[Midterms 1NC 3](#_Toc265883018)

[Midterms 1NC 4](#_Toc265883019)

[Midterms 1NC 5](#_Toc265883020)

[\*\*\*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\*\*\* 6](#_Toc265883021)

[Uniqueness: Democrats Winning – Momentum 6](#_Toc265883022)

[Uniqueness: Democrats Winning – Special Election 7](#_Toc265883023)

[Uniqueness: Democrats Winning – A2: GOP Enthusiasm 8](#_Toc265883024)

[Uniqueness: Obama Approval High 9](#_Toc265883025)

[Uniqueness: Obama Approval High 10](#_Toc265883026)

[Uniqueness: Obama Approval High – A2: Oil Spill 11](#_Toc265883027)

[\*\*\*\*\*Links\*\*\*\*\* 12](#_Toc265883028)

[2NC Link 12](#_Toc265883029)

[2NC Link Turn Shield: No Wins For Obama 13](#_Toc265883030)

[Link: Generic 14](#_Toc265883031)

[Link: Generic 15](#_Toc265883032)

[Link Uniqueness: Republicans Not Running on National Security Now 16](#_Toc265883033)

[Link: Military Spending Reductions 17](#_Toc265883034)

[Link: Soft on Korea 18](#_Toc265883035)

[Link: Soft on Korea 19](#_Toc265883036)

[Link Uniqueness: Tough on Iran/Proliferators Now 20](#_Toc265883037)

[Link: Depleted Uranium – Nuclear Lobby 21](#_Toc265883038)

[Link: Depleted Uranium – Link Turn Shield 22](#_Toc265883039)

[Link: Drone Strikes 23](#_Toc265883040)

[Link: Bipartisanship 24](#_Toc265883041)

[Link: Japan Troops 25](#_Toc265883042)

[Link Uniqueness: No Base Drawdown Now 26](#_Toc265883043)

[Link: Flip-Flop Uniqueness – Obama Supports Military Presence 27](#_Toc265883044)

[Internal Link: Military/Foreign Policy Key to Obama’s Approval Rating 28](#_Toc265883045)

[Internal Link: Republican Majority Blocks Immigration 29](#_Toc265883046)

[Internal Link: Republican Majority Blocks Obama’s Agenda 30](#_Toc265883047)

[\*\*\*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*\*\* 31](#_Toc265883048)

[Impacts: Immigration Reform – Economy 31](#_Toc265883049)

[Impacts: Immigration Reform – Economy 32](#_Toc265883050)

[Impacts: Immigration Reform – Agriculture Sector 33](#_Toc265883051)

[Impacts: Immigration Reform – Agriculture Sector 34](#_Toc265883052)

[Impacts: Immigration Reform – Competitiveness 35](#_Toc265883053)

[Impacts: Immigration Reform – Competitiveness 36](#_Toc265883054)

[Impacts: Economic Decline Causes War 37](#_Toc265883055)

[Impacts: Republicans Bad – Laundry List 38](#_Toc265883056)

[Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change Module 1/2 39](#_Toc265883057)

[Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change Module 2/2 40](#_Toc265883058)

[Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change 41](#_Toc265883059)

[Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change – U.S. Solves 42](#_Toc265883060)

[\*\*\*\*\*Affirmative Answers\*\*\*\*\* 43](#_Toc265883061)

[\*\*\*Link Answers\*\*\* 43](#_Toc265883062)

[Link Answers: Democrats Oppose Military Presence 44](#_Toc265883063)

[Internal Link Answers 45](#_Toc265883064)

[\*\*\*Uniqueness Answers\*\*\* 46](#_Toc265883065)

[Uniqueness: Democrats Losing 46](#_Toc265883066)

[Uniqueness: Democrats Losing – Oil Spill +Economy 47](#_Toc265883067)

[Uniqueness: Democrats Losing 48](#_Toc265883068)

[Uniqueness: Obama Approval Low 49](#_Toc265883069)

[Uniqueness: Obama Approval Low 50](#_Toc265883070)

[Uniqueness: Republicans Winning – Enthusiasm 51](#_Toc265883071)

[Uniqueness: Republicans Winning – Independents 52](#_Toc265883072)

[Uniqueness: Republicans Winning 53](#_Toc265883073)

[\*\*\*Impact Answers\*\*\* 54](#_Toc265883074)

[Impact Answers: Economy 54](#_Toc265883075)

[Impact Answers: Warming 55](#_Toc265883076)

[Impact Answers: Warming 56](#_Toc265883077)

[Impact Turn: Republicans Good – Deficit Spending 57](#_Toc265883078)

[Impact Turn: Republicans Good – Deficit Spending 58](#_Toc265883079)

[CP Links to the Disadvantage: U.S. Peace Treaty to North Korea 59](#_Toc265883080)

# Midterms 1NC

## Uniqueness: Democrats will maintain control of Congress now—polling data proves

Ben **Reilly, 6/16/2010** (staff writer). “Good News for Congressional Democrats in Latest Polling.” Accessed from: <http://www.shortnews.com/start.cfm?id=84488>

As the economy continues to be voters´ top priority heading into the 2010 midterm elections, the latest Associated Press-GfK poll contains encouraging news for Democrats trying to retain control of Congress. Americans trust Democrats´ handling of the economy over Republicans by a margin of 47 percent to 42 percent, and 64 percent of Americans say their household budgets are doing OK. That latter number has been climbing. **Americans favor Democratic control of Congress by a margin of 46 percent to 39 percent**, the second consecutive month in which Democrats have held the advantage in that question since April, when Republicans were preferred by a three-point margin.

## Links

## Military cutbacks will be opposed by powerful lobbyists—creating a giant political fiasco for Obama.

Matthew **Yglesias, 2010**.  (Center for American Progress).  April 8, 2010.  “How Politically Feasible Are Defense Spending Cuts?”  <http://yglesias.thinkprogress.org/archives/2010/04/how-politically-feasible-are-defense-spending-cuts.php>

**The most relevant issue, when thinking about cuts, is thinking about the political fight that ensues**. If a President proposed cutting the defense budget and then y**ou had a ton of stories in the press where senior military officers fret off the record that the cuts will endanger America, and every television network trotted out a former general with undisclosed ties to defense contractors as an “independent analyst” to condemn the cuts,** and if active duty soldiers sent emails to their civilian family and friends complaining about the cuts, and if think tank experts who depend on cooperation with the military to do their research either complained about the cuts or else stayed silent, then I think **you’d have a giant political fiasco** on your hands.  The relevant issue here, in other words, is that **the military is the most trusted institution in America and then on top of that the defense sector of the economy has a lot of money and economic reach.** Consequently**, it’s very political difficult for a president to do anything that provokes the ire of the defense establishment whether or not it polls well in the abstract. This seems to me to be a huge problem in American political life**, but it’s not obvious to me what steps will resolve it.

1. **Obama’s approval rating is key to democratic success**

**CHINNI 11 – 25 – 09**  Christian Science Monitor Staff

Dante Chinni, What Obama’s approval ratings could mean for midterm elections, http://patchworknation.csmonitor.com/csmstaff/2009/1125/what-obama%E2%80%99s-approval-ratings-could-mean-for-midterm-elections/

**With less than a year until midterm elections, special interest is being paid to** President **Obama’s approval rating**. A few new polls show him below 50 percent for the first time since his inauguration. **As the president’s support goes, so goes the support of his party** – or at least **that’s what recent history says. Look at the approval ratings of** Presidents Bill **Clinton and** George W. **Bush and the congressional results** of midterm elections during their tenures. So what does this mean for Mr. Obama? For one thing, **a president’s approval rating is a slippery thing. It can change in a moment**.

# Midterms 1NC

## C) Impacts

## Keeping a House majority is key to successful immigration reform

**West 2009 [**Darrell, Director of Governance Studies at Brookings. AND, Thomas Mann, Senior Fellow of Governance Studies at Brookings. July. Brookings Immigration Series, “Prospects for Immigration Reform in the New Political Climate.” [http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2009/07\_immigration\_mann\_west/07\_immigration\_mann\_west.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/%7E/media/Files/rc/papers/2009/07_immigration_mann_west/07_immigration_mann_west.pdf)]

Immigration reform in the new political landscape will be shaped by a popular Democratic president armed with substantial Democratic majorities in the House and Senate. However, unified party control of the national government does not guarantee comprehensive policy-making. Democrats controlled Congress and the presidency during the Carter administration but were unable to reform energy policy. During the Clinton administration, Democrats were in a similarly strong political position, yet could not enact the centerpiece of the president’s domestic agenda: health-care reform.“**New federal policy will require a new immigration narrative, bold and innovative ideas and a determination to overcome major obstacles to action.”** Still, on controversial subjects requiring intricate compromise, **it helps to have one party clearly in charge**. This institutional position makes it easier to negotiate policy differences because it narrows the range of principles that must be negotiated. Such a dynamic is especially the case during periods of extreme polarization of the sort witnessed in recent years. With each party striving for electoral advantage and extremes from each party demanding ideologically pure responses, it is difficult to enact comprehensive measures. Contentious issues such as immigration reform require some support within the opposition party to firm up or compensate for majority party members that might defect under cross-pressures. The supermajority hurdles in the Senate that flow from the filibuster also necessitate bargaining across party lines. The new climate facilitates reform because it features renewed attention to big ideas and bold policy actions. The 2008 election took place against a backdrop of a global Prospects for Immigration Reform in the New Political Climate recession, destabilized financial institutions and a strong sense among the American public that old policy approaches were failing and new ones were required. An October 2008 CBS/New York Times national survey found that only 7 percent of Americans thought the country was headed in the right direction while 89 percent felt it was seriously off track. After President Obama’s first 100 days, that 7 percent had jumped to nearly 50 percent. With massive public discontent and big majorities, President Obama has pledged a new policy course in areas from financial regulation and education to health care and energy. As reflected in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, there is a willingness to tackle tough issues and try new policy approaches. In his inaugural address, Obama promised to alter the status quo. Noting that critics had complained that he had “too many big plans,” the chief executive responded that “the ground has shifted” and it was time for action. On immigration reform, Obama has expressed support for comprehensive legislation. At a March 18 town hall meeting in Costa Mesa, Calif., he explained that “I know this is an emotional issue. I know it's a controversial issue. I know that the people get real riled up politically about this, but ultimately, here's what I believe: We are a nation of immigrants ... I don't think that we can do this piecemeal.” During his April 29 press conference, the president reiterated his desire to move the process forward, saying “We can't continue with a broken immigration system. It's not good for anybody. It's not good for American workers. It's dangerous for Mexican would-be workers who are trying to cross a dangerous border.” **“Immigration reform in the new political landscape will be shaped by a popular Democratic president armed with substantial Democratic majorities in the House and Senate.** However, unified party control of the national government does not guarantee comprehensive policy-making.” With experienced leaders in key departments, the Obama administration is well-positioned to achieve immigration reform. For example, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano is a former governor of Arizona who brings detailed immigration knowledge and political skills. Commerce Secretary Gary Locke is an Asian American who presided as governor of Washington, a state with considerable in-migration, especially from Asian countries.

## Immigration reform is key to the economy

Jenkins and Thukral 6/12/10 (Alan Jenkins and Kuhu Thukral, staff writers for the Athens Banner-Herald, June 12, 2010, accessed from http://www.onlineathens.com/stories/061210/opi\_652439496.shtml on June 29, 2010.)

Nearly everyone agrees the current system is badly broken and serves no one well, whether native-born or immigrant, documented or undocumented. In fact, the only real beneficiaries of the status quo are unscrupulous employers looking to hire workers whom they can exploit and underpay. With common-sense, comprehensive immigration reform, more immigrants will be able to contribute to this country, promoting an economic recovery in which every American can share. After all, immigrants do their part - and then some - to fortify the economy by generating jobs and contributing to tax revenues. As the President's Council of Economic Advisers has reported, immigrants pump at least $37 billion a year into the economy, to the benefit of native-born Americans and newcomers alike. Foreign-born Americans account for one in 10 self-employed business people, and these businesses will be part of the engine of our economic recovery. But what about unauthorized immigrants? This much is known: They come here to work hard and participate in the economy. Undocumented men have the nation's highest workforce participation rate: 94 percent are working or looking for jobs, compared to only 83 percent of native-born men. The large majority of undocumented workers pay taxes: the Social Security Administration estimates that three-quarters of unauthorized immigrants pay payroll taxes, even though they aren't eligible for Social Security. The real problem is that it's almost impossible for most undocumented workers who have lived, worked and paid taxes in this country to become legal. Sensible, workable immigration reform would provide a system for these workers to comply with the law and regularize their status. Fixing the broken system will help all working Americans, especially those whose wages are driven down by employers exploiting undocumented workers. Because undocumented workers currently live and work in the shadows, they too often are not covered by laws ensuring a minimum wage, overtime pay, job safety and civil rights protections. With so many workers who can be compelled to submit to substandard wages and working conditions, millions of native-born workers and legal immigrants find that their job security, pay scales, health coverage, and retirement income are in jeopardy. Immigration reform will be good for all workers, whether newcomers or native-born. Comprehensive immigration reform must offer fairness and accountability for all. Better control of our borders is important, and must come primarily through improved technology and coordination, rather than building walls or militarizing border communities. To be effective, reform must be combined with a workable system of legal immigration, including for undocumented workers who register, pay a fee and any back taxes, and who begin to learn English. Converting today's 12 million undocumented immigrants into full-fledged contributors to our country and our economy is a crucial part of the solution.

# Midterms 1NC

## Economic downturn risks global nuclear war

**Mead, 09**

Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations (Walter Russell, The New Republic, “Only Makes You Stronger”, 2/4, <http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2>)

If current market turmoil seriously damaged the performance and prospects of India and China, the current crisis could join the Great Depression in the list of economic events that changed history, even if the recessions in the West are relatively short and mild. The United States should stand ready to assist Chinese and Indian financial authorities on an emergency basis--and work very hard to help both countries escape or at least weather any economic downturn. It may test the political will of the Obama administration, but the United States must avoid a protectionist response to the economic slowdown. U.S. moves to limit market access for Chinese and Indian producers could poison relations for years. For billions of people in nuclear-armed countries to emerge from this crisis believing either that the United States was indifferent to their well-being or that it had profited from their distress could damage U.S. foreign policy far more severely than any mistake made by George W. Bush. It's not just the great powers whose trajectories have been affected by the crash. Lesser powers like Saudi Arabia and Iran also face new constraints. The crisis has strengthened the U.S. position in the Middle East as falling oil prices reduce Iranian influence and increase the dependence of the oil sheikdoms on U.S. protection. Success in Iraq--however late, however undeserved, however limited--had already improved the Obama administration's prospects for addressing regional crises. Now, the collapse in oil prices has put the Iranian regime on the defensive. The annual inflation rate rose above 29 percent last September, up from about 17 percent in 2007, according to Iran's Bank Markazi. Economists forecast that Iran's real GDP growth will drop markedly in the coming months as stagnating oil revenues and the continued global economic downturn force the government to rein in its expansionary fiscal policy. All this has weakened Ahmadinejad at home and Iran abroad. Iranian officials must balance the relative merits of support for allies like Hamas, Hezbollah, and Syria against domestic needs, while international sanctions and other diplomatic sticks have been made more painful and Western carrots (like trade opportunities) have become more attractive. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia and other oil states have become more dependent on the United States for protection against Iran, and they have fewer resources to fund religious extremism as they use diminished oil revenues to support basic domestic spending and development goals. None of this makes the Middle East an easy target for U.S. diplomacy, but thanks in part to the economic crisis, the incoming administration has the chance to try some new ideas and to enter negotiations with Iran (and Syria) from a position of enhanced strength. Every crisis is different, but there seem to be reasons why, over time, financial crises on balance reinforce rather than undermine the world position of the leading capitalist countries. Since capitalism first emerged in early modern Europe, the ability to exploit the advantages of rapid economic development has been a key factor in international competition. Countries that can encourage--or at least allow and sustain--the change, dislocation, upheaval, and pain that capitalism often involves, while providing their tumultuous market societies with appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks, grow swiftly. They produce cutting-edge technologies that translate into military and economic power. They are able to invest in education, making their workforces ever more productive. They typically develop liberal political institutions and cultural norms that value, or at least tolerate, dissent and that allow people of different political and religious viewpoints to collaborate on a vast social project of modernization--and to maintain political stability in the face of accelerating social and economic change. The vast productive capacity of leading capitalist powers gives them the ability to project influence around the world and, to some degree, to remake the world to suit their own interests and preferences. This is what the United Kingdom and the United States have done in past centuries, and what other capitalist powers like France, Germany, and Japan have done to a lesser extent. In these countries, the social forces that support the idea of a competitive market economy within an appropriately liberal legal and political framework are relatively strong. But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

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

# Uniqueness: Democrats Winning – Momentum

## **Wall Street reforms score a second major victory for Obama, giving Democrats momentum in midterms**

Kuhnhenn 6/25/10 (Jim Kuhnhenn, Writer for AP, “Obama claims victory in financial overhaul deal,” June 25, 2010, from <http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5g7ffRdswXTlfgaQS0FCOZmrvbwcAD9GIDC800> on July 2, 2010)

House and Senate negotiators reached a dawn agreement Friday on legislation that redefines federal oversight of Wall Street and, following the signing of the health care act in March, adds another milestone to mark the Obama presidency. President Barack Obama declared victory Friday after congressional negotiators reached agreement on a sweeping overhaul of rules overseeing Wall Street. Lawmakers shook hands on the compromise legislation at 5:39 a.m. after Obama administration officials helped broker a deal that cracked the last impediment to the bill — a proposal to force banks to spin off their lucrative derivatives trading business. The legislation touches on an exhaustive range of financial transactions, from a debit card swipe at a supermarket to the most complex securities deals cut in downtown Manhattan. Speaking to reporters as he left the White House to attend an economic summit of world leaders in Canada, the president said he was gratified by Congress' work and said the deal included 90 percent of what he had proposed. He said the bill, forged in the aftermath of the 2008 financial meltdown, represents the toughest financial overhaul since the Great Depression. "We've all seen what happens when there is inadequate oversight and insufficient transparency on Wall Street," he said. "The reforms working their way through Congress will hold Wall Street accountable so we can help prevent another financial crisis like the one that we're still recovering from." Asked by reporters whether he can get the financial measure through the Senate, Obama said, "You bet." With the new health care law, passage of the legislation would give Obama a second major triumph that he and Democrats can take to voters as they head toward tough congressional elections in November. Senate Democrats are now trying to coalesce around the third big-ticket item on Obama's agenda, passage of clean energy legislation. Obama said he will discuss the regulations with other leaders at the Toronto meeting because the recent economic crisis proves that the world's economies are linked. Lawmakers hope the House and Senate will approve the compromise legislation by July 4. Republicans complained the bill overreached and tackled financial issues that were not responsible for the financial crisis.

