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Obama will win now – things are looking good.

Mike Dorning, 9-6-12 (Bloomberg News, “Election Forecast Models Clouded by Economy’s Slow Growth”, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-09-06/election-forecast-models-clouded-by-economy-s-middling-growth :)

Moody’s Analytics says its economic- forecasting model shows President Barack Obama winning re- election with 303 electoral votes. Economist Douglas Hibbs Jr., pointing to slow income growth, predicts a Mitt Romney victory. To Yale University’s Ray Fair, the race is simply “too close to call.” While the state of the U.S. economy is the No. 1 issue in the election, even nonpartisan forecasters who crunch data and claim to have predicted the results in past presidential races can’t agree on what impact it will have on the outcome. Sophisticated models in the past have bolstered arguments that presidential elections are mostly predetermined by the economy. This time, some concede that the plodding recovery may not tilt the balance toward either candidate. Instead, the costly, cross-country political campaign, which these forecasters have dismissed as irrelevant, may tip the balance. “When you get down to that point, where I’m saying that it’s going to be decided by less than one percentage point, then it’s possible that the campaigns really do matter,” said Alan Abramowitz, a political science professor at Emory University in Atlanta who developed one of the most-followed forecasting models. U.S. companies added more workers than forecast in August, a private payroll services company reported this morning a day ahead of an official government report, offering hope that the labor market is improving. Roseland, New Jersey-based ADP Employer Services reported a 201,000 in jobs, exceeding the 140,000 median estimate of economists surveyed by Bloomberg. Economy’s Movement The economy’s condition heading into the election is clear right now: a slow recovery from the worst U.S. downturn since the Great Depression. Economic growth this year is below normal for the post- World War II era, though stronger than when Dwight Eisenhower was re-elected in a 1956 landslide. Even with unemployment at its highest in any election year since the war, joblessness has declined more over the past 12 months than during the same period of any postwar election year except 1984 and 1976. What matters most to voters isn’t the absolute state of the economy, it’s the trajectory, said Christopher Wlezien, a professor at Temple University in Philadelphia and co-author of the forthcoming book “The Timeline of Presidential Elections.” The election models point in different directions based on what their developers say influences voters the most. Battleground States The Moody’s electoral vote projection, which assesses economic performance state by state, gives Obama the advantage, reflecting better circumstances in many of this year’s battlegrounds. Obama wins Ohio, where the unemployment rate was 7.2 percent in July, below the 8.3 percent national average that month, and Virginia, where joblessness was at 5.9 percent, under the Moody’s projection. Romney picks up Florida, where unemployment was 8.8 percent in July. The Republican challenger can expect victory under the “Bread and Peace” model developed by Hibbs, a retired professor who taught at Sweden’s University of Gothenburg. He says the drivers of voter opinion are war casualties and income growth. He forecasts Obama will receive 47.5 percent of the two- party vote to Romney’s 52.5 percent. The Afghanistan war has produced few casualties relative to the Vietnam and Korean wars. Too Close Yale’s Fair, who developed one of the first models to forecast elections based solely on economic indicators, projects Obama will win 49.5 percent of the two-party vote to Romney’s 50.5 percent, based on gross domestic product growth and inflation under the incumbent. That amounts to “too close to call” given an error margin of three percentage points, he said. Two models that weigh public opinion polls as well as economic data give Obama the advantage. Abramowitz’s “Time for Change,” based on GDP growth during the April-to-June quarter and presidential job approval in the Gallup Poll for the last three days of June, anticipates an Obama win with 50.5 percent of the two-party vote, with a 1.5 percentage-point margin of error. While some of the election modelers say polling data detracts from the goal of capturing how fundamental forces shape the vote, Abramowitz said he includes public opinion because “you get a much better forecast.” Leading Indicators Wlezien and Robert Erikson, a political science professor at Columbia University, look to leading economic indicators through the first three months of the election year and an average of all polls of voter preferences. Based on polling data for July, they predict a bigger Obama win, with 52.6 percent of the two-party vote and a 3.1 percentage-point margin of error. Poll results move closer to the outcome suggested by the economy’s condition as the election year progresses and “voters increasingly take stock of things,” Wlezien said.

The public doesn’t want more transportation infrastructure spending at bad economic times.

Bernstein, 11/01/2010 (Andrea – Director of the public radio Transportation Nation project, Wariness about spending on transportation and infrastructure accompanies voters to the polls, Transportation Nation, p. http://transportationnation.org/2010/11/01/wariness-about-spending-on-transportation-and-infrastructure-acompanies-voters-to-the-polls/)

