming Attack on Iran” <http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/coming-attack-iran_626631.html?page=2>)

What, then, about Israel’s undeclared but widely acknowledged nuclear arsenal, which would surely be unleashed in reprisal? Perhaps there are those in Iran who would be prepared to pay such a price for the destruction of the Jewish state. Surely the rhetoric of the Holocaust-denying Iranian president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, calling for the annihilation of Israel is not reassuring. Iran might well be deterred from using a nuclear weapon against Israel by the prospect of nuclear retaliation. But what are the chances that it won’t be? Is one chance in five over the next 20 years an acceptable risk? Precise calculation of such a risk is impossible. Yet it may be worthwhile, even at considerable cost, to attempt to reduce the likelihood of a low-probability, high-impact event to zero at least for some period of time. This view is understandably more prevalent in Israel than among Americans—though if it’s a suitcase that concerns you, Tel Aviv is not the only place about which you might be concerned. A more common worry among American analysts is the possibility that if Iran gets the bomb, Saudi Arabia will want one as a deterrent. Perhaps Iran’s neighbor Turkey will as well. From there, who knows? The fear is that Iran is the tipping point to a so-called polynuclear Middle East, which might easily extend into Central Asia. The stability of such a situation is highly open to question. If one state in the region goes on nuclear alert, all the other states will follow suit (as, likely, would the United States, Russia, and China). The regional nuclear arsenals in question will likely not be large, and each state will feel a certain “use ’em or lose ’em” pressure in fear of being attacked first. The chance of such fears leading to catastrophe—well, once again, it is incalculable, but it is not zero. Deterrence theory, even on the assumption that all of the states involved seek only to deter the others from attack, is not at all reassuring in such a scenario.

# China Bashing

### No impact

#### No impact – china will not over react and irt will not trigger a trade war

Michal**Meidan** (is an analyst in Eurasia Group's Asia practice) **10/18** Foreign Policy http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/18/beijings\_fine\_balance

The Senate bill that aims to punish China for holding down the value of its currency and that is now in the hands of the House will not trigger a trade war between China and the United States (as feverish speculation has suggested). That said, as both Beijing and Washington head toward political transitions in 2012, politicians will have to take tough stances on sensitive issues to please domestic audiences-while trying to keep bilateral relations stable. Maintaining its footing between these sometimes opposing demands will become increasingly challenging for Beijing as its campaign season revs up. China's leaders aren't formally campaigning the way U.S. presidential candidates do, but jockeying for the country's top political positions is underway. Current leaders, as well as the younger crop they hope to promote, are therefore vulnerable to criticism from hardliners within the government, as well as from an increasingly nationalistic public. China's expanding economic clout, combined with a sense that American primacy has reached its end, is fuelling calls for more assertive responses to perceived provocations from Washington. In the run up to the Senate vote, Beijing therefore made every effort to lobby U.S. lawmakers to reject the bill. And once the bill had passed, Chinese politicians were compelled to express their displeasure vociferously. Government spokespeople slammed the bill as a protectionist move that could hinder the global economic recovery, while the state-run media denounced Washington's attempts to use the yuan as "a scapegoat for the U.S. politicians' incompetence." Now that Beijing's rhetorical dues to its people are paid, though, it is unlikely to rock the boat further.By retaliating with currency devaluation or a trade war, Beijing could embolden lawmakers in Washington to push the bill forward. Instead, Beijing reckons that as things stand there's only a slim chance that the bill will become law. Even if the bill moves forward, China's leaders will likely wait for President Barack Obama to either water it down or veto it altogether. That is, Beijing will give the White House a chance to uphold the tacit bilateral agreement to keep cool.