# Uniqueness: Democrats Winning – Special Election

## **Democrat victory in special election gives hope for maintaining majority after midterms.**

Hulse 5/19/10 (Carl Hulse, staff writer for the New York Times, “Democrats See Hope for Fall in Victory in House Race,” May 19, 2010, accessed from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/20/us/politics/20elect.html on June 30, 2010.)

Congressional Democrats on Wednesday seized on their special election victory in a Pennsylvania House district and other primary results as evidence that they can stem Republican political momentum, as both parties sifted through Tuesday night’s returns for lessons to learn and mistakes to avoid heading to November.After hearing for months that they were on the verge of losing control of the House, Democrats said the decisive victory by Mark Critz, a Democrat, in the blue-collar district formerly represented by the late John P. Murtha, showed they remain competitive in the kinds of hotly contested regions Republicans need to win to have a real chance of capturing the House.“We are going to maintain our majority,” Representative Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, the majority leader, said. “Obviously the president’s party historically loses seats, but we are going to lose a lot fewer than people think.”Chastened Republicans conceded that they had made some missteps in the race and said they would make course corrections as they tried to capture Democratic swing districts, many of which have close parallels to the one retained by Democrats on Tuesday.

# Uniqueness: Democrats Winning – A2: GOP Enthusiasm

## Historically enthusiasm doesn’t mean anything this early before the elections

[Feldmann](http://www.csmonitor.com/About/Contact/Staff-Writers/Linda-Feldmann) June 21 [Linda, Staff writer / 2010 “Gallup poll shows just how pumped Republicans are for midterms” <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2010/0621/Gallup-poll-shows-just-how-pumped-Republicans-are-for-midterms>]

In addition, while Democrats are grappling with internal divisions, they are hopeful that the Republicans’ own intramural battles – the conservative tea-party movement versus more-mainstream GOP candidates – will help save some endangered Democrats, including Senate majority leader [Harry Reid](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/The-Vote/2010/0619/Tea-party-favorite-Sharron-Angle-takes-aim-at-Harry-Reid).

Democrats can also look hopefully at the one midterm, in 1998, in which the Republicans enjoyed an enthusiasm gap most of the year until the gap shifted slightly in the final poll to the Democrats’ favor. The Democrats ended up gaining seats.

# Uniqueness: Obama Approval High

## **Obama has substantial credibility and job approval – multiple warrants.**

Schier 6/20/10 (Steeven E. Schier, Dorothy H. and Edward C. Congdon Professor of Political Science at Carleton College, “Why Has Obama's Approval Held Steady Despite the Oil Spill?,” June 20, 2010, accessed from <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/06/why-has-obamas-approval-held-steady-despite-the-oil-spill/58419/> on July 2, 2010.)

A recent batch of polls reveal that President Obama's job approval has remained steady over the last two months despite his presiding over the biggest environmental catastrophe in our nation's history. Why might that be? First, consider the evidence. Checking realclearpolitics.com's presidential job approval index of major polls, Obama's job approval on June 18 stood at 48.1 percent, virtually equal to his 47.9 percent rating on April 23, the day of the spill. His disapproval rating has also changed very little on average, moving to 47.4 on June 18 from 46.9 on April 23. Tom Bevan at realcearpolitics.com notes that on specific questions regarding the oil spill, Obama's rating has shifted recently in a decidedly negative direction. So why isn't that reflected in his overall job approval ratings? Two reasons suggest themselves. First, Obama has BP to thank for his job approval stability. BP has primary responsibility for the spill and response, and the blame is readily shifted to them -- as Obama has done. A large multinational corporation is a convenient presidential punching bag. The public has by now learned much about the spill and apparently had decided that Obama does not merit sufficient blame to deserve lower job approval. Contrast that pattern with the Iraq war, in which George W. Bush was the instigator and held direct responsibility in the public's mind for the conflict and subsequent occupation. As the bloody occupation drug on, citizens fixed blame squarely on Bush. Political scientist Alan Abramowitz performed a recent analysis of Bush's job approval ratings and found that his handling of Hurricane Katrina did not accelerate the decline in job approval that had already set in during early 2005. Rather, the increasing job disapproval proceeded at the same pace as before Katrina. The hurricane may have kept the trend going, but the trend began before Katrina and persisted long after Katrina. That points to the conduct of the Iraq occupation as a more likely cause of the decline. Second, citizens have many grounds upon which to judge a president's conduct in office, and the BP spill, with Obama's attenuated responsibility for the disaster, seems not to be determinative among all of the factors an individual might consider in weighing a job approval verdict for the president. There's also the economy, Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea, health care, and a variety of other issues that may figure into an individual's calculations. The news for Obama on the issues just listed has not been good lately, and that is a greater threat to his presidency than BP alone. Once a critical mass of disapproval on a variety of grounds arises, the president's job approval will decline further. This contrasts somewhat with the situation of his predecessor, for whom the Iraq issue became a dominant negative driving down his popularity. The BP mess thus far hasn't had the same effect upon Obama's job approval. It's striking that Obama's job approval has not reached the lows of Ronald Reagan during the 1982 recession. Then, the new president fell to 41 percent approval in a July 1982 Gallup poll. Obama now averages seven percent higher than that. Has Obama reached the floor of his job approval? If so, that's very good news for the White House, because with his approval in the high forties, he remains a competitive candidate for reelection. Over the next several month's, we'll be "testing the bottom," and the results of that test will determine the fate of Obama's reelection prospects.

# Uniqueness: Obama Approval High

## **Upholding civilian control of the military has earned Obama credibility.**

Goldstein 6/24/10 (David Goldstein, The Star’s Washington Correspondent, “Obama had Little Choice but to fire McChrystal,” June 24, 2010, accessed from <http://primebuzz.kcstar.com/?q=node/22713> on July 2, 2010.)

President Barack Obama has been taking it on the chin lately from friend and foe alike for not being tough enough. Not tough enough on BP for the oil spill. Or on Republicans for throwing up roadblocks to everything he does. But in firing Gen. Stanley McChrystal, his four-star commander in Afghanistan, he not only was upholding civilian control of the military and what he called its “strict code of conduct,” but he also was setting down a marker. “Presidents have to be both loved and feared, and his bipartisan approach to policymaking has undercut the fear element,” said Stephen Wayne, a presidential expert at Georgetown University. “Firing General McChrystal was an attempt to show he’s tough.” The reaction Wednesday was generally positive. “While I have tremendous gratitude for General McChrystal’s service to our nation, his conduct was unfortunate and the president has taken what action he felt necessary,” said Republican Sen. Pat Roberts of Kansas, a Marine Corps veteran and frequent critic of the president. Falls from grace are routine affairs in the capital. But from Congress to the Pentagon and in all the defense and foreign policy shops and think tanks in between, Washington remained wide-eyed over McChrystal’s sudden downfall and the — call it arrogance or stupidity — that led to it. Obama graciously showed him the door. “Stan McChrystal has always shown great courtesy and carried out my orders faithfully,” he said. But the former Green Beret and soldier for more than three decades, as well as several junior officers, made cutting comments about top administration officials to Rolling Stone magazine that couldn’t be ignored and destroyed Obama’s trust. Republican Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, a colonel in the Air Force Reserve and a military lawyer, called the episode “a low point in my view of the armed forces, and I am glad the president made the decision.” There also was robust praise for his replacement, Gen. David Petraeus, a Capitol Hill favorite and the head of the U.S. Central Command. Until Wednesday, he had been McChrystal’s immediate boss. Democratic Rep. Ike Skelton of Missouri, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said it was “a measure of the man that he will take a subordinate position.” He said that Petraeus, a former commanding general at Fort Leavenworth, was “as good as they come.” But Skelton said the larger issue was the conduct of the war. “The most important thing for us to remember is that success in Afghanistan is paramount,” he said. Indeed, the McChrystal crisis underscores concerns on Capitol Hill over progress in the war. His departure could be the trigger for an evaluation of the counterinsurgency strategy designed to win over the population and freeze out the Taliban. It’s an arduous task, made only more difficult by Obama’s pledge to begin withdrawing the nearly 100,000 troops in Afghanistan a year from now. “What is more important than an analysis of our entire strategic position?” said Thomas Hammes, a counterinsurgency expert at the National Defense University. “Is Afghanistan worth what it’s going to cost us to make it a stable country?”

# Uniqueness: Obama Approval High – A2: Oil Spill

## **Despite the oil spill, Obama is still as popular as before it.**

Harwood 6/13/10 (John Harwood, writer for the NY Times, “Criticism Flowing Like Oil, but Obama’s Rating Is Steady,” June 13, 2010, accessed from <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/06/13/criticism-flowing-like-oil-but-obamas-rating-is-steady/> on July 2, 2010.)

Oil has gushed into the Gulf of Mexico for eight weeks now — and sent a bipartisan wave of criticism crashing into the White House. Allies and adversaries have accused President Obama of reacting too slowly, deferring too much to BP, displaying too little emotion and demonstrating incompetent management. Fans of historical analogy compare his performance to ineffectual responses by President Jimmy Carter during the Iran hostage crisis, and President George W. Bush during Hurricane Katrina. In other words, the crisis in the gulf has become a first-class political crisis, too. Right? Maybe not — or at least, not so far. Polls show that American voters give Mr. Obama the same mixed evaluation as before the spill. They like him personally but have reservations about his policies. Roughly half approve of his performance in the Oval Office, about where the president has remained since last fall, after his initial honeymoon with Americans faded. “It’s hard to make the case that the BP oil spill has a substantial impact on Obama’s job approval,” said Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster. Charles Franklin, an analyst for pollster.com, has tried to make it. Mr. Franklin examined polls that run “hot” for Mr. Obama, like the Washington Post/ABC News survey that recently measured a 52 percent job approval rating. He parsed polls that run colder, like Rasmussen Reports, whose automated phone survey recorded 47 percent approval over the weekend. Neither has moved significantly since the Deepwater Horizon rig exploded on April 20.

# \*\*\*\*\*Links\*\*\*\*\*

# 2NC Link

## **The public makes cuts politically disastrous**

Yglesias, 2010. (Center for American Progress). April 8, 2010. “How Politically Feasible Are Defense Spending Cuts?” <http://yglesias.thinkprogress.org/archives/2010/04/how-politically-feasible-are-defense-spending-cuts.php>

A recent Economist/YouGov poll confirmed that while the public is furiously hostile to the budget deficit and furiously hostile to tax increases it’s also furiously hostile to all feasible methods of reducing the deficit by reducing spending. Annie Lowrey made a helpful summary chart that combines (in blue) the number of people who say something should be cut with (in red) the percent of the budget that these programs account for: Defense spending is, of the major budget items, the least-unpopular cut. Ezra Klein remarks: You can make too much of this, of course. Only about a quarter of the population wants defense spending cut. But given how terrified politicians are to touch defense spending — we even invented a category called “non-defense discretionary spending” in order to protect it — maybe it’s time to take another look. Washington may consider defense spending sacred, but the country doesn’t — at least not more than anything else.

# 2NC Link Turn Shield: No Wins For Obama

## Obama can’t get a win before the midterms – legislative victories take too long to develop and there’s only a risk the republicans spin it as a loss for him

**Raum 05/24**/10 [Tom, AP| Obama Administration's Legislative Victories May Not Help Them In Midterm Elections http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/24/obama-administrations-leg\_n\_587008.html]

WASHINGTON — Anxious and angry, **Americans are not in a congratulatory mood**. That's bad news for President Barack Obama and his Democratic allies. After winning a landmark health care overhaul earlier this year, Obama now stands on the brink of seeing Congress approve the most far-reaching overhaul of Wall Street regulations since the 1930s. Democrats aim to put it on his desk by July 4. Yet with the economy still wobbly and the stock market retreating, Americans remain nervous about the possibility of a double-dip recession. They have seen few concrete benefits yet from the slow-to-unfold health care law. Likewise, it may be some time before Obama can point to results from the advancing legislation to rewrite the rules that govern Wall Street. Senate passage last week of the financial overhaul bill was "another big win for him. But the problem is that, **in terms of his standing in the eyes of the public, both these enormously far-reaching pieces of legislation are going to take quite a while to play out and to begin to affect the lives of Americans,"** said Ross Baker, a political scientist at Rutgers University in New Jersey. **In the meantime, there's plenty for people to worry about**. Despite signs of a fledgling corporate recovery, unemployment seems stuck at just under 10 percent. Home foreclosures continue to rise. U.S. stocks have fallen some 10 percent in just the last month, signaling a correction to the bull market that began in March 2009. Despite a rebound on Friday, stocks generally continued their downward course on Monday, with the Dow Jones industrials lower by about 30 points in midday trading. Riots in Athens and strikes in Spain are rattling world markets. And **millions of gallons of crude oil have gushed into the Gulf** of Mexico over the past month from a blown out well, threatening the environment and jobs in the region. The result: Americans are in a sour mood, and the polls reflect that. Just 35 percent surveyed this month say the country is heading in the right direction, the lowest measured by the AP-GfK survey since a week before Obama took office in January 2009. His approval rating remains at 49 percent, as low as it has been since he became president. **Both the health care overhaul and the financial regulation measures are complicated pieces of legislation. Republicans have gone out of their way to portray both as examples of Democratic efforts to expand the scope of government**. Two months after Obama's health care overhaul narrowly passed Congress, polls suggest many Americans still either don't like the looming health care changes or are skeptical of them – and Republicans are seizing on that discontent at every opportunity. Democrats believe the financial overhaul bill will be a bigger winner for them in November elections, given widespread public anger at Wall Street bailouts and bonuses. Obama won't be on the ballot until 2012 and by then, the White House hopes, the economy will be stronger, the jobless rate will be lower and Americans will be enjoying benefits of the health care changes. The health care bill and now the financial regulation legislation follow Obama's signature legislative accomplishment of 2009, a $787 billion stimulus package passed in February 2009 that contained dozens of federal initiatives aimed at preventing the worst recession in 70 years from becoming another Great Depression. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the 2009 stimulus package has an actual long-term cost of $862 billion. "By any objective terms, the Obama presidency has had an incredibly productive start. He reached high. **The major things he's taken on during very difficult times will pay dividends in legislative terms. But will he get credit in the short term? Probably not**," said Thomas Mann, a political scientist at the Brookings Institution. "**The public has come to believe the stimulus bill and financial bailout were of no use in helping the economy, contrary to evidence suggesting otherwise. Health reform remains a very controversial measure. The bottom line is that the public is scared, they're angry, they're in a foul mood and not inclined to see great victories or achievements,"** Mann said.