It’s been a rough election season out there. Unless you’ve crawled into a cave for the last three months, you know the airwaves have been flooded with ads calling candidates everything from thieves to hooligans to rogues and everything in between. But the sour voter mood isn’t just about advertisements — it’s about reduced circumstances, drastic cuts in local government services, higher taxes and fees, fewer jobs, and dramatically higher health care costs — despite health care reform and an $800 billion stimulus bill. Or as one Florida election volunteer Marcia told me in a largely African American neighborhood in Tampa last week: “People are disappointed,” she said. “They thought they were going to have this magic wand that I’m going to save my home because we have Obama as President. And I’m going to have a job because we have Obama as President.” But then, people lost their jobs, and they lost their homes. “Where’s the change?” retired Hoovers vacuum worker Alice Prestier asked me in Canton, Ohio. Or, more bitterly, as one Colorado contractor told me in Loveland, Colorado: “I don’t need to spend $2,000 to support every illegal f\*\*\*\*\*g Mexican in this country. Nor do I need to keep busting my ass for this government. You know, my son can’t ride the bus to school anymore. He’s got to walk two miles to school, explain that to me! You know, why does education have to go, but yet we can support illegals, we can piss money away on stuff that doesn’t’ matter, a health care plan that will never work?” All of which has created a wary public, seemingly unwilling to spend on big transit projects like the ARC tunnel, high speed rail, or even roads. Even though the President has bracketed this campaign season with a call for $50 billion in additional spending on roads, rails, and airports and the distribution, last week, of some $2.5 billion in high speed rail grants, kitchen-table cut backs have spilled over into an attitude about government spending. Where once voters seemed to have faith that large infrastructure projects would create jobs, both in the long and short terms, they now worry that worthy as projects may be, there simply isn’t enough money to spend on things like new transit tunnels, high speed rail systems, or even roads.

Poor economic situations will swing the elections in Romney’s favor.

New York Times, 3/13/2012 (Muddled Economic Picture Muddles the Political One, Too, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/us/politics/economy-plays-biggest-role-in-obama-re-election-chances.html?\_r=1)

The final major economic turning point of President Obama’s first term seems to have arrived. The question is which way the economy will turn. Job growth has picked up nicely in the last few months, raising the prospect that the American economy is finally in the early stages of a recovery that will gather strength over time. But with gas prices rising, the government cutting workers and consumers still deep in debt, some forecasters predict that economic growth — and with it, job growth — will slow in coming months. Politically, the difference between the two situations is vast. In one, Mr. Obama will be able to campaign on a claim, as he has recently begun to do, that the country is back on track. In another, he will be left to explain that recoveries from financial crises take years, and to argue that Republicans want to return to the Bush-era policies that created the crisis — as he tried to argue, unsuccessfully, in the 2010 midterm election. His approval rating has slipped again in some polls recently, with higher gas prices possibly playing a role. As a result, the economic numbers over the next couple of months, including an unemployment report on April 6, will have bigger political implications than the typical batch of data. The Federal Reserve acknowledged the uncertainty in its scheduled statement on Tuesday, suggesting the economy had improved somewhat but still predicting only “moderate economic growth.” Economists say the economy’s near-term direction depends relatively little on Mr. Obama’s economic policies. The standoff over Iran’s nuclear program, the European debt crisis and other events will most likely affect the economy more. But many American voters are still likely to make their decision based on the economy. Historically, nothing — not campaign advertisements, social issues or even wars — has influenced voters more heavily than the direction of the economy in an election year. “If you could know one thing and you had to predict which party was going to win the next presidential election,” Lynn Vavreck, a political scientist at the University of California, Los Angeles, said, “you couldn’t do better than knowing the change in economic growth.”

Romney will end cooperation with Russia on reducing nuclear arms.

Lyman, 3/30/2012 (John – editor-in-chief of International Policy Digest, Romney’s Foreign Policy and Russia, International Policy Digest, p. http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/03/30/romneys-foreign-policy-and-russia/)

U.S.-Russian relations transcend the United Nations and other multilateral institutions. The United States relies on Russian assistance in counterterrorism, Afghanistan, shoring up loose nuclear material in the former Soviet Republics, international narcotics trafficking, WMD proliferation and reducing American and Russian nuclear stockpiles, which has become a cause celeb for Mr. Obama. Obama has calculated that the Russians would be amendable to significant reductions in their nuclear stockpiles if he negotiates with the Russians in good faith over missile defense. This process was started several years ago in an effort to “reset” U.S.-Russian relations, when Obama ordered a different configuration to the missile defense system – the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) – planned for construction in Eastern Europe. The original system envisioned a radar base that was to be built in the Czech Republic with interceptors housed in Poland. The EPAA is designed to intercept ballistic missiles launched from “rogue” nations from interceptors housed in Poland and now Romania. The Russians have been highly critical of the system first announced by the Bush administration as they claim it would undermine their own nuclear deterrent. “This is not a matter of hiding the ball,” Mr. Obama said. “I want to see us gradually, systematically reduce reliance on nuclear weapons.” Now that Mr. Romney has antagonized the Russians, he might find it difficult to negotiate with them over a whole host of issues, much less getting Russia on board with prodding the Iranians to return to the negotiating table or facilitating America’s withdrawal from Afghanistan if he defeats Mr. Obama in November.

Cooperation on nuclear–arms reduction is key to survival – Russia remains the elephant in the room.