### Trade relations resilient

#### Trade relations are resilient

China Daily 3-19-2010 “Yuan solution will be found” http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2010-03/19/content\_9611258\_2.htm

Huntsman also tried to strike a conciliatory tone, saying disputes should not impede cooperation on global issues such as climate change. Such differences "cannot, must not, prevent the two countries from working together to create jobs, address climate change, and prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability," he said. "To put our relationship on a more stable and mature footing, we have to delink our differences on bilateral issues from our cooperation on global issues, including nonproliferation," he said. Huntsman expressed confidence in the resilience of ties. "I've seen enough ups and downs to know that the recent turbulence we've experienced is part of a natural cycle our relationship is mature and stable enough to weather our differences," Huntsman said, adding that he believed "blue skies are already on the horizon". Qin responded by saying that "we hope there are always blue skies and sunshine in the Sino-US relationship. Both sides have to make efforts to disperse the dark clouds".

### Obama bash now

#### Obama is bashing china – will continue as campaign heats up

Reuters 7/5 “WRAPUP 3-Obama knocks China trade policy, Romney on campaign tour”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/05/usa-campaign-obama-idUSL2E8I5ART20120705

MAUMEE, Ohio, July 5 (Reuters) - President Barack Obama took a shot at China and Republican rival Mitt Romney on Thursday, complaining to the World Trade Organization that Beijing is abusing trade laws by imposing more than $3 billion in duties on U.S. automobile exports. "Americans aren't afraid to compete," Obama told an enthusiastic crowd in this northern Ohio city hours after his administration filed the complaint with the WTO. "As long as we're competing on a fair playing field instead of an unfair playing field, we're going to do just fine. We're going to make sure that competition is fair." The Democratic president's speech kicked off a two-day campaign bus tour aimed largely at blue-collar workers in Pennsylvania and Ohio, crucial battleground states in the Nov. 6 presidential election. The complaint to the WTO seemed directed particularly at Ohio, home to thousands of auto-supply workers, many of whom have jobs likely saved by the U.S. government's $80 billion bailout of the industry Obama supported and Romney opposed. It was also a counterpunch to Romney's claims that Obama has not been tough enough on China's trade policies, and gave Obama's campaign another way to remind voters of its efforts to tie Romney's work as a private equity executive to the outsourcing of American jobs to China. The WTO in Geneva confirmed it had received the complaint from the United States, the nation's third such challenge to China following action against duties imposed by Beijing on the exports of certain U.S. steel and chicken products.

#### Obama is bashing china now

Alexander Burns 7/5/2012 “China-bashing on the Obama bus tour”, Politico, http://www.politico.com/blogs/burns-haberman/2012/07/chinabashing-on-the-obama-bus-tour-128054.html

China-bashing on the Obama bus tour The Toledo Blade previews a Midwest-pleasing move from the president as he hits the trail in Ohio: A senior administration official told The Blade Wednesday the United States will file the case with the World Trade Organization in Geneva, accusing China of putting illegal duties on $3.3 billion worth of U.S.-made auto imports. President Obama is expected to refer to the WTO trade action in his speech today in suburban Toledo as he begins his two-day "Betting On America Bus Tour" through northern Ohio and western Pennsylvania. Mitt Romney has made a habit of whacking China in his presidential campaign, and has pledged in speeches and TV ads to label the country a currency manipulator on the first day of his presidency. That would be a seriously disruptive thing for a president to do in the middle of a reelection campaign, but that apparently won't stop Obama from getting a cut of the anti-China rhetoric Republicans have used since the start of the 2012 cycle.

#### Bashing is part of the campaign

Deborah Solomon (member of the Bloomberg View editorial board) 7/5/12 “Obama Campaigns in Ohio by Way of Beijing”, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-05/obama-campaigns-in-ohio-by-way-of-beijing.html

Nothing says campaign season like a little China-bashing, and President Barack Obama delivered in Ohio today, announcing his administration's latest trade complaint against the world's second-largest economy. Less than two months after slapping Chinese-made solar panels with hefty tariffs, Obama accused China of charging unfair tariffs on U.S. autos. China, the world's biggest car market, is charging duties on more than 80 percent of U.S. auto shipments, putting the U.S. at a disadvantage by making its cars more expensive.