# Link: Generic

## Any effort to cut back on the military will be branded as weakness in the face of the war on terror:

Doug **Bandow**, February 1, **2008** (Senior Fellow, CATO Institute), “GOP lost in defense budget black hole.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/doug_bandow_gop_lost_in_defense_budget_black_hole2008-02-01T08_00_00.html>

Republicans once claimed to oppose wasteful government spending. But Republicans are now demanding ever more military expenditures, irrespective of need. Presidential candidates Rudy Giuliani, John McCain and Mitt Romney all want a major military buildup. Romney proposes spending "a minimum of 4 percent of GDP on national defense." Former Sen. Jim Talent and the Heritage Foundation’s Mackenzie Eaglen similarly contend that policy makers "should be judged by whether or not they support spending a minimum of 4 percent of GDP on the regular defense budget." Candidate Fred Thompson advocated spending 4.5 percent of GDP on the military. Mike Huckabee would trump everyone by spending 6 percent of GDP on the military: $800 billion, a 50 percent increase in current outlays. What could possibly justify such huge increases? The economy’s size and growth are unrelated to national security threats. Between 1960 and 2005, real GDP more than quadrupled while the world grew much safer. In fact, these conservatives sound like liberals on domestic policy: Spend as much money as possible irrespective of need or effectiveness. The U.S. currently spends roughly as much as the rest of the world combined. Nevertheless, Talent talked of "threats that are highly unpredictable and therefore, taken as a whole, more dangerous than the threats we faced during the Cold War." Apparently those years of defending war-ravaged allies from an aggressive Soviet Union, unpredictable Maoist China, and various European and Third World communist satellites were nothing compared with confronting Osama bin Laden with his vast legions.

# Link: Generic

**Looking weak on foreign policy will doom the democrats in the midterms**

**FLY 1 – 28 – 10** Executive Director - Foreign Policy Initiative & Research associate at the Council on Foreign Relations Jamie M. Fly, Does Obama Have a Foreign Policy?, http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/does-obama-have-foreign-policy

While it is understandable that given the state of the economy and lingering recession, most Americans are perhaps more focused on their job security than about what is happening in Kabul, Tehran, or Pyongyang, it is troubling that this president does not seem to have a clear agenda on these issues other than a retro-80s approach to twenty-first century challenges. If the Christmas Day bomber, growing concern about Yemen, instability in Iran, continued uncertainty about nuclear Pakistan, and the difficult months (and years) ahead in Afghanistan are any indication, 2010 will be just as consequential for U.S. foreign policy as any year in recent memory with the exception of 2001.

President Obama came into office with a foreign policy agenda that was essentially limited to expressing concern about nuclear weapons and showing the world that he was not George W. Bush. He has now done the latter through speech after speech in Istanbul, Accra, Cairo, to cite just a few of the exotic venues. Despite focusing on the former with his “reset” of the U.S.-Russian relationship, the foreign policy challenges he faced during 2009 were largely thrust upon him by events. Despite several courageous decisions as commander in chief, he was clearly uncomfortable (witness the Afghanistan Strategy Review) with the issue set he was forced to focus on during year one.

In this very political White House, **foreign policy is viewed through the lens of mid-term elections in 2010 and the president’s reelection in 2012, just like any other issue**. Thus, it is important for Team Obama to act tough on security and kill terrorists (preferably using classified means), but most other foreign policy issues become time consuming obstacles to the pursuit of a robust domestic agenda. This is foreign policy as a political tactic, not as a grand strategy or a coherent formulation of America’s global interests (with the exception of a headlong rush for disarmament).

Despite the challenges the country faces on the domestic front, it would behoove the president in 2010 to do what he failed to do last night -- speak more frequently to the American people about what is at stake overseas and what his vision is for keeping Americans safe and advancing U.S. interests around the world. Otherwise, he risks being nothing more than a reactionary president doing little more than what is required to avoid the wrath of the electorate. He runs the risk of becoming an inconsequential commander in chief in very consequential times.

# Link Uniqueness: Republicans Not Running on National Security Now

## Republicans won’t run on national security now

Frank J. Gaffney, 2010 (president of the Center for Security Policy). April 6, 2010. Washington Times. “War’s outcome now in doubt; Redeployment of forces to Afghanistan is premature.” Accessed via Lexis/Nexis.

It may be that Team Obama is calculating that the American people are so sick of these conflicts and the associated costs in blood and treasure that they will consider cutting our losses to be a "great achievement" - irrespective of the consequences. After all, a generation ago, their ideological forefathers led the United States in abandoning the South Vietnamese, without obvious political fallout here at home. To the extent that **Republicans are increasingly signaling a determination to run next fall on a platform silent on national security matters**, they may be right, at least in the short run.

## **Focus on national security crushes Dems in the midterms.** Karl Rove, 2009 (former senior adviser to President Bush). Wall Street Journal. November 11, 2009. “A Referendum on This White House.” Accessed from: http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704402404574529583347899774.html

If the 2010 midterms are nationalized, they will be a referendum on Mr. Obama's increasingly unpopular policies. For example, in the newest Gallup survey released on Monday, only 29% say they'd advise their congressman to vote for the health-care bill. This is down from 40% last month. A Rasmussen poll out this week shows that 42% of Americans strongly oppose the bill, while only 25% strongly favor it. Obama is increasingly seen as governing from the left—the latest Gallup poll shows that 54% of Americans say the president's policies have been mostly liberal and only 34% say they are mostly moderate. That's a risky position to be in when the country leans to the right. High unemployment and the president's low approval on jobs and the economy (which is at 46% in a CNN/Opinion Research poll released last week), won't by themselves sink Democrats. But what will hurt are the beliefs that Mr. Obama's $787 billion stimulus bill was a flop and that he doesn't know how to speed up the economic recovery. Mr. Obama's approval on handling the deficit in the CNN/Opinion Research survey is now 39%. The president's plans to triple the deficit over the next decade is causing a level of angst among independents that we haven't seen since Ross Perot ran for president in the 1990s. This angst has given Republicans a four-point lead in Gallup's generic ballot (48% to 44%), putting the party in a better position than it was in spring 1994, just a few months before its historic takeover of Congress. Democrats increasingly recognize their vulnerability. Of the 80 House Democrats whose districts were carried by Mr. Bush or John McCain, nine voted against the stimulus, 21 against a budget resolution that called for doubling the national debt in four years, 36 against cap and trade, and 36 against health care. Defections will grow. Nothing concentrates a troubled centrist's mind like a coming election. Maybe the Obama inner sanctum realizes that its agenda is unpopular and will cost many Democrats their seats next year but calculates that enough will survive to keep the party in control of Congress. Perhaps they have decided that Mr. Obama's goal of turning America into a European-style social democracy is worth risking a voter revolt. Many Democrats who will be on the ballot next year may come to a different conclusion. Nationalizing the elections over an unpopular agenda isn't likely to repeat Mr. Bush's feat of picking up congressional seats. It is, however, likely to lead to more Republican congressmen than are there now.

# Link: Military Spending Reductions

## Democrats oppose defense spending reductions

Robert Scheer, (Contributing Editor, The Nation), THE PORNOGRAPHY OF POWER: HOW DEFENSE HAWKS HIJACKED 9/11 AND WEAKENED AMERICA, 2008, 123.

The delusion of the Democrats is twofold: Military expenditures can be used for meaningful social programs such as job training through the military, and even if the money is totally wasted there will be enough left over to fund more needed domestic programs. Democrats, certainly since the failed presidential campaign of George McGovern, have been wary of being "soft on defense" and have come to regard the reform of military expenditures as a politically life-threatening third rail

.

## Defense cuts kill Republican support for foreign aid

Robert Kagan, (Sr. Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), WASHINGTON POST, Feb. 3, 2009, A15.

Cuts in the defense budget would have consequences in other areas of the budget, most notably foreign aid. Some Republicans have already begun to grumble about foreign aid and development spending. If the Obama administration begins by cutting defense, it will be much harder to persuade Republicans to support foreign aid.

# Link: Soft on Korea

## Obama’s hardline towards North Korea is key to democratic voter turnout in november

Joe **Han**, Political commentator from U. Cal. Berkely Wednesday, June 17, **2009** LN nsa

I'm very worried that war, yes war, could break out on the Korean Peninsula. I think the chances are still remote, but the current situation on the Korean Peninsula and the United States seems to be more conducive to its possibility than any other I've seen within my lifetime. When South Korean President Lee Myung Bak met U.S. President Barak Obama, it was clear (while not from the attendence of the press core), but from their joint statement that the meeting was perhaps the most substantive between leaders of the two countries in a very long time. U.S. President Barak Obama enjoys considerable support among the U.S. electorate, but most importantly, he enjoys support among those left of center or those that have been against the War in Iraq. Thus, when the U.S. President promises extended deterrence and that he will no longer let North Korea be rewarded for lies, these words hold weight that words from former President George W. Bush's never could (for example, remember CVID, or "Complete Verifiable Irreversible Disarmament? I bet former President Bush doesn't want to either). By the way, I cannot stress enough how much of a disaster U.S. "policy" towards North Korea was during the first administration of George W. Bush (Check out "A Long Road to Pyongyang" in Foreign Affairs - Nov/Dec 2007). So, we have a popular president in the United States who enjoys the support of those traditionally against war. **This president also needs to show or prove to those that are skeptical of President Obama's ability to be "tough" in defending U.S. national security interests.**

# Link: Soft on Korea

## North Korea is perceived by the public to be the biggest national security threat the US faces—the plan would be perceived as backing down:

Joshua Stanton, 2010 (staff writer), “North Korea Re-Re-Declares War, Threatens ‘Merciless Physical Force,’ Demands Peace Treaty” Mar. 8, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.freekorea.us/2010/03/08/north-korea-re-re-declares-war-threatens-mercilless-physical-force-and-wants-a-peace-treaty/>

In a survey last year by Rasmussen, a U.S. polling organization, North Korea topped the list of countries that American voters see as the biggest national security threat. A Gallup poll in February showed that the view hasn’t changed. The North again topped the list of countries, together with Iran, in “critical threats to the U.S. vital interests.” The results show the predominantly negative perceptions the American public have toward North Korea. And given that their view on the North, not the U.S. administration, may be the ultimate decider on whether a peace treaty should be signed, Pyongyang is at a critical disadvantage. In its peace treaty demand, North Korea may have neglected this factor. It’s important for the secretive state to have “winning negotiations” with U.S. nuclear envoys, but behind them are lawmakers, and behind them the general public, who ultimately influences U.S. negotiations.

“There is a tendency in the U.S. that sees a peace treaty with North Korea as somehow a concession,” said Feffer. “That’s why it has been so difficult to push the issue forward domestically.”

# Link Uniqueness: Tough on Iran/Proliferators Now

## **Sanctions on Iran now are the toughest that has ever been imposed on it.**

Colvin 7/2/10 (Ross Colvin, White House correspondent for Reuters, “Obama says new U.S. sanctions on Iran toughest ever,” July 2, 2010, accessed from http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE66001Z20100702 on July 2, 2010.)

President Barack Obama signed into law on Thursday far-reaching new sanctions on Iran that aim to squeeze the Islamic Republic's fuel imports and deepen its international isolation. Obama said the new sanctions were the toughest ever passed by the U.S. Congress and would make it harder for Iran to buy refined petroleum as well as goods and services to modernize its oil and natural gas sector, the mainstay of its economy. While the door to diplomacy remained open, he said, Iran would come under even greater international pressure if it continued to defy international calls to halt its uranium enrichment program. The United States and its European allies suspect Iran is trying to build an atomic bomb, despite Tehran's insistence that its nuclear program is for the peaceful generation of electricity. "There should be no doubt -- the United States and the international community are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons," Obama said at the signing of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act at the White House. European Union leaders agreed last month to tighten U.N. sanctions on Iran with additional measures targeting Iran's financial, banking, insurance, transportation and energy sectors. The new U.S. sanctions go much further than the measures agreed to by the U.N. Security Council in June and are aimed at ratcheting up pressure on Iran to persuade it to return to international talks on its disputed nuclear program. The U.S. sanctions penalize companies supplying Iran with gasoline and international banking institutions involved with Iran's increasingly powerful Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps or its nuclear program. Foreign banks that do business with key Iranian banks or the Revolutionary Guards will not be allowed access to the U.S. financial system. Global suppliers of gasoline to Iran could also face bans on access to the U.S. banking system, property transactions and foreign exchange in the United States. NO SILVER BULLET "With these sanctions -- along with others -- we are striking at the heart of the Iranian government's ability to fund and develop its nuclear programs," Obama said. "We are showing the Iranian government that its actions have consequences." Democratic congressman Howard Berman, one of the architects of the new U.S. sanctions package, said he hoped it would provide Obama "with the tools he needs to persuade Tehran to permanently abandon its nuclear weapons program." The new sanctions are designed to hurt Iran where it is most vulnerable -- it's energy sector. The world's fifth-largest oil producer lacks sufficient refining capacity and imports up to 40 percent of its gasoline needs. Recognizing its vulnerability, Iran has drawn up plans to become self-sufficient in gasoline output within two years while reducing domestic demand, partly through phasing out government subsidies. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has dismissed the threat of sanctions, saying Iran could be self-sufficient in gasoline "within one week" if necessary. Obama came into office in January 2009 promising a new beginning of diplomatic engagement with Iran if it "unclenched its fist." But after Iran's leaders rebuffed the offer and continued enriching uranium he mobilized international support for a fourth round of U.N sanctions. White House spokesman Robert Gibbs acknowledged on Thursday that the new measures offered no "silver bullet," echoing earlier comments by Central Intelligence Agency director Leon Panetta, who said targeted economic sanctions would probably not deter Iran from seeking a nuclear capability. The sanctions have already started to bite. France's Total this week joined an expanding list of companies that have stopped gasoline sales to Iran, and Spain's Repsol said it had pulled out of a contract to develop part of the country's huge South Pars gas field in the Gulf.

# Link: Depleted Uranium – Nuclear Lobby

## *Pro-nuclear weapons lobby supports Depleted Uranium bullets:*

Sepp **Hasslberger,** 2/1/20**08** (http://www.communicationagents.com/sepp/2008/02/01/world\_health\_organization\_paralyzed\_by\_nuclear\_lobby.htm)

A study by the World Health Organization's senior radiation advisor Dr Keith Baverstock, completed in 2001, suggested that the use of **uranium weapons in Iraq** could pose a unique health hazard to the civilian population. The publication of the study was suppressed by the World Health Organization's hierarchy and only in February 2004 the UK Sunday Herald broke that story. Dr Baverstock was quoted as saying: “I believe our study was censored and suppressed by the WHO because they didn’t like its conclusions. Previous experience suggests that WHO officials were bowing to pressure from the IAEA, whose remit is to **promote nuclear power**. That is more than unfortunate, as publishing the study would have helped forewarn the authorities of the risks of using DU weapons in Iraq.” At the time, the WHO's Dr Repacholi, a corrupt scientist known for his role in hiding any damaging effects of mobile phone radiation on humans and animals, denied that there had been any interference with the report, saying “The IAEA role was very minor,” but the study titled Radiological toxicity of DU which could have saved countless lives in the Middle East, had indeed never been published. And of course the damage that is being done by depleted uranium munitions and missiles coated with the radioactive metal can hardly be overlooked any more: Use of "Depleted" Uranium Munitions Daytona Beach News-Journal Special DEPLETED URANIUM BURNING: AN E T E R N A L MEDICAL DISASTER WHO\_Nuclear\_Independence.jpg Fast forward to December 2007: Health professionals are CALLING FOR INDEPENDENCE OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION. Their letter to Madam Chan, Director-General of the WHO, makes reference to another case of suppression of scientific data, nuclear contamination after the disastrous accident at the Chernobyl reactor, and the consequent endangerment of human life without adequate intervention. The appeal spells out what is wrong and asks that the World Health Organization rescind its link with the International Atomic Energy Agency and fulfill its stated purpose of protecting human health: - - -APPEAL BY HEALTH PROFESSIONALS FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF W.H.O. To Madam Chan, Director-General, WHO and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Minister of Health of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (country). The World Health Organization (WHO) works towards the resolution of public health problems and to this end, it is mandated “to assist in developing an informed public opinion” (WHO Constitution, 7 April 1948). However, since the WHO/IAEA Agreement (WHA12-40) was signed on 28 May 1959, the WHO appears to be subordinate to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). As health professionals, we support the request that WHO, in line with its constitution, recover its independence in the area of ionising radiation. In the past, WHO was paralysed in its struggle against passive smoking because it was infiltrated by the tobacco lobby. In the same way, **WHO is paralysed by the nuclear lobby**, incomparably more powerful, represented by the IAEA, at the top of the UN hierarchy. This agency reports to the UN Security Council where it coordinates the promotion of commercial nuclear energy. The other UN agencies and the WHO report only to the UN Economic and Social Council.

## B) The pro-nuclear weapons lobby outnumbers and outflanks arms control proponents—this outweighs any link turns and proves the plan massively undermines Obama’s political capital:

C. G. **Weeramantry, 1998** (Justice Without Frontiers: Protecting human rights in the age of technology, pg. 332-333, accessed via google books)

There is also **domestic political power in the nuclear weapons enterprise**, for the enterprise means tens of thousands of jobs and **every job represents a vote**. The political systems (and the economic systems) of many states in the U.S. are heavily dependent on the weapons establishment, and the same can be said of power realities in other countries. The **nuclear weapons lobby is immensely powerful**, and in Washington, as in other centres of power, the weapons enterprise, with vast funds at its disposal, has the **ear of senators and representatives** which the **anti-nuclear movement cannot match**. As for the military leaders themselves, their power keeps expanding as the nuclear weapons enterprise expands.