Collins and Rojansky, ’10 (Ambassador James F. Collins is director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, is an expert on the former Soviet Union, its successor states, and on the Middle East, was the U.S. ambassador to the Russian Federation from 1997 to 2001, before appointment as ambassador to Russia he served as ambassador-at-large and special adviser to the secretary of state for the New Independent States in the mid 1990s and as deputy chief of mission and chargé d'affaires at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow from 1990 to 1993, in addition to three diplomatic postings in Moscow, he also held positions in the U.S. Embassy in Amman, Jordan, and the Consulate General in Izmir, Turkey, he is recipient of the Secretary of State's Award for Distinguished Service; the Department of State's Distinguished Honor Award; the Secretary of State’s Award for Career Achievement; the Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service; and the NASA Medal for Distinguished Service, Ambassador Collins has been active on the boards of non-profit organizations concerned with U.S. foreign policy and U.S. relations with Russia, East Europe, and Eurasia, has served as a member of the board of the U.S.-Russia Business Council, the American Academy of Diplomacy, the Open World Leadership Center, and American Councils for International Education, is also a member of the advisory board of the Civilian Research and Development Foundation and the Library of Foreign Literature in Moscow, before joining the State Department, Collins taught Russian and European history, American government, and economics at the U.S. Naval Academy / Matthew Rojansky is the deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment, expert on U.S. and Russian national security and nuclear weapons policies, his work focuses on relations among the United States, NATO, and the states of the former Soviet Union, Rojansky is an Adjunct Professor at American University in Washington, D.C. and a participant in the Dartmouth Dialogues, a track 2 U.S.–Russian conflict resolution initiative begun in 1960) 8-18-2010, “Why Russia Matters,” FOREIGN POLICY, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/2010/08/18/why-russia-matters/3si)

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

# Wind Power DA

Wind power supplies less than 1% of electricity now, but it’s growing

Christopher **Cotter**, published 20**07** (JD candidate @ University of Dayton School of Law, “Comment: Wind Power and the Renewable Portfolio Standard: An Ohio Analysis,” 32 Dayton L. Rev. 405, l/n)

Wind power currently supplies less than 1% of electricity consumption in the United States. n6 However, wind power could potentially supply about 20% of the nation's electricity. n7 Both state and federal lawmakers have enacted legislation aimed at increasing the development of wind power. n8 These incentives include tax breaks, grants, and a policy known as the Renewable Portfolio Standard ("RPS" or "RPS policy"). n9

The plan’s modernization of inland waterways is crucial to wind energy

**NEED**, 20**09** (National Energy Education Development Project, releases publications by experts to inform students and teachers about renewable energy, “Energy and Our Rivers,” http://www.riverworksdiscovery.org/downloads/need\_curriculum/StudentBackgrounder.pdf)

How does the energy industry utilize the inland waterway system? • Coal: The barge industry transports 20 percent of the coal consumed in the U.S., enough to generate 10 percent of the electricity used each year. • Petroleum: Over 130 million tons of petroleum and petroleum products are shipped along the nation’s rivers. This accounts for 22 percent of the nation’s petroleum supply. • Ethanol: River barges carry 10 percent of the nation’s ethanol supply. • Wind: Up to 18 turbine blades can be stacked on a single barge. Transporting wind turbine parts by barge is expected to grow. Not only does the energy industry transport raw materials on the rivers, but they also transport parts needed at power plants, such as generators and boilers. There continues to be a growing demand for inland navigation, and economists estimate that there will be a 35 percent increase in the next 20 years. To continue to be successful in transporting materials to meet consumers’ demand, the inland waterway infrastructure needs to be modernized and maintained. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for maintaining nearly 12,000 miles of commercially navigable waterways, and 207 lock chambers at 171 lock sites. Most of the 207 lock chambers were built in the 1930s and were only designed for a life of 50 years. More than half of the locks and dams operated by the Corps are over 50 years old. About 2,000 of the United States’ 74,000 dams are owned by the federal government. These structures are also aging, with dams averaging 40 years old. Other entities responsible for maintaining waterways are facing similar challenges. To address the problem of an aging inland waterway infrastructure, the Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) was established. This fund was created and is maintained through a 20-cent per gallon fuel tax. These monies, almost $100 million a year, support half of the capital construction and rehabilitation of the locks and dams on the waterways. The other half is federally funded. In recent years, projects have seen many significant delays and cost overruns. This has hindered the progress toward modernizing the inland waterway system. The Inland Waterways Users Board is working with representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to prioritize the needs for the inland navigation system, developing reasonable costs and a strategy to make sure funding stays closer to budget and that projects are completed on time. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provided over $400 million in stimulus funds for projects to construct and improve locks and dams. This money does not have to be matched by the IWTF. However, it is estimated that projects currently under construction or ready to begin would require approximately seven billion dollars. Given current funding practices and trends between IWTF and the government, these projects would take 40 years to complete. If the inland waterway system is not modernized, it may force cargo to be shipped by other methods. The U.S. highway system is already congested in many areas and the railway lines are near capacity. Accordingly, moving cargo from barges to trucks or trains could be challenging. The amount of cargo transported on rivers is equivalent to 58 million truck trips annually, which would double the number of tractor trailers currently on the interstates and require significant upgrades to highways. If river cargo was moved to the railway, it would add almost 25 percent more tonnage to the railway system. Not only would diverting barge cargo loads to railways and highways have a physical impact to the capacity and maintenance of these systems, it would also have an environmental impact. The amount of fuel required to ship cargo varies between each transportation mode. One ton of cargo can be shipped 59 miles by truck using one gallon of fuel. That same gallon can move one ton of cargo 202 miles by rail, and 514 miles by barge. Shipping goods by barge is energy efficient and releases fewer carbon dioxide emissions than the other options. Accidents can occur while transporting some environmentally hazardous materials. There are fewer accidents and fuel spills by barge than by rail and truck. The inland shipping industry works closely with the Coast Guard to ensure the safety of its workers and the environment. Since 1994, oil spills in the inland shipping industry have been reduced by 82 percent. From Native American canoes to contemporary barges and towboats, rivers have played an important part in America’s growth and commerce. River transportation also plays a vital role in our country’s energy picture, moving many of our natural energy resources to plants and refineries allowing us to put these sources to work.

Specifically, modernized waterways are key to access wind farms in hard-to-navigate locations – rail and roads can’t sustain the wind industry

Brad **Hall**, April 16th, 20**09** (American Commercial Lines’ Vice President, General Manager Dry Cargo, “Inland waterways have an abundance of unused capacity,” <http://www.pes.eu.com/assets/misc/ask-the-experts-american-commercial-linespdf-79.pdf> >:)

PES: Often, wind farms are sited in hard-to-navigate locations – how do you overcome this? BH: The advantage of transporting blades and towers by barges is that you do not require police escorts or spotting trucks carrying “wide load” signs as you do with trucking. Barges navigate the inland waterways quietly and consistently without the hassle of special permitting associated with many over-the-road moves or restrictions on rail dimensional moves. ACL has strategic partnerships that enable us to provide complete multi-modal to wind farms, and we will coordinate every aspect of a move from the factory to the wind farm. We are prepared to deliver for our customers wherever the destination may be. PES: The wind industry is growing at an astounding rate – what measures are you putting in place to ensure that your company capitalises upon this? BH: ACL is actively marketing our services to the wind power industry, and we continue to invest in our fleet to ensure that we have the equipment to meet the growing demand. PES: In this issue of PES we’re focussing on the booming renewable energy industry in the US. Your company is inextricably linked to this sector – what are your observations/predictions? BH: ACL looks forward to continuing to provide complete transportation solutions to the wind power industry that provide significant savings for our customers, as well as great benefits for our environment. As the cost[s], congestion and delays associated with rail and trucks continue to increase, the cost savings, environmental benefits and service reliability of barging make it the natural, logical and more sustainable course today and for the future.

Wind power is bad – disrupts US warning radars and missile defense systems

DoD **R&E**, written 20**06** (Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, “The Effect of Windmill Farms on Military Readiness,” <http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/windfarmreport.pdf> >:)

There is growing public and private sector interest in generating electrical power using wind energy. According to the Department of Energy, over 60,000 megawatts of wind power capacity is in operation worldwide with over 10,000 megawatts installed in the United States. These systems are largely comprised of installations of up to several hundred wind turbines with rotating blades reaching to heights of up to 500 feet. The numbers, height and rotation of these wind turbines present technical challenges to the effectiveness of radar systems that must be carefully evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure acceptable military readiness is maintained. For many cases, processes are in place to allow responsible federal authorities to complete determination of acceptability of wind turbine impacts on military readiness. However, since wind energy use in the United States is dramatically increasing, research and interagency coordination is warranted to enhance capability for completing timely determinations and developing measures for mitigating readiness impacts. This report focuses on the effects of wind farms on air defense and missile warning radars and the resulting potential impact on military readiness. Its scope is limited to these specific subjects and is based on the current level of understanding regarding interactions between such defense systems and state-of-the-art wind turbines. The report begins with a brief introduction of the key principles of radar systems, describes in what circumstances wind farms might cause problems for the Department and under what circumstances such wind farms would not cause problems. Radar test results from multiple flight trials near wind farms performed by the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence are discussed. The results from those flight trials documented that state-of-the-art utility-class wind turbines can have a significant impact on the operational capabilities of military air defense radar systems. The results demonstrated that the large radar cross section of a wind turbine combined with the Doppler frequency shift produced by its rotating blades can impact the ability of a radar to discriminate the wind turbine from an aircraft. Those tests also demonstrated that the wind farms have the potential to degrade target tracking capabilities as a result of shadowing and clutter effects.

Missile defense is key to deter and deny all missile threats – specifically, solves war with North Korea and Syrian bioweapons use

Robert **Pfaltzgraff,** **et al**, January 30th, 20**09**, PhD and professor of international security studies at Tufts, president of the IFPA, “Missile Defense, the Space Relationship & the Twenty-First Century,” <https://www.claremont.org/repository/docLib/200901291_iwg2009.pdf>