# Link: Depleted Uranium – Link Turn Shield

## (--) Zero link turns: public attention to the harms of DUB’s is intentionally downplayed:

Yusuf **Progler, 1997** (<http://www.muslimedia.com/ARCHIVES/book98/armsbk.htm>, US arms industry launches nuclear war on enemies and allies alike)

The threats of DU have not received much public attention for some very specific reasons. There is a conspiracy of silence on the part of government agencies, corporations, and universities to ignore or downplay the threats of radiation poisoning from DU weapons development and other military and research related projects. Government complicities have already been noted. In addition, the American corporate broadcasting conglomerate NBC is owned by General Electric, one of the major producers of nuclear weapons and waste. Some activists even dub it the 'Nuclear Broadcasting Corporation.' News stories about DU, needless to say, are taboo on NBC, but all the other major corporate media outlets, print and electronic, have also kept the NBC code of silence.

The Brookhaven Research Laboratory in Long Island, New York, has been implicated in a number of radioactive spills and leaks, threatening the water supply and general health of residents within a 50-mile radius. The lab is governed by Associated Universities, Inc., which is a consortium of American universities including Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Princeton. All are complicit in the shroud of silence around any talk of the dangers of nuclear energy, weapons, and related research. Several American corporations are also implicated in this conspiracy of silence, including General Electric, AT&T, and Hughes Aircraft. This wide ranging power nexus of government, military, media, corporate, and university interests has nearly succeeded in removing any public debate on the dangers of radiation. But this book is evidence that many voices have not been silenced.

# Link: Drone Strikes

## The CIA Supports drone attacks—the plan would anger the military:

**Pakistan Observer, 3/22/2010** (<http://pakobserver.net/detailnews.asp?id=21628>)

Washington—**CIA Chief Leon Panetta** has said the US counter terrorism polices in Pakistan are **legal and highly effective** and that he is acutely aware of the gravity of some of the decisions thrust upon him. In an interview Wednesday at CIA headquarters, Panetta refused to directly address the matter of Predator strikes, in keeping with the agency’s long-standing practice of shielding its actions in Pakistan from public view. “Any time you make decisions on life and death, I don’t take that lightly. That’s a serious decision,” he said. “And yet, I also feel very comfortable with making those decisions because I know I’m dealing with people who threaten the safety of this country and are prepared to attack us at any moment.” Panetta had personally authorized the Drone strike that killed Taliban chief Baitullah Mehsud at his fatiehr in law’s home on August 5, 2009, according to a senior intelligence official who described the sequence of events.

## Drone strikes are critical to the perception that Obama is tough on national security:

Max **Fisher, 3/18/2010** (staff writer, <http://www.theatlanticwire.com/opinions/view/opinion/Does-CIA-Really-Have-Al-Qaeda-On-the-Run-2880/>)

\* Obama Resists Liberals in War on Terror Conservative blogger Allahpundit praises President Obama for his **tough approach to national security**. "Naturally, with **drone strikes** proving more effective than ever, Obama’s now under legal pressure from the ACLU to discontinue them, but I give him full credit for resisting the left thus far. Summarily executing these turds with missiles cuts entirely against [Attorney General] Eric Holder’s 'innocent until proven guilty' criminal-law ethos of counterterrorism, but in this case, three cheers for hypocrisy."

# Link: Bipartisanship

## Hawkish foreign policy stances have bipartisan political support:

Doug Bandow, March 15, 2010 (Senior Fellow, CATO Institute), “Battling the Bipartisan Consensus for War.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/doug-bandow/battling-the-bipartisan-c_b_498681.html>

In January 2009 Republican George W. Bush yielded to Democrat Barack Obama, and the U.S. government increased military spending and expanded the war in Afghanistan. If a Republican is elected in 2012, recent history suggests that defense outlays will grow further, as Washington attacks another nation or two. Enthusiasm for war crosses party lines -- Robert Kagan recently wrote approvingly of the militaristic alliance between "liberal interventionist Democrats" and "hawkish internationalist Republicans" -- both groups which have never met a war they didn't want to fight. However, support for peace also is transpartisan. Such sentiments are perhaps strongest on the Democratic left, which increasingly feels disenfranchised by President Obama. A smaller contingent of libertarians, traditional conservatives, and paleo-conservatives has resisted the conservative movement's adoption of war-mongering intervention as a basic tenet.

## Moves toward peace will be opposed by a bipartisan coalition:

Doug Bandow, March 15, 2010 (Senior Fellow, CATO Institute), “Battling the Bipartisan Consensus for War.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/doug-bandow/battling-the-bipartisan-c_b_498681.html>

Unfortunately, politicians have proved extraordinarily adept at rousing, at least temporarily, public support for foreign military adventures. Resisting the ivory tower warmongers will be no easier today. But those who believe in peace have no choice but to try, and try again. Peace should be America's natural condition. Unfortunately, it will not be so as long as today's unnatural alliance of liberal and neoconservative hawks runs U.S. foreign policy. And only the American people can take back control. The future of the American people and republic is at stake.

# Link: Japan Troops

## Nearly all of Americans support troops in Japan

**Rasmussen 9** [26% Favor Pulling All U.S. Troops Out of Japan, November 15,]

A new Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey finds that 49% disagree and oppose the removal of all U.S. troops from Japan. Twenty-five percent (25%) are not sure. The United States still has 47,000 troops based in Japan, many on the island of Okinawa, and friction between Americans and local residents have been growing in recent years. But the president in his visit to Tokyo held firm to a previously negotiated plan to maintain the troops there, saying the two countries have a shared commitment to "the defense of Japan with minimal intrusion on the lives of the people who share this space."

# Link Uniqueness: No Base Drawdown Now

**Congress will prevent base drawdowns in the squo.  The are off-limits**

**Dayen 10** [David Dayen, “Defense Spending Cuts Face Likely Congressional Override,” Monday May 17, 2010 9:18 am, http://news.firedoglake.com/2010/05/17/defense-spending-cuts-face-likely-congressional-override/]

The lesson of Congress in the modern age is that it’s much harder to eliminate a program than it is to enact one. Every program has a champion somewhere on Capitol Hill, and it probably only needs one to be saved – but 218 and 60 to be put into motion.

A case in point: our bloated military budget. The Obama Administration has generally tried to cancel out unnecessary defense programs, with meager success in the last budget year. **Congress will probably assert themselves in an election year**, however. Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates has vowed to impose fiscal austerity at the Pentagon, but his biggest challenge may be persuading Congress to go along. Lawmakers from both parties are poised to override Gates and fund the C-17 cargo plane and an alternative engine for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter — two weapons systems the defense secretary has been trying to cut from next year’s budget. They have also made clear they will ignore Gates’s pleas to hold the line on military pay raises and health-care costs, arguing that now is no time to skimp on pay and benefits for troops who have been fighting two drawn-out wars. The competing agendas could lead to a major clash between Congress and the Obama administration this summer. Gates has repeatedly said he will urge President Obama to veto any defense spending bills that include money for the F-35’s extra engine or the C-17, both of which he tried unsuccessfully to eliminate last year. Last year, after a similarly protracted struggle, Gates succeeded in getting Congress to end funding for the F-22, a plane which tended to malfunction in the rain. Seriously. But Congress did not move on the F-35 engine or the C-17, and they seem similarly positioned this year. Ike Skelton and Carl Levin support the F-35 engine, for example, and included it in their appropriation requests out of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, which they separately chair. I fully recognize that the **off-limits discussion about military spending concerns the bases in over 100 countries** and continued adventures abroad in places where “victory” means almost nothing. But it is a symptom of the same problem – the persistent inertia that aids the military-industrial complex to keep the war machine moving. And so we get new engines to planes that don’t need new engines.

# **Link: Flip-Flop Uniqueness – Obama Supports Military Presence**

## **Obama’s administration loves expanding military presence, he is increasing operations in 75 countries.**

DeYoung and Jaffe 6/4/10 (Karen DeYoung and Greg Jaffe, Washington Post Staff Writers, “U.S. 'secret war' expands globally as Special Operations forces take larger role,” June 4, 2010, accessed from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/03/AR2010060304965.html on July 1, 2010.)

Beneath its commitment to soft-spoken diplomacy and beyond the combat zones of Afghanistan and Iraq, the Obama administration has significantly expanded a largely secret U.S. war against al-Qaeda and other radical groups, according to senior military and administration officials. Special Operations forces have grown both in number and budget, and are deployed in 75 countries, compared with about 60 at the beginning of last year. In addition to units that have spent years in the Philippines and Colombia, teams are operating in Yemen and elsewhere in the Middle East, Africa and Central Asia. Commanders are developing plans for increasing the use of such forces in Somalia, where a Special Operations raid last year killed the alleged head of al-Qaeda in East Africa. Plans exist for preemptive or retaliatory strikes in numerous places around the world, meant to be put into action when a plot has been identified, or after an attack linked to a specific group. The surge in Special Operations deployments, along with intensified CIA drone attacks in western Pakistan, is the other side of the national security doctrine of global engagement and domestic values President Obama released last week. One advantage of using "secret" forces for such missions is that they rarely discuss their operations in public. For a Democratic president such as Obama, who is criticized from either side of the political spectrum for too much or too little aggression, the unacknowledged CIA drone attacks in Pakistan, along with unilateral U.S. raids in Somalia and joint operations in Yemen, provide politically useful tools. Obama, one senior military official said, has allowed "things that the previous administration did not."

## **Obama is ratcheting up special operations and increasing budgets for increased military presence.**

DeYoung and Jaffe 6/4/10 (Karen DeYoung and Greg Jaffe, Washington Post Staff Writers, “U.S. 'secret war' expands globally as Special Operations forces take larger role,” June 4, 2010, accessed from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/03/AR2010060304965.html on July 1, 2010.)

But Obama has made such forces a far more integrated part of his global security strategy. He has asked for a 5.7 percent increase in the Special Operations budget for fiscal 2011, for a total of $6.3 billion, plus an additional $3.5 billion in 2010 contingency funding. Bush-era clashes between the Defense and State departments over Special Operations deployments have all but ceased. Former defense secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld saw them as an independent force, approving in some countries Special Operations intelligence-gathering missions that were so secret that the U.S. ambassador was not told they were underway. But the close relationship between Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton is said to have smoothed out the process. "In some places, we are quite obvious in our presence," Adm. Eric T. Olson, head of the Special Operations Command, said in a speech. "In some places, in deference to host-country sensitivities, we are lower in profile. In every place, Special Operations forces activities are coordinated with the U.S. ambassador and are under the operational control of the four-star regional commander."

# Internal Link: Military/Foreign Policy Key to Obama’s Approval Rating

**Obama’s stronghold includes minorities & the military**

**CHINNI 11 – 25 – 09**  Christian Science Monitor Staff

Dante Chinni, What Obama’s approval ratings could mean for midterm elections, http://patchworknation.csmonitor.com/csmstaff/2009/1125/what-obama%E2%80%99s-approval-ratings-could-mean-for-midterm-elections/

Bearing that in mind, we looked at Obama’s job approval ratings in Patchwork Nation’s 12 community types. We analyzed the results of a recent survey from the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press and found that his rating looks very different in different places.

Strongholds and weak spots

More than 10 months into his presidency, Obama has strongholds in more-urban areas, as he has from the start. The counties with America’s biggest cities – the places we call the “Industrial Metropolis” – support him at extremely high rates. More than 70 percent here “approve of the way Barack Obama is handling his job as president.”

Obama also does well in the “Monied ’Burbs” – wealthy, largely suburban counties, where his approval rating is more than 58 percent. And in three other community types his rating tops 60 percent: “Immigration Nation” (heavily Hispanic), “Minority Central” (heavily African-American), and “Military Bastions” (near military bases). The finding for that last group, however, is derived from a small sample of survey respondents.

In two other community types, there were not enough respondents to draw statistically significant conclusions: “Tractor Country” and “Mormon Outposts.” But our contacts with people in those places suggest they are strongly opposed to Obama.

**Weak foreign policy positions hurt Obama’s standing**

**STAROBIN 2 – 1 – 10**  National Journal Contributor

[Paul Starobin, Obama's Weakened Position: What Does It Mean For U.S. Foreign Policy?, http://security.nationaljournal.com/2010/02/obamas-weakened-position-what.php]

President Obama is in a rough political patch with the apparent demise of his top domestic priority, universal health care; with the loss of a 60-vote Democratic supermajority in the Senate; with improved Republican prospects for the midterm elections in November; and with his once sky-high approval rating now below 50 percent.

So, what does his weakened position mean for his handling of foreign affairs and for the tack that allies, rivals and outright enemies take toward the U.S.? With his focus on "jobs, jobs, jobs," Obama devoted a grand total of nine minutes to national security issues in his State of the Union address. Does this suggest less activism on the foreign policy front? If so, Obama would be going against the historical pattern, which suggests that a president weakened on the domestic front is likely to become more energetic in foreign affairs as the realm that is less subject to congressional and political control at home (Bill Clinton and Richard Nixon are examples).

In any case, what is the best course for Obama at this juncture? Should he try to improve his standing at home with a prestige-enhancing triumph abroad? Are there such opportunities out there -- for example, a bold deal with the Russians on nuclear disarmament, a tough package of sanctions against Iran, a breakthrough on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? Are the Russians, the Chinese, the Pakistanis, the Iranians, the Indians, the Japanese, the Europeans, likelier to be tougher or more accommodating with Obama facing troubles at home? (Or to put it another way: Do any of them want to see Obama fail?) Is a weakened Obama in danger of being seen as another Jimmy Carter -- that is, as an ineffectual president not likely to serve another term? (The analyst Les Gelb of the Council on Foreign Relations is already likening Obama to Carter.) Is his damaged domestic position likely to matter in any way to Al Qaeda and other anti-U.S. Islamic militant groups?

Any and all speculations on this theme are welcome.

# **Internal Link: Republican Majority Blocks Immigration**

## **Republicans won’t vote for immigration – midterms victories for them ensures an end to reform**

Oddis 7/1/10 (Michelle Oddis, Assistant Managing Editor at Human Events, “Republicans Blast Obama’s Immigration Speech,” July 1, 2010, accessed from http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=37879 on July 1, 2010.)

President Obama blamed Republicans Thursday for the impasse on immigration reform, as he called the new Arizona law “divisive” and claimed the border was “more secure today than at any time in the past 20 years.” Republicans responded quickly after Obama’s first major address on immigration reform, saying the speech was heavy on rhetoric and short on specifics. “This was the patented Obama policy speech,” Rep. Dan Burton (R.-Ind.) told HUMAN EVENTS. “Short on details and long on emotions. We’ve been through this process with the President before. Today, he calls for bipartisanship, but tomorrow he’ll link arms with Speaker Pelosi and try to ram amnesty down our throats.” Rep. Rob Bishop (R.-Utah) said, “It is clear to me, more now than ever before, that President Obama and his administration just don’t get it. Today’s remarks, which were heavy on rhetoric and light on substance, don’t inspire confidence that this administration has a concrete plan, or even the desire, to achieve full operational control of the border.” In his speech Obama said he was “ready to move forward” with immigration reform. "But the fact is, without bipartisan support, as we had just a few years ago, we cannot solve this problem.” “Reform that brings accountability to our immigration system cannot pass without Republican votes. That is the political and mathematical reality," said Obama. Rep. John Shadegg (R.-Ariz.) said that this is just not true. “This statement on its face is ridiculous,” Shagegg said. “He didn’t seem to feel that way when it came to healthcare. He didn’t give a darn how Republicans voted.” The bi-partisanship of “a few years ago” that Obama spoke of, was a bill by Sen. John McCain (R.-Ariz.). But a majority of Americans opposed the McCain-Kennedy measure and many dubbed it the amnesty bill. “John McCain and the 11 Republicans who were on board with that… I think they learned their lesson in 2007, that it was incredibly unpopular among voters,” said Ira Mehlman, National Media Director of the Federation for American Immigration Reform. “The 2007 bill was defeated because there was an uprising from grassroots and the public simply said, ‘No, we will not accept this,’” said Mehlman. Rep. Bishop said that the one issue that transcends party lines is border security. “Trying to reform immigration policies before we secure the border is foolish. If your bathtub is overflowing, you don’t deal first with the water already in the tub. You first turn off the faucet to stop the flow. We can’t solve the immigration issue without stopping the flow by first securing the border,” said Bishop. In his speech Obama said the Southern border is “more secure today than at any time in the past 20 years.” “He has been misinformed,” responded Bishop. “In reality, the porous Southern border is one of the greatest threats to our national security and it’s well known that things are getting worse, not better. Apprehensions may be down but it’s widely known that it’s not due to less trafficking and smuggling, but rather to our inability to adequately capture the criminals as they enter the U.S.” Obama called the controversial new Arizona illegal-immigration law “ill conceived” and “divisive,” saying it made America streets more dangerous. Rep. Burton, author of the “No Sanctuary for Illegals Act,” said, “While I doubt that an endangered Democratic caucus wants to rock the boat this summer, if they move forward with an amnesty initiative, Republicans are ready to counter with better plans that focus on law enforcement on the border and in the business place.” Melhman similarly said, “A lot of Democrats out there would be happy not to have to stick their necks out there on this. There are a lot of Democrats who were elected in 2006 and 2008 that come from districts that used to be held by Republicans, the purple districts, I’m not sure that this is what they want to take home to their voters” Rep. Peter Roskam (R.-Ill.) told HUMAN EVENTS that the disappointment in Obama’s approach is his lack of recognition of how generous the United States has been to immigrants. “This notion that somehow the United States and the American taxpayers haven’t been generous towards immigrants is a non-starter. Ultimately this is all politics and they are not serious about moving a bill.”