Twenty-first century threats to the United States, its de­ployed forces, and its friends and allies differ fundamental­ly from those of the Cold War. An unprecedented number of international actors have now acquired – or are seeking to acquire – missiles. These include not only states, but also non-state groups interested in obtaining missiles with nucle­ar or other payloads. The spectrum encompasses the missile arsenals already in the hands of Russia and China, as well as the emerging arsenals of a number of hostile states. The character of this threat has also changed. Unlike the Soviet Union, these newer missile possessors do not attempt to match U.S. systems, either in quality or in quantity. In­stead, their missiles are designed to inflict major devasta­tion without necessarily possessing the accuracy associated with the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals of the Cold War.1 The warning time that the United States might have be­fore the deployment of such capabilities by a hostile state, or even a terrorist actor, is eroding as a result of several fac­tors, including the continued proliferation and widespread availability of technologies to build missiles and the result­ing possibility that an entire system might be purchased out­right. Would-be possessors do not have to engage in the pro­tracted process of designing and building a missile. They could purchase and assemble components, reverse-engineer a missile after having purchased a prototype, or immediately acquire a number of assembled missiles. Even missiles that are primitive by U.S. standards might suffice for a rogue state or terrorist organization seeking to inflict extensive damage upon the United States. As the Rumsfeld Commission point­ed out in its 1998 report: Rogue States North Korea In the years since the surprise launch of its three-stage Tae­po Dong 1 missile over Japan in August 1998, North Korea has made substantial advances in its ballistic missile capabilities and now possesses the largest ballistic missile force in the developing world, according to Jane’s Information Group.3 Pyongyang has engaged in extensive efforts to conceal the size and scope of its ballistic missile programs, though es­timates suggest that it may have deployed as many as 1000 ballistic missiles, including some 600-800 Scud-type short-range rockets, between 150 and 200 medium-range No Dong missiles, and 50 other longer-range missiles.4 In 2003, North Korea lifted its self-imposed 1999 mora­torium on long-range missile testing.5 In July 2006, the Kim Jong-il regime fired a Taepo Dong 2 long-range missile as part of a series of missile tests.6 While the 2006 test failed 40 seconds after launch, it signified a considerable advance in the development of North Korea’s extended-range missile capability. The Congressional Research Service has indicat­ed that the Taepo Dong 2’s design would allow it to deliver a 1,500-kilogram warhead to targets as far as 8,000 kilometers away.7 According to 2005 testimony by Vice Admiral Low­ell Jacoby, USN (Ret.), former director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), Pyongyang’s Taepo Dong 2 mis­sile “could deliver a nuclear warhead to parts of the United States in a two-stage variant and target all of North Ameri­ca with a three-stage variant.”8He also stated that North Ko­rea had achieved the ability to arm a missile with a nuclear device. North Korea has had a declared nuclear capability since 2005.10 In 2008, North Korean officials admitted that 37 ki­lograms of plutonium had been produced at the Yongbyon reactor, enough for as many as nine nuclear weapons.11 American assessments suggest that the actual amount of plutonium produced is likely much higher and that as much as 60 kilograms could have been extracted.12 Based upon this judgment, North Korea may have as many as 15 nucle­ar weapons, though most estimates in the U.S. intelligence community place the number at around ten.13 The extent of North Korea’s uranium enrichment program is not well known, but Pakistani nuclear scientist Abdul Qadeer (A.Q.) Khan stated that he had provided uranium enrichment equipment to Pyongyang.14 In 2002, DPRK First Vice For­eign Minister Kang Sok-ju admitted that North Korea was pursuing a uranium-enrichment program, the clear impli­cation being that the program was meant for weapons pro­duction.15 An operational North Korean uranium program could have the capability to add as many as six additional nuclear weapons a year to Pyongyang’s arsenal.16 A resolu­tion to the North Korean nuclear weapons dilemma has yet to be achieved, despite the various efforts to use the six-par­ty talks and other efforts for this purpose.17 Iran With the benefit of assistance from abroad, including North Korea and Pakistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran has moved forward with its ballistic missile program. Iran has had a demonstrated tactical ballistic missile capability since the 1980s, but in June 2003 it marked a major milestone when it deployed its 1,300-kilometer-range Shahab-3, capable of targeting Israel and Turkey, as well as U.S. forces in the Per­sian Gulf.18 Since then, Iran has begun “mass production” of This work has yielded impor­tant dividends: in September 2007, Iran publicly unveiled a “new” medium-range ballistic missile, the Ghadr-1, at a mil­itary parade in Tehran. This missile, which Iran claims has a range of 1,800 kilometers, appears to be an extended-range variant of the Shahab-3.21 Subsequently, in November 2007, Iran carried out a test of its Ashoura missile, a 2,000-kilo­meter-range solid fuel variant of the Shahab.22 These steps are part of what U.S. officials believe is a growing emphasis in Tehran on the development of an inter­continental ballistic missile capability. As John Rood, then-acting assistant secretary of state for international security and nonproliferation, told Congress in May 2007, “The In­lah, Hamas, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. The transfer of the Shahab 3 into the Pasdaran, in lieu of the Artesh, suggests that Ira­nian missile technologies could find their way into terrorist hands as part of Tehran’s ongoing sponsorship of terrorist activities. Intelligence Community assesses that Iran would be able to develop an ICBM capable of reaching the United States and all regions of Europe before 2015 if it chose to do so. And, I would point out that Iran has acquired ballistic missiles from North Korea in the past and note the possibility that it could do so again in the future, potentially acquiring mis­siles with even longer ranges.”23 As a result of these advanc­es, it is likely that Iran could field an intercontinental ballis­tic missile by the middle of the next decade.24 Iran may have conducted tests to determine whether its ballistic missiles, notably the Shahab-3 or the Scud, could be detonated by re­mote control while