# Internal Link: Republican Majority Blocks Obama’s Agenda

## GOP majority would destroy Obama’s agenda

**WITT 5 – 10** JD., Prof of Government and Politics. The Examiner’s “Political Buzz” Columnist and Election MonitorRyan Witt (5/10/10, " Taking back the House, an analysis of the **Republican**s' chances in the 2010 ... ", http://www.examiner.com/x-5738-Political-Buzz-Examiner%7Ey2010m5d10-Taking-back-the-House-an-analysis-of-the-**Republican**s-chances-in-the-2010-midterm-elections)

We are now nearly only six months away from the 2010 midterm elections. Republicans have been waiting for this day every since their disastrous defeats in 2008. Democrats now dominate both Houses of Congress and the White House. The most important political battle of 2010 will be over the House of Representatives. President Obama has another two years before he is up for reelection and the Senate is seen as a long shot for Republicans. However, every U.S. House Representative is up for election, and so Republicans have a much better shot at the House. Here is a breakdown of where things stand right now.

There are 435 seats in the House. Currently Democrats hold 253 seats with Republicans holding 178 seats. There are 4 vacancies. It takes a majority of 218 to to gain control of the House of Representatives. Republicans will therefore need to gain 40 seats to gain a majority.

If Republicans were able to gain a majority they likely still will not be able to pass legislation. First, the Democrats will have at least 40 seats in the Senate with which they can filibuster. As Democrats found over the past year, the filibuster can be very difficult to overcome. Secondly, the President could veto any legislation passed by the House and Senate. It would take a 2/3rd vote to overcome a filibuster, and none of the current projections have Republicans gaining that many seats.

What Republicans could do with a majority is score political points. Investigations of the Obama administration and Democratic members of the House could be undertaken by the Republican majority. Hearings could be done, among other things, on allegations against Rep. Charlie Rangel (D-NY). The Republicans would have subpoena power with which they could force Obama administration to testify. Basically, imagine every Glenn Beck conspiracy theory getting serious consideration by a House committee with subpoena power.

Finally, the Republicans would have significantly more power over the budget if they gained control of the House. Every fiscal bill must first pass through the House. In the Senate, budget measures qualify for reconciliation which allows Democrats to win with merely 50 votes. Republicans would have significantly more power over what is in the budget if they could vote down the President's proposals. It is possible we could see another government shutdown along the lines of the President Clinton/Speaker Gingrich showdown of 1995.

# **\*\*\*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*\*\***

# **Impacts: Immigration Reform – Economy**

## **Undocumented workers key to economy and competitiveness; immigration reform will keep this workforce stable**

Auburn Journal 6/4/10 (News media source, “We need them,” June 4, 2010, accessed from http://my.auburnjournal.com/detail/151531.html on June 30, 2010.)

The Texas-based Perryman Group has published an in-depth study of the undocumented immigrant workforce in USA. It includes a sobering scenario of what would happen if the illegal workforce were suddenly deported. - For the US economy, the immediate negative effect of eliminating the undocumented immigrant workforce would mean $1.757 trillion in lost spending annually, $651.511 billion a year in lost output, and $8.1 million in lost jobs. - If all undocumented workers were suddenly removed from the workforce, a number of industries would face critical labor shortages and American citizens would have to be induced into the labor pool or provided incentives to take jobs far below their current education and skill levels. For the latter phenomenon to occur, substantial domestic wage escalation would likely be necessary, eroding North American competitiveness in global markets. - As the domestic workforce becomes older, larger and better educated, US production increasingly requires more low-skilled workers. In 1960 about 50% of men in this country who were not high school graduates joined this low-skilled labor force. That number is now less than 10%. Shortages in the low-skilled labor force are likely to continue to escalate. - There is clear evidence that undocumented workers are making contributions to the US economy that far exceed their cost in social benefits. Undocumented workers pay more in taxes overall than they receive in government benefits. - The amount of Social Security taxes alone paid by undocumented workers is $9 billion annually. Paycheck withholding collects federal tax from illegal workers, just as it does for legal workers. But undocumented workers can't collect the benefits they pay for. The Social Security Administration estimates that three-quarters of illegal workers pay taxes that contribute to the overall solvency of Social Security and Medicare. In 2005 (the last year for which figures are available) $9 billion in taxes was paid on $75 billion in wages from people who filed W2 forms with incorrect or mismatched data. This typically includes illegal immigrant workers who draw paychecks using fake names and SS numbers. The beneficial effect to Social Security is critical because most of that money is never claimed by the people who pay it. Instead, helps cover SS retirement checks to legal workers. (federal law prohibits paying Social Security to illegal immigrants). Any realistic immigration policy needs to recognize the inescapable reality that the resource represented by undocumented workers is, at least for the foreseeable future, an absolutely essential element of the modern US economy.

# **Impacts: Immigration Reform – Economy**

Top business leaders conclude immigration reform is key to reforming and rejuvenating the economy.

Breakthrough 6/25/10 (Human Rights organization, “Bloomberg leads U.S. corporations and cities to lobby for immigration reform,” June 25, 2010, accessed from http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/6163540-bloomberg-leads-us-corporations-and-cities-to-lobby-for-immigration-reform on June 28, 2010.)

It seems fitting that New York City, the crux of the U.S.’s rich immigrant history is leading a new direction in the movement for immigration reform.In what promises to be an important step towards re-framing the immigration debate in this country, New York City Mayor Bloomberg has formed a coalition of top executives and city mayors to put pressure on Congress and steer the nation towards immigration reform. On Thursday the 24th, Mayor Bloomberg announced the Partnership for a New American Economy, a coalition that includes the chief executives of major corporations such as News Corp., Hewlett-Packard, Disney, Boeing, Morgan Stanley, Marriott International and the NY Mets, and the mayors of Los Angeles, Philadelphia, San Antonio and Phoenix.The coalition argues that immigration reform is the key solution to repairing and rejuvenating the economy. By conducting polls, funding public educational campaigns, convening forums and publishing studies that demonstrate the ways in which a healthy economy thrives on immigrant workers, the coalition aims to “break the legislative stalemate that has taken over Congress.” Rupert Murdoch, a central member of the partnership and chairman of the News Corporation, who is also a naturalized immigrant from Australia, summed up the argument for the New York Times-This country can and must enact new immigration policies that fulfill our employment needs, provide a careful pathway to legal status for undocumented residents, and end illegal immigration….American ingenuity is a product of the openness and diversity of this society.The CEO’s who have signed on to the partnership released statements about how their companies rely on immigrants. They mentioned the constant challenge they face in acquiring visas for professional workers whom they want to hire. Walt Disney chairman and CEO, Robert Iger said that the country’s immigrant population was “our great strength as a nation, and …critical for continued economic growth.” His statement went on to say, “To remain competitive in the 21st century, we need effective immigration reform that invites people to contribute to our shared success by building their own American dream.”While stressing the importance of securing the national borders and preventing further entry of undocumented immigrants, the coalition urges Congress to create a path to legalization for the 12 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the U.S.

# **Impacts: Immigration Reform – Agriculture Sector**

## **Comprehensive immigration reform is bipartisan and will help aid the agricultural sector.**

Schierer 5/10/10 (Ben Schierer, staff writer for AgWeek, “Immigration reform and agriculture,” May 10, 2010, Accessed from <http://www.agweek.com/event/article/id/16325/> on June 29, 2010)

President Obama and members of Congress from both political parties recently have expressed their desire to pursue comprehensive immigration reform. Sens. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., published an opinion piece March 19 in the Washington Post outlining a framework for bipartisan immigration reform. Comprehensive reform is critical to American agriculture as growers across the nation continue to struggle to find the skilled workers they need to successfully run their farms and feed our country. The proposed outline from Schumer and Graham is a reasonable, bipartisan proposal, and as the authors put it, “tough but fair.” It relies on three key components — strengthened commitments to enforcement on the border and in the workplace; a workable program for allowing temporary workers for American agriculture and other businesses that need a legal and reliable source of labor; and a viable solution for the millions of immigrants currently in the United States who are living and working outside of the rule of law. All of these components are essential for effective reform, but the most important to American agricultural producers are the provisions for a practical and usable temporary guestworker program. This piece of the puzzle often is misunderstood and overlooked by the general public when considering the need for immigration reform.

## **Only comprehensive immigration reform can replenish the lost workers and fix the agricultural sector.**

Allen 10 (James S. Allen, President of the NY Apple Association, “Immigration Reform Critical to State’s farms,” April 6, 2010 from http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=918764&category=opinion on June 30 2010.)

Now that health care reform is on the books, it's time for Congress to get on with immigration reform, especially as it relates to the needs of agriculture. Specifically, the apple industry, along with most other New York commodity groups, is looking for immediate consideration from Rep. Scott Murphy, D-Glens Falls, and Rep. Paul Tonko, D-Amsterdam, of the Agricultural Job Opportunity, Benefits and Security Act. The bill proposes to create a stable guest worker program to allow migrant laborers to continue to work in our orchards and other farms throughout their districts. We're grateful Sen. Charles Schumer and Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand have already signed on to the Senate version of the bill. Several members of New York's House delegation are supporting the measure as well. But we need Rep. Murphy and Rep. Tonko, who collectively represent close to 3,000 acres of apple orchards. In order to bring this bill to the floor, their support with a signature is critical, especially too since Murphy sits on the House Agriculture Committee. The legislation restructures and reforms the federal government's H-2A temporary agricultural worker program by substantially streamlining the program's administrative procedures. The program currently is awash in red tape and extremely difficult for farmers to navigate. Over the past three years, immigration raids throughout the state have left apple growers with tremendous uncertainty over their labor supply. These raids would cease if there were a solid immigration policy coming out of Washington. The AgJOBS legislation will ensure labor-intensive industries like agriculture have access to a legal and predictable supply of skilled labor. New York farmers do not support illegal workers, they support legal immigration. Our preference would be to have local folks working in our orchards. And many do. In fact, apple growers are required to recruit local workers as much as possible before we can access foreign workers through the H2A program. The problem is that there are not enough local workers available to meet the demand in the fall. It takes more than 8,000 workers to harvest more than 3.4 billion apples in New York. Even in this down economy, most domestic workers are not interested in physical labor and don't have the necessary skills to do the work anyway. So we are wholly reliant on a work force of foreign laborers to get the apples off the trees each fall. Meanwhile, consumers have a major stake in this issue. Without immigration reform, many of our farms will go out of business. That will lead to higher food costs, lesser quality and lower regulatory standards. New York farms are the backbone to the local economy across the state. We urge the public and our members of Congress to support us in this fight. This is a fight to not only protect local food production but also to help preserve the overall agricultural heritage and economy of upstate New York.

# **Impacts: Immigration Reform – Agriculture Sector**

## **The agricultural sector is suffering due to crackdowns on farms, reforming immigration will reinvigorate the sector.**

Rathke 5/10/10 (Lisa Rathke, staff writer for Businessweek, “US Farmers: Immigration Reform needed for workers,” May 10, 2010, accessed from http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9FJROHO0.htm on June 30, 2010.)

Even during the recession, foreign workers harvested vegetables, milked cows and picked apples on many U.S. farms, doing work that farmers say Americans don't want to do. Most Americans shy away from jobs such as hand-picking tomatoes or cutting cabbage because the work is seasonal, physically tough, out in the elements and often in remote areas, farmers say. To get the jobs done, many farmers hire foreign workers, including some who are illegal, and they say a crackdown on illegal immigration combined with changes to a visa program for temporary workers could make it even harder for them to find reliable employees. Farmers want Congress to pass an "AgJobs" bill that would enable those who have worked in U.S. agriculture for at least 150 days in the previous two years to get some kind of legal status. They also say the visa program for temporary workers needs to be simplified. Without those changes, some farmers say they may have to cut back production because of a shortage of reliable labor.

# **Impacts: Immigration Reform – Competitiveness**

## **Reform of US immigration policies will increase competitiveness by attracting skilled individuals.**

Siskind 6/13/10 (Greg Siskind, J.D. from the University of Chicago, “Brain Gain,” June 13, 2010, accessed from http://www.ilw.com/articles/2010,0614-siskind.shtm on June 29, 2010)

The Brookings Institute's Darrell West has authored a new book entitled Brain Gain: Rethinking US Immigration Policy which makes the case that comprehensive immigration reform is critical to keeping the US competitive in the 21st century global economy. From the Brookings description of the new work: Many of America’s greatest artists, scientists, inventors, educators, and entrepreneurs have come from abroad. Rather than suffering from the “brain drain” of talented and educated individuals emigrating, the United States has benefited greatly over the years from the “brain gain” of immigration. These gifted immigrants have engineered advances in energy, information technology, international commerce, sports, arts, and culture. To stay competitive, the United States must institute more of an open-door policy to attract unique talents from other nations. Yet Americans resist such a policy despite their own immigrant histories and the substantial social, economic, intellectual, and cultural benefits of welcoming newcomers. Why? In Brain Gain, Darrell West asserts that perception or “vision” is one reason reform in immigration policy is so politically difficult. Public discourse tends to emphasize the perceived negatives. Fear too often trumps optimism and reason. And democracy is messy, with policy principles that are often difficult to reconcile. The seeming irrationality of U.S. immigration policy arises from a variety of thorny and interrelated factors: particularistic politics and fragmented institutions, public concern regarding education and employment, anger over taxes and social services, and ambivalence about national identity, culture, and language.

## **Full scale immigration reform will bring overseas talent to the US and keep us competitive.**

Smith 5/11/10 (Richard Herman Robert L. Smith, staff writer for the Providence Journal, May 11, 2010, accessed from http://www.projo.com/opinion/columnists/content/CT\_immi11\_05-11-10\_ANI8L98\_v15.4084ea5.html on June 29, 2010.)

With Arizona imposing the toughest immigration laws in the land, and right-wing radio hosts calling for snipers at the border, President Obama says it’s time to take another crack at comprehensive immigration reform. His call to renew the immigration debate no doubt leaves many Americans thinking, “Here we go again,” exhausted as we all are from the national brawl over health-care reform. Goodbye public option, hello amnesty? But there lies a path to immigration reform that could both transform an outdated system and win the speedy approval of most Americans. The seeds of the solution lie in the reform bill being hammered out in the offices of U.S. Senators Lindsey Graham (R.-S.C.) and Charles Schumer (D.-N.Y.). Their package of proposals includes a provocative idea that has not been getting the attention it deserves. The senators call for a dash of high-skill immigration reform. More specifically, their plan would offer fast-track visas to immigrants with rare talent and ingenuity. They would, in other words, extend a wider welcome to men and women most likely to enhance America’s competitiveness and create jobs. Now that’s an idea a skeptical public might not bother to oppose. Oh, there are other far-reaching and surely controversial proposals in their bill, according to what the senators have so far divulged. Tamper-proof national ID cards. A mea culpa from immigrants who entered illegally. Harsher sanctions for employers who willingly hire them. But the high-skill stuff is the game changer. So powerful and sensible is high-skill immigration, it might as well inspire its own reform bill. Graham and Schumer might keep that in mind if comprehensive change proves impossible in a poisonous political climate. To welcome high-skill immigrants is to promote a lucrative and little-know phenomenon. While the country was preoccupied with illegal immigrants, legal immigrants were building the New Economy. The founders of Google, Intel, Yahoo, Sun Microsystems, AST Research, eBay and YouTube are all largely immigrants. New Americans are behind more than half of the high-tech companies in Silicon Valley and about a quarter of the biotech companies in New England. In a global economy fueled by technology and innovation, high-skill immigrants have become America’s competitive edge.

# **Impacts: Immigration Reform – Competitiveness**

## **Bad immigration policies hold back the US; Comprehensive immigration reform gets the nation back on track in the global scene.**

Giovagnoli 6/22/10 (Mary Giovagnoli, Director of the Immigration Policy Center, “Comprehensive Immigration Reform Is More Than a Piece of Legislation,” June 22, 2010, accessed from http://www.alternet.org/immigration/147285/comprehensive\_immigration\_reform\_is\_more\_than\_a\_piece\_of\_legislation on June 30, 2010.)