still in flight. The significance of such a capability lies in its potential to launch an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attack, discussed later in this section. This effort is closely linked to Iran’s growing interest in space. In October 2005, Iran became the first space nation in the Muslim world when it launched a surveillance satellite on a Russian rocket from Russia’s missile base at Plesetsk.25 Since then, Iran has made great strides toward development of an indigenous space launch capability. In February 2007, it successfully carried out an initial test of a “space rocket” built in Iran.26 A year later unveiled its first space center, with Tehran claiming that it had now “joined the world’s top 11 countries possessing space technology to build satel­lites and launch rockets into space.”27 These advances ampli­fy and expand Iran’s ballistic missile program, since a space-launch vehicle (SLV) is similar in technology and function to the booster on an intercontinental ballistic missile. The threat posed by Iran’s ballistic missile program is closely linked to Tehran’s nuclear effort. Since it was pub­licly exposed by an Iranian opposition group in August 2002, Since December 2007 Iran has built a stockpile of low-enriched uranium hexafloride. According to the IAEA, Iran’s stockpile had reached more than 1000 pounds by August 31, 2008, with monthly production rates of more than 100 pounds. In 2009 this could give Iran at least 1,500 pounds that could be recirculated through its centrifuges to pro­duce the 35 pounds of weapon-grade uranium sufficient for one bomb.31 In April 2008, Iranian president Mahmoud Ah­madinejad disclosed that his government had begun to in­stall another 6,000 centrifuges at the Natanz facility.32 Ira­nian leaders have taken this to be a critical milestone. “The nuclear issue (of Iran) is the most important political devel­opment in contemporary history,” Ahmadinejad announced to supporters at that time. “Iran’s victory in this biggest po­litical battle will lead to new international developments.”33 Thus all indicators point toward the development of an Ira­nian nuclear capability with varying estimates not about whether Iran is doing so, but instead when it will have such weapons. There have also been reports that Iran as well as North Korea, and even terrorist groups, could have benefited from information from the notorious A.Q. Khan proliferation network. In 2006 drawings were discovered on computers owned by Swiss businessmen that included how to build a warhead that could be fitted on an Iranian ballistic missile. Whether these drawings were earlier passed on to Iran is not certain. The nuclear-related documents allegedly included hundreds of pages of specifications for a compact nuclear device that could have been designed for Iran.34 Other states already possess or are developing weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. They include: Pakistan• , which has had a nuclear capability at least since 1998 and has extensive ballistic and cruise missile pro­grams. Pakistan possessed as many as 100 nuclear war­heads and continues to upgrade its missile forces. The country has made major advances in missile technology, especially considering that it presently lacks the domestic science and technology base for developing such weap­ons, which suggests that it has been very successful in acquiring technologies from abroad. At the moment, Pak­istan’s longest-range ballistic missile is the Hatf-6, which has a range of 2,000 kilometers. At that range, the Hatf-6 is nearing the 2,500 kilometer threshold which the Rums­feld Commission indicated would mark the existence of the technical base necessary for the development of long-range missile systems. While Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal and ballistic missiles are • ostensibly intended to deter Indian aggression, Pakistan’s domestic political situation is so turbulent that there is no guarantee that these weapons will be used strictly for that purpose. For example, under a radicalized regime such missiles could be used against U.S. forces and mili­tary installations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Despite Paki­stan’s cooperation in the War on Terror, serious questions exist as to whether elements in the Pakistani security services, in particular the Directorate for Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), are actively working against U.S. inter­ests by supporting Afghan and Pakistani Taliban fighters in the Pakistani tribal areas. The fact that such powerful elements could be operating outside official Pakistani policy channels is frightening, even though ISI does not directly supervise the nuclear arsenal. Pakistan’s nuclear forces are overseen by the National Command Author­ 34 ity (NCA), and underwent a thorough security upgrade in 2003. Nevertheless, concerns remain about the com­mand and control of Pakistan’s nuclear forces. Particu­larly troubling is the level of sympathy for al-Qaeda and the Taliban within the junior and mid-level cadres of the Pakistani military as a result of fighting side-by-side with Islamists against Indian forces in Jammu and Kashmir. It is precisely these officers who are most likely to be pro­moted to sensitive positions in the years ahead. Syria• , which maintains biological and chemical weapons capabilities and possesses a large inventory ofsurface-to-surface ballistic missile systems, could deliver con­ventional and unconventional warheads to neighboring countries in the Middle East.35 Syria has also shown more than a passing interest in acquiring a nuclear weapons capability, as evidenced by the construction the Al-Kibar reactor site, which was subsequently destroyed by an Is­raeli Air Force strike in September 2007.The Central In­telligence Agency (CIA) has estimated that Damascus possesses hundreds of free-rocket-over-ground (FROG) missiles, Scud missiles, and SS-21 short-range ballistic missiles (SRBMs).36 Syria also maintains the indigenous capability to manufacture liquid-fuel Scuds.37 In Septem­ber 2003 testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, then-Under Secretary of State John Bolton outlined that Syria “is fully committed to expanding and improving its CW [chemical weapons] program” and “is continuing to de­velop an offensive biological weapons capability.”38 Syr­ia’s mobile missile force is capable of targeting much of Israel, as well as parts of Iraq, Jordan, and Turkey, and it has “developed a longer-range missile – the Scud-D – with assistance from North Korea” while simultane­ously pursuing “both solid- and liquid-propellant mis­sile programs.”39 Egypt• , which is engaged in a clandestine effort to acquire WMD and ballistic missile technologies. Egypt has been a primary destination for North Korea’s ballistic missile exports and has received shipments of Scud B and C mis­ 35 siles, as well as No Dong missiles.40 Inspections by the IAEA have uncovered plutonium traces at Egyptian nu­clear facilities, increasing international concern about clandestine nuclear development efforts on the part of the Mubarak regime.41 The IAEA has also criticized Cairo for failing to declare certain nuclear materials and sites, one of which was a facility for separating plutonium that could be used in an atomic weapon.42 Saudi Arabia• , which will undoubtedly find a nuclear weapons program a more attractive option if Iran achieves nuclear status and may already be pursuing a nuclear hedging strategy. Under an agreement signed during the October 2003 visit to Islamabad by Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah, Riyadh reportedly gained access to Pakistani nuclear technologies in exchange for stepped-up energy cooperation and improved strategic relations with Pak­istan.43 While Saudi Arabia has denied that it is devel­oping a nuclear weapons capability, it has been granted “small quantities protocol” status from the IAEA, which removes strict oversight of its nuclear reactor and could potentially facilitate the clandestine pursuit of nuclear weapons.44 Riyadh, meanwhile, was reported to be seek­ing modern replacements from China for its aging arse­nal of CSS-2 missiles originally purchased from China more than a generation ago.45 Strategic Competitors People’s Republic of China According to the Defense Department, “China has the most active ballistic missile program in the world. It is develop­ing and testing offensive missiles, forming additional missile units, qualitatively upgrading certain missile systems, and developing methods to counter ballistic missile defenses.”46 PRC missile modernization efforts build upon current capa­bilities that encompass ballistic missiles able to target the United States as well as Japan and other regional U.S. allies. For example, China has over 46 Dong-feng 4, Dong-feng 5, and Dong-feng 31 intercontinental ballistic missiles, approx­imately 35 intermediate-range (Dong-feng 3, and Dong-feng 21) missiles, and hundreds of short-range rockets currently deployed.47 Between 990 and 1,070 SRBMs are deployed op­posite Taiwan, and the People’s Liberation Army is increasing this force by more than 100 missiles each year.48 At the same time, China is in the midst of a massive, multi-year strategic-military modernization program, encompassing air power, naval, and land force capabilities, air defense, and electron­ic-, information- and space-warfare technologies.49 As part of this effort, China is upgrading its existing bal­listic missile arsenal. This includes the deployment of its Dong-feng 31 and Dong-feng 31A ICBMs with multiple inde­pendently targetable re-entry vehicle (MIRV) warhead tech­nology designed to defeat primitive anti-missile systems, priority solid-fuel propellant research intended to provide Beijing with immediate “launch on command” capabili­ties, and the transformation of its strategic offensive forc­es from large, stationary missiles to more versatile road- and rail-mobile variants. Notably, a successful flight test of China’s new submarine-launched version of the Dong-feng 31, the Julang 2, was conducted in June 2005.50 The Julang 2 has a range of up to 9,600 kilometers and, according to the U.S. Air Force’s National Air Intelligence Center, “will, for the first time, allow Chinese [missile submarines] to target portions of the United States from operating areas located near the Chinese coast.”51 These capabilities are even more troubling in light of remarks made by Chinese Major Gener­al Zhu Chenghu, who declared that nuclear weapons would have to be used if the United States intervened militarily in a conflict over Taiwan.52 In addition, China has also begun to undermine Ameri­can space dominance and is developing asymmetrical op­tions to exploit perceived U.S. vulnerabilities in space. These include a variety of space-denial capabilities, as well as space assets and launch systems that will significantly augment Beijing’s space operations. For example, in the wake of its successful October 2003 launch of the Shenzhou V space­craft, China is developing advanced military capabilities as part of an exo-atmospheric “deterrent” force even while Bei­jing warns against any U.S. weaponization of space. In Jan­uary 2007, China successfully destroyed a Chinese weather satellite using a direct-ascent, anti-satellite weapon, indi­cating its ability to attack satellites operating in low-earth orbit. Beyond the hit-to-kill technology demonstrated in this operation, the PRC is also developing technologies to “jam, blind, or otherwise disable satellites.”53 China has also developed a range of “nano-satellite” technologies for spacewarfare, apparently for the purpose of crippling American space assets.54 Other Chinese advances in space include the Ziyuan 1 and Ziyuan 2 remote-sensing satellites and the develop­ment, through a joint venture between China’s Tsinghua University and the United Kingdom’s University of Surrey, of a constellation of seven mini-satellites (weighing between 101 and 500 kilograms) with 50-meter-resolution remote-sensing payloads.55 Furthermore, there is growing evidence that China is increasingly interested in developing an EMP capability, both as a theater weapon for use in a potential Taiwan conflict and as a strategic asset to counter the Unit­ed States.56 Beijing’s space achievements also include the Shenzhou VII, the third Chinese manned spaceflight, together with China’s first spacewalk in September 2008.57 In addition, China is working on in-orbit rendezvous and docking pro­cedures (which also have direct applications for ASAT and space-denial missions), and exploring the prospects for a manned space station. The Shenzhou VII mission and space­walk will provide China with docking techniques required for the construction of a space station that will reportedly be accomplished by joining two Shenzhou vehicles togeth­er. Moreover, the PRC has an elaborate lunar exploration program that includes an unmanned moon lander, a sam­ple return mission, and an eventual human mission to the moon. For these missions, Beijing is developing a new Long March V booster. The timetables for the Chinese unmanned moon landing, a sample return mission, and a manned lunar mission are believed to be 2012, 2015, and 2017, respectively. China’s manned moon mission is approximately three years ahead of the U.S. target date for returning to the moon. Another extremely troubling development is the PRC’s increasing efforts in the realm of cyber warfare, particular­ly as a means to attack U.S. infrastructure, computers, and associated networks. Such asymmetrical efforts underscore Beijing’s understanding of the increasing role played in U.S. military operations by command, control, communication, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems. The