As the Immigration Policy Center has consistently pointed out, comprehensive immigration reform is the solution to a problem that is far more pervasive than most Americans (still) realize. Our broken immigration system contributes to our stalled economy, undermines our reputation in the world, costs us billions of dollars in unworkable enforcement only strategies, and chips away at the moral values of the country. The problem is so big, in fact, that no one bill will ever fix all the pieces at once. But a systematic overhaul, one that includes legalization for the roughly 11 million people already here, a reduction in immigration backlogs that keep families apart, a flexible and fair system for bringing in new workers, and reasonable enforcement would create a solid base on which to build an immigration system that helps the country succeed in the 21st century.

## US ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS KEY TO LEADERSHIP

Khalilzad, 1995 (The Washington Quarterly; Lexis)

The United States is unlikely to preserve its military and technological dominance if the U.S. economy declines seriously. In such an environment, the domestic economic and political base for global leadership would diminish and the United States would probably incrementally withdraw from the world, become inward-looking, and abandon more and more of its external interests. As the United States weakened, others would try to fill the Vacuum.  To sustain and improve its economic strength, the United States must maintain its technological lead in the economic realm. Its success will depend on the choices it makes. In the past, developments such as the agricultural and industrial revolutions produced fundamental changes positively affecting the relative position of those who were able to take advantage of them and negatively affecting those who did not. Some argue that the world may be at the beginning of another such transformation, which will shift the sources of wealth and the relative position of classes and nations. If the United States fails to recognize the change and adapt its institutions, its relative position will necessarily worsen.

## US leadership is essential to prevent global nuclear exchange.

Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND, The Washington Quarterly, Spring 1995

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.

# Impacts: Economic Decline Causes War

## Economic decline risks global great power wars:

Mead 09 [Walter Russell, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, New Republic, February 4, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2]

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, **so has war.** The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? **The United States** may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we **may still have to fight.**

## Economic decline causes nuclear & biological war.

**Kerpen 08** [Oct. 28 policy director for Americans for Prosperity, Phil, From Panic to Depression?, <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=OWQ3ZGYzZTQyZGY4ZWFiZWUxNmYwZTJiNWVkMTIxMmU=>]

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors — not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale.

# **Impacts: Republicans Bad – Laundry List**

## **A Republican majority will guarantee a halt to any global progress on a laundry list of issues**

Cesca 6/30/10 (Bob Cesca, News Media Producer, “Listen All Y'all, It's a Republican Sabotage,” June 30, 2010, accessed from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bob-cesca/listen-all-yall-its-a-rep\_b\_631380.html on July 1, 2010.)

So how does this sabotage play out? It begins with the cynical exploitation of the angry, screeching Republican base. Unlike the Democrats during a Republican congressional majority, it's clear that Republican voters generally don't care whether their lawmakers actually attain any legislative accomplishments short of blocking the other guys. In other words, there's no political demand from the GOP base to actually pass anything resembling a conservative piece of legislation. Consequently, there's no need to barter or compromise with the Democrats. All they have to do is to block, and they'll use any means necessary to do so, be it self-contradiction or utter ridiculousness. Speaking of which, we have Tom Coburn (R-OK) who insists he's a fiscal hawk beating the "stop spending" drum, voting against unemployment benefits and filibustering jobs bills, while, at the same, time voting to continue paying $35 billion in corporate welfare to Big Oil every year. Yesterday, Coburn and Mitch McConnell, blocked the Homeless Women Veterans and Homeless Veterans With Children Act. Why? "Stop spending!" of course. So the president has no choice but to zigzag his agenda through this Senate with those arcane filibuster rules, and in an era when the Republicans are given a free pass from their dittoheads and tea party hooples to scrap the GOP legislative agenda in lieu of obstructing the economic recovery (among other things). They're counting on independents and voters in both parties to not grasp the intricate realities of the Senate. The Republican-enabling Conservadem senators often stymie the Democratic majorities, and the complicated filibuster/cloture procedures grant lopsided power to the minority party. They're counting on the most simplistic and obvious reaction: the Democrats are the majority party so they should be able to do... something. And since they can't, maybe the Republicans can. That's precisely how the Republicans might end up winning. But if anyone believes a Republican majority in Congress will suddenly make things better, they're absolutely mistaken in so many ways. At least now, Congress and the president are able to pass reforms that will actually help real people regardless of party or politics. These achievements are often compromised and watered-down (how can they not be with this Senate?), and we might not agree with the motives of every line item, but despite how it's being painted in various circles, there hasn't been an era of significant reform like this one in generations. Yet, if the Republicans manage to take the House or Senate or both, not only will Congress "stop spending," but literally nothing will get done. Nothing. Except for endless investigations of the administration by zealots like Darrell Issa.

# Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change Module 1/2

## The Democrats must keep their majority to pass legislation to combat global warming in 2011

**HIGH PLAINS JOURNAL 1 – 29 – 10**

**High Plains Journal** **1/29** (Sara Wyant, 1/29/10, " How a topsy-turvy political world got turned upside down again ", google news)

Cap-and-trade legislation also seems destined for retooling, perhaps in favor of a much broader energy bill focused on job creation. "We will likely not do climate change this year but will do an energy bill instead," said Sen. Byron Dorgan during a recent speech. The North Dakota Democrat says he supports "fuel economy standard increases, moving toward electric drive transportation systems, renewable energy production, modern transmission grid, conservation, and efficiency" as part of U.S. energy policy. Dorgan's assessment is that "In the aftermath of a very, very heavy lift on health care, I think it is unlikely that the Senate will turn next to the very complicated and very controversial subject of cap-and-trade climate change kind of legislation."

Fight, fight, fight

Several Democratic Party members expect the president to learn from the recent elections and hit the "reset" button on his far-reaching agenda. Independent voters are fleeing their party in droves. To get them back in the fold and re-energized, they expect him to move more toward the middle, focusing on bread and butter issues like jobs and the economy, just as Bill Clinton did after the Republican takeover of the House and Senate in 1994. Yet, many other Democrats are pushing President Obama to charge ahead with a very liberal agenda--despite the recent Senate loss in Massachusetts and losses in gubernatorial races in New Jersey and Virginia last fall. It's now or never, they reason, and if Democrats lose their majorities in 2010, it will be impossible to pass health care reform the following year. They want a fight to the finish, even if there is barely anyone left to take credit.

## The U.S. must act – if congress takes steps the rest of the globe will help us solve global warming

**PEGG 08** Staff Writer for the Environmental News Service

[J.R., “U.S. Lawmakers Urged to Lead Global Warming Battle” The Environmental News Wire February 1 http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/feb2008/2008-02-01-10.asp]

The head of the United Nations scientific climate panel spoke with U.S. lawmakers Wednesday, encouraging them lead to the world in cooling the overheated planet. "We really don't have a moment to lose," said Rajendra Pachauri, chair of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC. The massive reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to avoid serious disruptions to Earth's climate system are impossible without U.S. leadership, Dr. Pachauri told members of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. "It is essential for the U.S. to take action," said Pachauri, who also spoke at a public briefing Wednesday afternoon convened by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. The United States is responsible for some 22 percent of current greenhouse gas emissions. Although China recently emerged as the leading emitter, U.S. emissions are four times greater than China's on a per capita basis. Despite broad criticism from across the world, President George W. Bush and his administration have rejected mandatory limits on greenhouse gases. And many U.S. lawmakers remain reluctant to commit their nation to deep cuts without similar obligations from China, India and other developing nations. The IPCC chairman said that view is misplaced. "The rest of the world looks to the U.S. for leadership [but] the perception round the world is that the U.S. has not been very active in this area," Pachauri said, adding that strong action would "undoubtedly reestablish confidence in U.S. leadership on critical global issues." Pachauri presented the House committee with an overview of the key messages contained in recent reports issued by the IPCC panel, which shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with former U.S. Vice President Al Gore. The IPCC includes some 2,500 scientists from across the United States and around the world. The panel does no original research but rather assesses the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change. A native of India, Dr. Pachauri is an economist and engineer who has served on the Board of Directors of the Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., a Fortune 500 company, and on the Economic Advisory Council to the Prime Minister of India. He has taught at several American universitites, including the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Pachauri told lawmakers that greenhouse gas emissions must peak in 2015 - and drop 25 to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 - if the world is to keep global average temperatures from rising above 2.4 degrees Celsius. Without such restraint, the world faces a variety of potential troubling humanitarian and environmental problems. Pachauri cited concern over rising sea levels, the increased frequency of drought, heat waves and severe storms, as well as threats to agriculture and adverse impacts on the environment. Committee chair Ed Markey, a Massachusetts Democrat, said the work of the IPCC "highlights our moral obligation to reduce global warming pollution and prepare for those impacts that have become unavoidable." It is time for U.S. lawmakers to ensure the nation is a "leader, not a laggard" in the fight against global warming, Markey said. But it is unclear how serious U.S. lawmakers are about tackling global warming - only five of the nine Democrats on the panel attended the hearing and none of the committee's six Republicans were present.

# Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change Module 2/2

**Global Warming risks extinction of the planet**

**Tickell, 8-11-2008** , Climate Researcher

(Oliver, The Gaurdian, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

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

# **Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change**

## **Republican majority will stop passage of climate change and further attempts at it for at least two years.**

Walsh 6/29/10 (Bryan Walsh, reporter for Time Magazine, “Hope Seems to Dim for Cap and Trade,” June 29, 2010, accessed from http://ecocentric.blogs.time.com/2010/06/29/hope-seems-to-dim-for-cap-and-trade/?xid=rss-topstories on July 1, 2010.)

Would a weak climate bill even be worth passing? At this point, the likelihood of a Republican resurgence in November—which could put climate and energy legislation out of reach for at least two years—would make many environmentalists take whatever they can get. Indeed, mainstream green groups like the Environmental Defense Fund—which has led the way on cap-and-trade—released statements praising the President for his strong leadership on climate and energy, which frankly seems a little strong. But a weak bill could provide even less revenue to fund the research and development needed to innovate tomorrow's energy solutions. As Andrew Revkin points out over at Dot Earth, lowering the price of renewable energy and energy efficiency is the other part of the carbon equation—and that's being left behind by concerns over the deficit and simple lack of political will. Nothing that happened today in the West Wing seems likely to change that.

# Impacts: Republicans Bad – Climate Change – U.S. Solves

**US action solves – creates a global act & delay makes it worse**

**GUARDIAN 9 – 16 – 09**

http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/sep/16/**senate**-delay-**climate**-change-legislation

Todd Stern, the state department envoy, acknowledged as much last week, telling Congress: "Nothing the United States can do is more important for the international negotiation process than passing robust, comprehensive clean energy legislation as soon as possible."

There is also widespread concern a delay to next year would make it even more difficult for the Senate to take up difficult legislation, such as climate change, before congressional elections in November.

**US action key to global action**

**AP 9 - 16 - 09**

http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hdbnLCgcJEg0cdgYQvCnxJqMlOqQD9AOKO080

Industry, economic and environmental groups are making a final push to influence a **climate** bill that may go before the **Senate** within weeks.

Investors managing more than $13 trillion in assets called for new global emissions laws Wednesday, illustrating how the issue has divided even groups that traditionally have opposed new curbs.

Speaking at the International Investor Forum on **Climate** Change, Lord Nicholas Stern, among Britain's most influential economists, said the global debate over curbing greenhouse gases has reached a critical point.

If the U.S. does not pass substantial **climate** legislation, few believe other nations, particularly developing countries, will cut emissions on their own.

"We have to act now," said Stern, chair of the Grantham Research Institute on **Climate** Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics. "Some things you can postpone. This is not one of them."

Stern three years ago issued an influential report on the global costs of **climate** change. Greenhouse gases from burning coal and other fossil fuels are blamed for global warming.

He supports the cap-and-**trade** system that was passed in the U.S. House in June. The new cap-and-**trade** rules would, for the first time, place national limits on the amount of carbon dioxide that companies can release into the atmosphere.

The eventual cost to businesses and consumers is at the heart of what has become an intense informational and lobbying campaign on both sides. Environmentalists and some money managers see cap-and-**trade** as the best way to control carbon emissions while oil refiners warn the House bill could make foreign petroleum products cheaper and lead to even more imports.

How the U.S. will proceed on **climate** change legislation was a major topic at the World Economic Forum in China last week, and it is expected to be discussed in coming days when President Barack **Obama** speaks at a ministerial meeting of the U.N. General Assembly.

Todd Stern, the U.S. State Department's special envoy for **climate** change, said last week that it's crucial for the **Senate** to pass a **climate** bill. Doing so would give the U.S. the "credibility and leverage" needed to convince other countries like China and India to cut their pollution.

# \*\*\*\*\*Affirmative Answers\*\*\*\*\*

# \*\*\*Link Answers\*\*\*

## Can’t predict the midterms: it’s way too far off

**Cost 2010** [Jay, Real Clear Politics, April 29, “Predicting the 2010 Midterm Election Results”

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/horseraceblog/2010/04/predicting\_the\_2010\_midterm\_el\_1.html

Coleman's argument has theoretical merit, but it runs into the same data problem as we've been discussing: **too few observations for really solid testing**. What I find most interesting about this assertion is that, after the waves of 1974, 1982, and 1994, electoral prognosticators were not sharpening their models, but revisiting core assumptions! To summarize, here is where we are. In the last sixty years there have been only a handful of midterm elections, and even fewer can be considered waves. The midterms before the 1970s were so different in terms of context it's hard to derive much useful information from them. The midterm of 1974 was the product of a singular event in American history. The midterms of 1982 and 1994 caught everybody off guard. And the midterm of 2006 might not be relevant because the Republicans are different than the Democrats. So, I don't really know what will happen. Are the Democrats going to lose seats in November? Almost certainly. Are they going to lose "a lot" of seats? Probably - the macro trends generally point in that direction, and we do know enough to get an approximate sense of how things will play out. Is it going to be seat losses in the 20-40 seat range, 40-60 range, or 60+ range? Nobody knows yet. I understand that people want to see into the future. Lord knows I do. **Analysts are already working hard to satisfy this demand by proffering all sorts of arguments. Their assertions are useful - but only to a point. I've come to believe that congressional elections are a poorly understood phenomenon, and I would encourage you to be a cautious consumer of predictive punditry**.

## Turn - The public supports a less militarily aggressive foreign policy

Christopher **Preble 2009** (Dir., Foreign Policy Studies, Cato Institute), THE POWER PROBLEM: HOW AMERICAN MILITARY DOMINANCE MAKES US LESS SAFE, LESS PROSPEROUS, AND LESS FREE, , 133-134.

If the American people were given the choice, they would almost surely choose a different course. Tufts University Professor Daniel Drezner observes, "**Most Americans**, on most issues, **articulate** what George W. Bush characterized as **a 'humble' foreign policy** during the 2000 campaign. **They want a prudent foreign policy based on security against attacks and threats to domestic well-being**. In polls, **Americans consistently reject hegemony in favor of burden sharing**. In a survey conducted by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs in July 2006, 75 percent of respondents believed that the United States "should do its share to solve world problems together with other countries" and **only 10 percent wanted the United States to "remain the preeminent world leader in solving international problems**." By a similar margin, respondents agreed with the proposition that "The U.S. is playing the role of world policeman more than it should be." Bruce Stokes and Andrew Kohut of the Pew Research Center point out in their book America against the World that since the end of the Cold War, "**no more than 13 percent of Americans have said the United States should be the single most important leader in the world."**

# **Link Answers: Democrats Oppose Military Presence**

Widespread shift in Democrat mindset indicate that they oppose increasing military presence.

Nichols 6/15/10 (John Nichols, Political correspondent for The Nation, “A State Democratic Party Tells Congress: Reject More War Spending,” June 15, 2010, accessed from http://www.thenation.com/blog/state-democratic-party-tells-congress-reject-more-war-spending on July 1, 2010.)

Working with Progressive Democrats of America, anti-war delegates to the state convention of the Wisconsin Democratic Party passed a floor resolution urging Congress to block Obama's "emergency" proposal to spend an addition $33 billion to maintain the pay for the U.S. military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. So it is that, in one a state where grassroots Democrats in a state that provided earlier and enthusiastic support for Barack Obama's presidential run, members of the president's own party are saying "no" to Obama's plan to surge more troops and tax dollars into Afghanistan. "This is a major shift in thinking on the part of a lot of the Dem party base, who only a year ago were refusing to oppose the war in Afghanistan, arguing that we needed to support President Obama and his plans for escalation of the war," says Steve Carlson, a veteran peace activist and PDA organizer. PDA and other groups are working this year within state Democratic parties around the country to generate resolutions and activism against expanding the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Carlson and other activist are now contacting Democrats in Wisconsin's congressional delegation -- including some, such as Senator Russ Feingold and House members Tammy Baldwin, Gwen Moore and Steve Kagen, and Dave Obey, who have anti-war records or have made anti-war statements, and others, such as Senator Herb Kohl and Congressman Ron Kind, who have been war backers -- to "tell them the news" that their state party opposes steering more money toward the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. In addition to opposing the supplemental, the Wisconsin party resolution urged members of the state's congressional delegation to co-sponsor Florida Congressman Alan Grayson's "The War Is Making You Poor Act," which would have the Pentagon prosecute the wars with the $549 billion dollar base budget requested by President Obama and use the money the "emergency spending" the administration is seeking to cut taxes for working Americans.

# Internal Link Answers

## **Midterms will be a referendum on immigration – not the other way around : means immigration will never pass if it doesn’t before the elections**

Peck 6/25/10 (Adam Peck, Writer for Campusprogress.org, “In the Midterm Elections, Immigration Reform Will Be an Important Issue,” June25, 2010, accessed from http://www.campusprogress.org/news/5775/in-the-midterm-elections-immigration-reform-will-be-an-important-issue on July 2, 2010.)

“We’ve reached the milestone of 100-plus co-sponsors,” declared Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.) at a press conference yesterday in the Rayburn House Office Building for the Comprehensive Immigration Reform for America’s Security and Prosperity Act (CIR ASAP). A dozen of those co-sponsors joined Rep. Gutierrez on Thursday in outlining the need for CIR ASAP, citing a desire to keep families together, the need to ensure the country’s national security, and the economic impact that an estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants have on the country’s financial stability. “This is not an amnesty bill, it’s a responsible bill,” said Rep. Solomon Ortiz (D-Texas). CIR ASAP now stands with 102 co-sponsors, but remains off the legislative agenda in the House because Speaker Nancy Pelosi wants the Senate to act first, according to Gutierrez. The bill has languished in committee for months, and with a Supreme Court confirmation ahead that’s sure to stall most other legislative priorities, the possibility of addressing the bill before the November midterm elections is growing slimmer. The elections though may also serve as a referendum on immigration reform. The midterms should be used to demonstrate that “those that are anti-immigrant do not get elected,” said Rep. Grace Napolitano (D-Calif.) Several congressmen and women are facing tough reelection campaigns in states with large immigrant populations, and reform is likely going to be a huge campaign issue nationwide. “If there are members of Congress who do not support comprehensive immigration reform, do me a favor,” said Rep. José Serrano (D-N.Y). “Don’t advertise in Spanish.” The press conference was made up of a broad coalition of representatives. Leadership from the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the Congressional Progressive Caucus were all on hand to support the bill, as was representation from organizations pushing for reform, including Campus Progress. Rep. Mike Honda (D-Calif.), chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, noted that close to 10 percent of the undocumented are from Asia and the Pacific islands, while Rep. Gutierrez pointed out that 40 percent of all undocumented immigrants actually entered the country legally and simply outstayed their visas. “Immigrants are the fabric of America,” said Rep. Judy Chu (D-Calif.). Rep. Chu was one of a handful of congresspersons present who told stories of parents or relatives who immigrated to the United States. “We understand that we are an immigrant state,” added Rep. Jan Schakowski (D-Ill.) Immigration has been given a front seat since Arizona passed SB 1070, a bill that many view as the normalizing of racial profiling. “The Arizona law … is a call to action,” said Gutierrez. “It set a dangerous precedent.” Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-Texas) agreed. “We will have a domino effect of wrongness, of incorrectness, of hostility, of meanness,” she said, unless action is taken. And that’s not what America is about, said Ortiz. “We have been known as a humanitarian country. Let’s start acting like one.”

# \*\*\*Uniqueness Answers\*\*\*

# Uniqueness: Democrats Losing

## Democrats struggling to find an effective strategy

Stuart **Rothenberg, 2010** (Stuart Rothenberg is the editor of the Rothenberg Political Report and a columnist for the Roll Call) “President Obama, Welcome to Bush’s World” Roll Call June 29, 2010 Accessed from <http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.samford.edu/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?start=30&sort=BOOLEAN&format=GNBFI&risb=21_T9658320049> on June 30, 2010

The NBC News/Wall Street Journal survey's other poll numbers confirm the growing importance of the federal deficit in voters' minds, the low opinion that voters hold of both parties and the increased inclination of registered voters to support Republican candidates in the 2010 midterm elections. The poll also found the overall mood of the public continues to erode, with 29 percent of respondents saying the nation is "generally headed in the right direction" and 62 percent saying "things are off on the wrong track" - about where it was in December 2008, shortly after the presidential election. Democratic strategists are deluding themselves if they believe that passing a financial reform bill or a small-business measure will change the public's mood. It won't. Voters won't care by the time November rolls around unless their mood brightens. If bad news continues in our nation's newspapers and on the evening news, whether about jobs and the economy, foreign policy or the environment, the public will quickly discount Democratic achievements on Capitol Hill as ineffectual and insufficient. That's why Republicans were punished in 2006 and 2008, and it's why Democrats are headed for the same fate. The president needs some good news. Unfortunately for him and his party, time is running out, and tomorrow's news is largely beyond their control.

# Uniqueness: Democrats Losing – Oil Spill +Economy

## **Obama’s failure in resolving the oil spill and the economic downturn hurts the Democrats**

Zelizer 6/14/10 (Julian Zelizer, professor of history and public affairs at Princeton University, “For Obama, crisis may outweigh record,” June 14, 2010, from <http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/06/14/zelizer.crisis.leadership/index.html> on July 2, 2010)

A cartoonist for the San Diego Union-Tribune, Steve Breen, captured a big political challenge that President Obama is now confronting. The cartoon features four frames, each with a picture of the president. Over the first two frames, with the president barely smiling, he says, "No More Mr. Nice Guy" and "It's time I displayed some rage over the worst oil spill in U.S. history." The third frame shows him staring with a poker face. The restrained smile returns in the fourth frame, which reads, "Want to see it again?" As Democrats move into the 2010 midterm elections and start thinking about 2012, the administration is struggling to deal with two difficult crises, both of which have generated concerns about the president's response and the perceptions of him as a leader. The first is the oil leak in the Gulf, one of the greatest environmental catastrophes in American history. The second is an unemployment rate that continues to hover near 10 percent. The slow economic recovery has still failed to make a significant dent in the number of Americans who don't have jobs. American voters are frustrated and angry.

# Uniqueness: Democrats Losing

## Lack of immigration reform dooms dems in the midterms

**Cafferty 2010** (Jack, CNN, June 22, Will lack of immigration reform hurt Democrats in midterms? “http://caffertyfile.blogs.cnn.com/2010/06/22/lack-of-immigration-reform-hurt-democrats-in-midterms/

The debate over immigration reform has turned into a childish game of "he said - he said.” Republican Senator Jon Kyl says Pres. Obama told him in a one-on-one meeting, "if we secure the border, then you all won't have any reason to support comprehensive immigration reform. Kyl suggests border security is being held hostage by the Democrats for political reasons. The White House denies it, saying: "The president didn't say that and Senator Kyl knows it." But Senator Kyl is not backing down from his version of events. Actually, it almost doesn't matter who you believe in this. **The truth is that immigration reform is looking less and less likely to happen yet again - what a surprise. But this time inaction could cost Democrats dearly**. Take Senate Majority Leader Harry **Reid,** who **is facing an uphill battle for re-election** in Nevada. Reid **is now pandering to Latinos** there with Spanish TV ads. He **needs their vote** - and is still hoping they'll support him even though he promised immigration reform and now likely won't deliver. Democratic Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey tells Politico: "I don't necessarily think we're going to have a comprehensive bill this summer." One key Republican, Sen. Lindsey Graham, already backed away from bipartisan efforts for immigration reform. Meanwhile as Arizona moves forward with its own immigration law, the Obama justice department is thinking of suing the state. It's absolutely absurd. The federal government refuses to do anything about the illegal immigration crisis in this country. After all if they sealed the border, if they enforced their own laws against illegal immigration, Arizona wouldn't need such a law in the first place. Our government is badly broken.

# Uniqueness: Obama Approval Low

## **Obama has hit a low new in his approval ratings, heading towards Carter’s direction.**

Morrissey 6/18/10 (Ed Morrissey, writer for Hot Air, “Obama approval drops to 41% in Rasmussen tracking poll,” June 18, 2010, accessed from <http://hotair.com/archives/2010/06/18/obama-approval-drops-to-41-in-rasmussen-tracking-poll/> on July 2, 2010.)

On Wednesday, when Barack Obama hit a new low in his approval ratings in the Rasmussen daily tracking poll, I predicted a short-lived bump that would disappear by the weekend. The initial response to his Tuesday-night Oval Office speech would be seen on Thursday and today, and I expected a small increase in approval despite the delivery of a widely-panned address that many are now comparing to Jimmy Carter’s “malaise” speech. Yesterday, Obama’s job approval went from 42% to 43% — but today, it’s dropped even lower than on Wednesday: The Rasmussen Reports daily Presidential Tracking Poll for Friday shows that 25% of the nation’s voters Strongly Approve of the way that Barack Obama is performing his role as president. Forty-six percent (46%) Strongly Disapprove, giving Obama a Presidential Approval Index rating of -21 (see trends). These results are based upon nightly telephone interviews and reported on a three-day rolling average basis. As a result, more than two-thirds of the interviews for today’s update were conducted after the president’s speech to the nation. Tomorrow’s update will be the first based entirely upon interviews conducted after the speech. … Overall, 41% of voters say they at least somewhat approve of the president’s performance. That’s the lowest level of approval yet recorded for this president. Fifty-eight percent (58%) now disapprove. In other words, the Wednesday survey did improve his standing enough to raise his rating by a single percentage point — hardly moving the needle, but in a three-day rolling poll, an indication of something moving in the right direction. Yesterday’s survey, however, must have been bad enough to wipe out the gain from the previous day and be lower than the pre-speech polling. That indicates that the extended reaction to the speech has been especially bad. Rasmussen also released its weekly issue polling today, and it also looks bleak for the administration. Almost two-thirds (65%) believe government spending will go up, while only 11% believe taxes will go down. Obama only scores a 34% approval on the economy, with 68% of independents rating him only fair or poor, above the 59% of the general population giving Obama a thumbs-down. He also only gets a 38% job-approval rating on energy, and only 33% among independents. On national security, Obama gets a 38%, with 63% of independents disapproving. Obama may not be in Bush-approval territory, but that’s the direction he’s heading. One thing is certain: Obama can’t get a bounce any more just from giving a speech.

# Uniqueness: Obama Approval Low

## Obama and democrats are hurting in the polls

UPI (The United Press International), 2010 “Obama's approval rating down sharply” UPI June 29, 2010 Accessed from <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2010/06/29/Obamas-approval-rating-down-sharply/UPI-94591277853111/> on July 1, 2010

The standing of both President Obama and the U.S. Congress dropped sharply in the month of June, a poll released Tuesday indicated. Only 44 percent of those surveyed by Angus Reid Public Opinion approve of Obama's performance, while 50 percent disapprove. His approval rating dropped 4 percentage points since a similar poll in May. Those opposed to the president are also more likely to feel strongly about him, with 31 percent saying they strongly disapprove compared with 14 percent who strongly approve of his actions. There is a sharp partisan divide, with 81 percent of Republicans giving Obama a negative rating while 77 percent of Democrats remain positive. The number of independents disapproving of the president's performance rose 7 points to 60 percent while those approving dropped the same amount to 35 percent. Fewer than one in five, 18 percent, of those polled approve of Congress's actions. Even among Democrats, only 36 percent were positive, down 9 points. Angus Reid surveyed 1,001 adults in its Springboard America panel between on line between Friday and Sunday. The poll has a margin of error of 3.1 percentage points.

# Uniqueness: Republicans Winning – Enthusiasm

## GOP much more enthusiastic – will go to the polls and vote in huge numbers come november

**Drake July 1** [Bruce Poll Watch editor 2010 [“Bad News for Democrats: GOP Has Big Enthusiasm Advantage in Midterms” http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/07/01/bad-news-for-democrats-gop-has-big-enthusiasm-advantage-in-midt/]

**The GOP enthusiasm level is fueled by disapproval of President Obama**, with 62 percent of those in the "enthusiastic" category disapproving of the job he is doing and the same number describing their midterm decision as a vote against him. For **Republicans** in general, whether they are in the enthusiastic category or not, 54 percent say **their vote is aimed at showing opposition to Obama.** For the overall electorate, 28 percent describe their vote as one against Obama, 23 percent say it was one to support him and 47 percent say he isn't much of a factor. **The Republican conservative base is far more energized than the Democrat's liberal constituency**. Fifty-nine percent of self-described conservative Republicans say they are more enthusiastic about voting this year, compared to 37 percent of Democratic liberals.

Sixty-two percent of voters who say they agree with the Tea Party say they are more enthusiastic than usual this year.

# Uniqueness: Republicans Winning – Independents

## Republicans controlling independents now – they’re key to winning seats in november

**Gallup July 1** [2010, “Independent Voters Favor GOP in 2010 Election Tracking” Prefer Republican candidate to Democrat by an average of 45% to 35% http://www.gallup.com/poll/141086/Independent-Voters-Favor-GOP-2010-Election-Tracking.aspx]

Though the president is not on the ballot in midterm election years, he certainly is a major factor in many voters' vote decisions, as evidenced by the typical pattern in which the president's party loses congressional seats in midterms. Evaluations of the president could be especially important among independents, whose congressional voting preferences are not anchored by party loyalty. At this point, dissatisfaction with Obama appears to be a reason independents favor the Republican Party this year. Since March, 42% of independent registered voters, on average, have approved of the job Obama is doing as president, while 51% have disapproved. (This is a slightly more negative assessment than is true for all independents, among whom 44% approve and 45% disapprove of Obama.) Independent voters who disapprove of Obama's job performance say by 71% to 12% that they would vote for the Republican candidate in their district if the election were held today. In contrast, independent voters who approve of Obama favor the Democratic candidate, but by a smaller 63% to 17% margin. The vote patterns of independent approvers and disapprovers have been stable from month to month. A key to winning elections for the Democratic and Republican Parties is to appeal to independent voters. Thus far in the 2010 election campaign, Republicans have attracted greater support from independents than have Democrats. This may in part be the result of independent voters' greater dissatisfaction than satisfaction with the job President Obama is doing. Independents' preference for the Republican congressional candidate in their district has been consistent this year. Still, one in five independents remain undecided. The preferences of these voters, as well as which independents turn out on Election Day, will have a major impact on the direction and magnitude of seat change in the midterm elections.

# Uniqueness: Republicans Winning

## Republicans will run as the lesser of two evils – empirics mean they’ll crush in the midterms

**Guzman Jun 22nd** [Christopher 2010 “Republican enthusiasm for midterm elections may not lead to political change” http://caivn.org/article/2010/06/22/republican-enthusiasm-midterm-elections-may-not-lead-political-change]

With the Democratic-controlled Congress weighed down by a devastatingly low twelve percent approval rating, Republican leadership might be tempted to flaunt the political pummeling that Democrats could face in November. **The GOP certainly has some merit for their midterm optimism**.  The Christian Science Monitor [notes](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2010/0621/Gallup-poll-shows-just-how-pumped-Republicans-are-for-midterms) **the party with more enthusiasm going into the midterms is usually an indicator of how those elections will materialize**.  “The enthusiasm question has generally provided an accurate indication of which party will fare better in the midterm elections,” says Jeffrey Jones, whom the Monitor cites in their report. Heading into November, **59 percent of Republican and Republican-leaning Independents hold the “enthusiasm” advantage over Democratic voters**.  By comparison, a mere 44 percent of Democratic-leaning voters hold a “more enthusiastic than usual” mindset. For Republicans, **it appears as if a change in leadership favoring them is certainly coming**.  However, to slightly spin off a phrase from the Bill Clinton era, it depends on what the meaning of “change” is. That’s certainly what many voters are feeling at the moment. According to a recent Rasmussen Reports telephone [poll](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/general_politics/june_2010/72_of_gop_voters_say_republicans_in_congress_out_of_touch_with_their_base) taken of 1,000 likely voters, 72 percent of GOP voters “continue to believe that GOP members of Congress have lost touch with the party base throughout the nation over the past several years.”  A mere 21 percent of Republican voters believe that current Republicans in Congress are actually doing a “good job.” However, with a 61 percent approval from Democratic supporters, confidence in Democratic members of Congress is higher among their supporters than Republican support of Republican members.  Branching out to survey all voters, a shocking 18 percent of them say that the Republican members of Congress have done a “good job” of representing the party’s values. Rating the consistency of a party’s actions with its values, voters had higher marks for Democrats.  38 percent of all voters say that Democratic members of Congress have done a “good job” at representing the party’s values. What essentially seems to be the case here is that there’s a blurring of the lines between the two parties.  Given that voters perceive Republicans as being more inconsistent with party principles, what distinguishes them from Democrats? The most telling statement of the report from Rasmussen’s poll is that voters are “unconvinced” that a Republican takeover in November would make a “noticeable” difference.  As a matter of fact, 35 percent believe a new party is needed because the difference between Democrats and Republicans is not noticeable. Right now, **given the low approval ratings of the Democratic-controlled Congress, voters might perceive Republicans to be the lesser of two evils in the upcoming elections**.  At the same time, the “lesser” option still has the word “evil” tagged to the label. The Rasmussen poll demonstrates that Republicans must bring fresh solutions to the table if they are to change voters’ perceptions of making a difference after the midterms. Is the time coming for Republicans to party like it’s 1994? Perhaps, but their work is certainly cut out for them.

# \*\*\*Impact Answers\*\*\*

# Impact Answers: Economy

## (--) US ECONOMY NOT KEY TO GLOBAL ECONOMY

The International Herald Tribune, March 6, 2002, p. 11

Weinberg contends that U.S. consumption of the world's products no longer has the power to sway global economies the way it did in the past. "The decline in U.S. imports from their peak to their apparent trough in this business cycle will add up to only a few tenths of a percent of world GDP," Weinberg argues. "By reversing the logic, the case can be made that the U.S. economic recovery -- the one that people in the rest of the world now perceive as having begun -- will not boost the economies in Europe and Asia by more than the same few tenths of a percent that the slowdown subtracted." Weinberg believes that once the current stock market rally subsides, sober minds will turn again to the individual factors underpinning the economies around the world. In Europe, he sees an eventual recognition that the slowdown was caused by a drop in real incomes over the past two years and that the problem will need its own solution, regardless of U.S. growth. In Japan, some insist that the stock- market spree was inspired more by investors covering positions after the government changed the rules on short-selling than by genuine expectations that the United States will dig Japan out of its rut. As Weinberg puts it: "Over the last 12 years, Japan's economy has managed to contract almost continuously as the United States swung from recession to prosperity."

## (--) EMPIRICISM PROVES THAT ECONOMIC SHOCKS WON’T CAUSE DEPRESSION OR WAR, US ECONOMY IS RESILIENT

Los Angeles Times February 9, 2003 Sunday

Still, Gross's hand-wringing about "hegemonic decay" is terribly overstated. It ignores, after all, a fundamental lesson of history: The U.S. economy is remarkably resilient. Indeed, what Gross is ignoring is that America has faced tough times before -- and has successfully worked through them, only to emerge stronger. In the 1960s, President Johnson tried to fight the war in Vietnam without raising taxes, and that stretched the economy. The result was the runaway inflation of the 1970s and a crisis in the dollar that forced President Nixon to cut the greenback loose from the gold standard. Still, the U.S. economy bounced back, enjoying strong growth through much of the 1980s. In 1981, President Reagan increased the defense budget and cut taxes at the same time. The eventual result was swelling budget deficits, which raised interest rates and undermined the financial markets. But once again, the problems were dealt with, and the nation moved on, spurred by great technological advances.

# Impact Answers: Warming

**Their impacts are all historically denied ---- past temperatures were substantially warmer than the present**

**Idso and Idso in ‘7**

(Sherwood, Research Physicist @ US Water Conservation laboratory, and Craig, President of Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global change and PhD in Geography, “Carbon Dioxide and Global Change: Separating Scientific Fact from Personal Opinion”, 6-6, http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/hansen/HansenTestimonyCritique.pdf)

In an attempt to depict earth's current temperature as being extremely high and, therefore, extremely dangerous, Hansen focuses almost exclusively on a single point of the earth's surface in the Western Equatorial Pacific, for which he and others (Hansen et al., 2006) compared modern sea surface temperatures (SSTs) with paleo-SSTs that were derived by Medina-Elizade and Lea (2005) from the Mg/Ca ratios of shells of the surface-dwelling planktonic foraminifer Globigerinoides rubber that they obtained from an ocean sediment core. In doing so, they concluded that “this critical ocean region, and probably the planet as a whole [our italics], is approximately as warm now as at the Holocene maximum and within ~1°C of the maximum temperature of the past million years [our italics].” Is there any compelling reason to believe these claims of Hansen et al. about the entire planet? In a word, no, because there are a multitude of other single-point measurements that suggest something vastly different. Even in their own paper, Hansen et al. present data from the Indian Ocean that indicate, as best we can determine from their graph, that SSTs there were about 0.75°C warmer than they are currently some 125,000 years ago during the prior interglacial. Likewise, based on data obtained from the Vostok ice core in Antarctica, another of their graphs suggests that temperatures at that location some 125,000 years ago were about 1.8°C warmer than they are now; while data from two sites in the Eastern Equatorial Pacific indicate it was approximately 2.3 to 4.0°C warmer compared to the present at about that time. In fact, Petit et al.’s (1999) study of the Vostok ice core demonstrates that large periods of all four of the interglacials that preceded the Holocene were more than 2°C warmer than the peak warmth of the current interglacial. But we don’t have to go nearly so far back in time to demonstrate the non-uniqueness of current temperatures. Of the five SST records that Hansen et al. display, three of them indicate the mid-Holocene was also warmer than it is today. Indeed, it has been known for many years that the central portion of the current interglacial was much warmer than its latter stages have been. To cite just a few examples of pertinent work conducted in the 1970s and 80s – based on temperature reconstructions derived from studies of latitudinal displacements of terrestrial vegetation (Bernabo and Webb, 1977; Wijmstra, 1978; Davis et al., 1980; Ritchie et al., 1983; Overpeck, 1985) and vertical displacements of alpine plants (Kearney and Luckman, 1983) and mountain glaciers (Hope et al., 1976; Porter and Orombelli, 1985) – we note it was concluded by Webb et al. (1987) and the many COHMAP Members (1988) that mean annual temperatures in the Midwestern United States were about 2°C greater than those of the past few decades (Bartlein et al., 1984; Webb, 1985), that summer temperatures in Europe were 2°C warmer (Huntley and Prentice, 1988) – as they also were in New Guinea (Hope et al., 1976) – and that temperatures in the Alps were as much as 4°C warmer (Porter and Orombelli, 1985; Huntley and Prentice, 1988). Likewise, temperatures in the Russian Far East are reported to have been from 2°C (Velitchko and Klimanov, 1990) to as much as 4-6°C (Korotky et al., 1988) higher than they were in the 1970s and 80s; while the mean annual temperature of the Kuroshio Current between 22 and 35°N was 6°C warmer (Taira, 1975). Also, the southern boundary of the Pacific boreal region was positioned some 700 to 800 km north of its present location (Lutaenko, 1993). But we needn’t go back to even the mid-Holocene to encounter warmer-than-present temperatures, as the Medieval Warm Period, centered on about AD 1100, had lots of them. In fact, every single week since 1 Feb 2006, we have featured on our website (www.co2science.org) a different peer-reviewed scientific journal article that testifies to the existence of this several-centuries-long period of notable warmth, in a feature we call our Medieval Warm Period Record of the Week. Also, whenever it has been possible to make either a quantitative or qualitative comparison between the peak temperature of the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) and the peak temperature of the Current Warm Period (CWP), we have included those results in the appropriate quantitative or qualitative frequency distributions we have posted within this feature; and a quick perusal of these ever-growing databases (reproduced below as of 23 May 2007) indicates that, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the peak warmth of the Medieval Warm Period was significantly greater than the peak warmth of the Current Warm Period.

# Impact Answers: Warming

**Worst case scenario warming will only be 1.5 degrees**

**de Freitas in ‘2**

(C. R., Associate Prof. in Geography and Enivonmental Science @ U. Aukland, Bulletin of Canadian Petroleum Geology, “Are observed changes in the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere really dangerous?” 50:2, GeoScienceWorld)

In any analysis of CO2 it is important to differentiate between three quantities: 1) CO2 emissions, 2) atmospheric CO2 concentrations, and 3) greenhouse gas radiative forcing due to atmospheric CO2. As for the first, between 1980 and 2000 global CO2 emissions increased from 5.5 Gt C to about 6.5 Gt C, which amounts to an average annual increase of just over 1%. As regards the second, between 1980 and 2000 atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased by about 0.4 per cent per year. Concerning the third, between 1980 and 2000 greenhouse gas forcing increase due to CO2 has been about 0.25 W m–2 per decade (Hansen, 2000). Because of the logarithmic relationship between CO2 concentration and greenhouse gas forcing, even an exponential increase of atmospheric CO2 concentration translates into linear forcing and temperature increase; or, as CO2 gets higher, a constant annual increase of say 1.5 ppm has less and less effect on radiative forcing, as shown in Figure 3. Leaving aside for the moment the satellite temperature data and using the surface data set, between 1980 and 2000 there has been this linear increase of both CO2 greenhouse gas forcing and temperature. If one extrapolates the rate of observed atmospheric CO2 increase into the future, the observed atmospheric CO2 increase would only lead to a concentration of about 560 ppm in 2100, about double the concentration of the late 1800’s. That assumes a continuing increase in the CO2 emission rate of about 1% per year, and a carbon cycle leading to atmospheric concentrations observed in the past. If one assumes, in addition, that the increase of surface temperatures in the last 20 years (about 0.3 °C) is entirely due to the increase in greenhouse gas forcing of all greenhouse gas, not just CO2, that would translate into a temperature increase of about 1.5 °C (or approximately 0.15 °C per decade). Using the satellite data, the temperature increase is correspondingly lower. Based on this, the temperature increase over the next 100 years might be less than 1.5 °C, as proposed in Figure 19.

# Impact Turn: Republicans Good – Deficit Spending

## **GOP majority key to cutting deficit spending.**

Morrissey 7/1/10 (Ed Morrissey, writer for Hot Air, “GOP remains firm against further deficit spending on jobs benefits,” July 1, 2010, accessed from http://hotair.com/archives/2010/07/01/gop-remains-firm-against-further-deficit-spending-on-jobs-benefits/?print=1 on July 1, 2010.)

After extending unemployment benefits out to two years, some have begun to question the wisdom of perpetually extending the cutoff of federal aid for the unemployed. Many more object to additional deficit spending to fund it. Democrats, however, refused to compromise on the question, even after outgoing Senator George Voinovich (R-OH) offered to split the difference: The Senate failed once again late Wednesday to advance a plan to restore jobless benefits for people out of work more than six months, leaving millions of unemployed workers in limbo until after the July 4 recess. The measure fell one vote shy of the 60 needed to end a Republican filibuster. Sen. George V. Voinovich (R-Ohio) said he was prepared to provide that vote, but that Democrats had rejected his request to pay for at least half of the $34 billion measure with unspent funds from last year’s stimulus package. “Democrats are more interested in having this issue to demagogue for political gamesmanship than they are in simply passing the benefits extension,” Voinovich, who is retiring, said in a statement. “I came to the table with a fair compromise and the ball is in their court.” Earlier, the AP reported it as Republicans refusing to fund jobless benefits, which gets it exactly wrong. They later edited the passage to note only that Republicans blocked the bill that would have authorized the payment of benefits past the current cutoff date of two years, but earlier had written that Republicans “opposed” any such extension. The Washington Post gets it right. I disagree with Voinovich’s compromise, but it did have a salutary impact. It made clear which side of the debate wants to hold the jobless hostage to ideology. The unused Porkulus funds have already been authorized and would make sense to use in this effort, since Democrats have argued all along that jobless benefits were an important part of rescuing the economy. However, those funds already got earmarked for pet projects of Congressional Democrats and the wish list of progressives over the last 20 years. They care more about their pork-barrel projects than they do about providing extra benefits for the jobless. Harry Reid’s argument over the definition of “emergency” is a red herring. We should not be expanding deficit spending any further than the Democrats in Congress have already created with its massive expansion of annual federal spending during its time in control of Congress. The federal government should use the funds already authorized for use in the economic crisis to pay for any expansion of jobless benefits if that’s the policy they choose. Adding more debt to the US only extends the economic crisis, making the expansion of deficits a self-destructive cycle. Republicans did the right thing by standing on that principle. Let Democrats choose between their pork and the constituents that Reid loves slightly less than his pet projects.

## Mounting deficits risk a complete collapse of the US economy:

C. FRED **BERGSTEN 2/1**/20**07** (DIRECTOR PETERSON INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS, CQ Congressional Testimony; Lexis)

The huge and growing international trade and current account imbalances, centered on the US external deficits and net debtor position, represent the single greatest threat to the continued prosperity and stability of the United States and world economies. They could at any time trigger a large and rapid decline in the exchange rate of the dollar that would initiate sharp increases in US inflation and interest rates, bringing on stagflation at a minimum and quite possibly a deep recession. Even in the absence of such a crisis, continued failure to address the imbalances constructively will inevitably lead to a costly and perhaps wrenching adjustment of the US and world economies. They could also lead to a disruption of US trade policy, threatening the openness of the global trading system.

# Impact Turn: Republicans Good – Deficit Spending

## **Only Republican leadership in the House can stoop deficit spending.**

Popkey 6/4/10 (Dan Popkey, writer for the Idaho Statesman, “Labrador says GOP control key to fighting deficit, not Minnick line-item veto bill,” June 4, 2010, accessed from http://voices.idahostatesman.com/2010/06/04/idahopolitics/labrador\_says\_gop\_control\_key\_fighting\_deficit\_not\_minnick\_linei on July 1, 2010.)

First District Republican congressional nominee Raul Labrador says incumbent Democrat Walt Minnick's modified line-item veto bill is a PR ploy and replacing House Speaker Nancy Pelosi with a Republican is the most important step to end deficit spending. In a news release Thursday night, Labrador said, “I recognize the public relations value of Mr. Minnick’s claims, particularly this close to a tough election. But the simple fact is, the only thing that is going to stop this horrendous flow of red ink is a change in political leadership. The most effective thing we can do to arrest the irresponsible spending of this Congress is to take the gavel away from Nancy Pelosi. And Mr. Minnick is unwilling to do that.” Labrador noted that the national debt has topped $13 trillion, and grown at a rate of $5 billion a day since Barack Obama became president, three times the rate under *President* Bush. Labrador added, “The flow of federal red ink is as out of control as the oil pouring into the Gulf of Mexico. And the reaction of Walt Minnick and fellow Democrats to this budget crisis is equally ineffective.”

## B) FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE A COMMITMENT TO CONTROLLING THE DEFICIT WILL COLLAPSE THE GLOBAL ECONOMY –

**INDEPENDENT,** November 4, 20**04**

The central question now is whether, freed from the all-consuming need to be re-elected, the President has it in him to take the measures necessary to deal with the huge hole in the nation's finances which his policies have created. There is still time for the fiscal situation to be put right, but **if** things are left to drift and the **deficits continue to grow, an economic disaster for the US and the rest of the world is all but inevitable**.

## Any cushion is gone: further deficits would devastate the US economy:

C. FRED **BERGSTEN 2/1**/20**07** (DIRECTOR PETERSON INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS, CQ Congressional Testimony; Lexis)

Potentially even more important are two key structural factors. First, the United States is piling its present external deficits onto the world's largest debtor position. Our imbalances of the 1980s began when the United States was still the world's largest creditor country and, in some sense, "used up" the net asset position accumulated over the previous half century or more. We have no such cushion today. Second, the creation of the euro provides a true international financial alternative to the dollar for the first time in a century. The dollar has dominated global finance since the decline of sterling in the early twentieth century largely because it had no real competition. No other currency was based on an economy or capital markets anywhere near the size of those of the United States. The creation of the euro eliminates the dollar's currency monopoly, however, because the economy of Euroland is almost as large as that of the United States while its international trade and monetary reserves are even larger. Indeed, euro bonds have attracted more international investment than dollar bonds for the past two years and global holdings of euro currency now exceed those of the dollar. Hence the euro presents, for the first time in modern history, a true alternative to the dollar for footloose international investment that might previously have moved into dollar assets or that might already be invested in dollars.

# CP Links to the Disadvantage: U.S. Peace Treaty to North Korea

## Peace Treaty to North Korea would require a 2/3rds vote in the Senate—wasting immense political capital:

Joshua Stanton, 2010 (staff writer), “North Korea Re-Re-Declares War, Threatens ‘Merciless Physical Force,’ Demands Peace Treaty” Mar. 8, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.freekorea.us/2010/03/08/north-korea-re-re-declares-war-threatens-mercilless-physical-force-and-wants-a-peace-treaty/>

Some observers correctly say that it’s because U.S. negotiators see granting a peace treaty to the ill-behaving North as a “reward.” But a deeper and even ultimate diagnosis may be that it’s because the U.S. actually cannot afford to give it to North Korea. And the problem lies with its domestic political situation, according to Feffer. “U.S. law stipulates that a peace treaty must obtain two-thirds of the votes in the Senate. The problem is that there are a number of Senators, mostly Republican, who are not willing to sign a peace treaty with North Korea. This domestic consideration has to be taken into account,” said Feffer, adding that this is the “real reason” the U.S. administration is unwilling to offer a peace pact. [Korea Times, Sunny Lee]