objective of the PRC is to establish elec­tronic dominance early in any conflict scenario in order to disrupt and downgrade the utility of such assets, while si­multaneously taking steps to ensure that an adversary can­not deny China access to its own information systems.58 The inescapable conclusion is that Chinese strategic force mod­ernization, space denial and anti-access capabilities, and cyber warfare activities provide clear evidence of a strategy aimed at degrading the ability of the United States to proj­ect power and support its allies in the region and thus un­dermining the credibility of the U.S. extended deterrent. To address these challenges, the United States must ensure that it remains the preeminent space power. Russian Federation With the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Repub­lics (USSR), the Russian Federation inherited the sprawling Soviet ballistic missile apparatus, which includes medium- and long-range solid- and liquid-fueled missiles. Presently, Moscow retains a formidable offensive strategic arsenal – the cornerstone of which is the SS-18 Satan ICBM, slated to remain in combat service for the next ten or fifteen years.59 However, Russia’s principal ballistic missile of the future is the Topol ICBM, which has recently been deployed.60 The Russian military has created a highly maneuverable variant of this missile, the Topol M, which has MIRV warhead tech­nology. Beyond the Topol M, Russia appears to be continu­ing with the development of the RS-24, which is capable of being equipped with as many as 10 warheads.61 The RS-24 has been successfully tested on several occasions.62 The Rus­sian Navy has also continued flight tests of its Bulava sea-launched strategic missile system, which has a range of at least 8,000 kilometers and can carry ten or more MIRV war­heads, with varying degrees of success.63 Over the past several years, Russia has substantially al­tered its strategic posture. In late 2003, Russia unveiled a new military doctrine lowering the bar on the use of nu­clear force to protect Russian interests in its “near abroad” of Central Asia and the Caucasus.64 Then-President Vladi­mir Putin announced the end of Russian force reductions and launched massive exercises of the country’s strategic forces.65 Russia has also announced that it will discontin­ue missile-launch notifications to other signatories of the Hague Code of Conduct on missile proliferation. Moscow and Beijing have held joint military exercises on one anoth­er’s territory and continue to strengthen military ties with other countries in the region, by way of the Shanghai Coop­eration Organization.66 These steps are seen by Moscow as a hedge against Western encroachment into countries on its periphery and a means to blunt the emerging American missile defense system. These trends are likely to continue under the Medvedev administration, as power in Russia ap­pears to have shifted to the prime minister’s office, now oc­cupied by Putin. The Dangers This itemized list of advances in ballistic missile capabil­ities in recent years, if viewed individually, might still un­derstate the dangers to the United States and its allies. The proliferation of ballistic missile capabilities by potential enemies, both states and non-state actors, must be viewed more broadly. It carries with it the implication that America and its allies may face coalitions of missile powers as addi­tional states acquire such capabilities. For example, Russia or China could decide to back North Korea in a confronta­tion with South Korea, Japan, and the United States. Like­wise, U.S. allies may drop out in the face of such a combined threat stemming from enemy coalitions whose members are armed with ballistic missiles, thus possibly confronting the United States with the larger missile threat presented by such a combination of missile possessors. Furthermore, in an emerging multi-polar world where ballistic missile and nuclear proliferation create an increasingly complex coali­tion dynamic, the unpredictability factor increases dramat­ically and must be addressed. The analogy of two scorpions in a bottle that characterized the U.S.-Soviet confrontation in the Cold War is giving way to multiple scorpions in a bot­tle, with all the complexity, unpredictability, and danger that this possibility implies.Asymmetric Threats Asymmetric threats by rogue states and strategic compet­itors pose growing and compounding dangers to the Unit­ed States and its allies. WMD Terrorism An increasing number of terrorist groups are making con­certed efforts to acquire WMD.67 As long ago as 1994, ists affiliated with Iran’s Islamic Jihad Organization made a serious bid to buy an atomic bomb or fissile material from one of Russia’s crumbling “nuclear cities.”68 More recently, the 9/11 Commission explicitly warned that “Al-Qaeda remains extremely interested in conducting chemical, biological, ra­diological, or nuclear attacks.”69 After the March 2003 arrest of 9/11 mastermind Khaled Sheikh Mohammed, investiga­tions revealed that terrorists had obtained materials for pro­ducing botulinum and salmonella toxins and cyanide.70 Lebanon’s Hezbollah has also acquired menacing capa­bilities that were put on display during the 34-day war be­tween the Shiite militia and the Israeli Defense Forces in 2006 days of the war, when Hezbollah should have been weakened by Israel’s sustained military operations, mi­litiamen launched more rockets into Israel than at any oth­er. During the course of the conflict, Hezbollah man­aged to launch over 4,000 of its estimated 13,000 rockets into northern Israel.71 Particularly troubling is the fact that in the final time during the conflict, striking as deep into Israeli ter­ritory as Haifa. Since the 2006 war, Hezbollah has rearmed both quan­titatively and qualitatively, and Hezbollah Secretary Gen­eral Hassan Nasrallah has claimed that the group’s arsenal now includes rockets that can target anywhere in Israel. A 2007 United Nations report concludes that Hezbollah may now have as many as 10,000 long-range rockets and 20,000 short-range rockets.72 United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has suggested that Hezbollah is now capable of striking Israel’s main metropolis, Tel Aviv, and that the mi­litia has tripled its stockpile of C-802 land-to-sea missiles. The addition of longer-range missiles significantly challeng­es efforts to counter Hezbollah’s capabilities. As part of the ceasefire agreement that ended the hostilities in 2006, the Lebanese army and the United Nations Interim Force in Leb­ anon (UNIFIL) have assumed much greater responsibilities in disrupting Hezbollah activities south of the Litani River. In response, Hezbollah has simply moved many of its long-range missile launchers north of the Litani into areas of the Bekaa Valley where neither the Lebanese army nor UNIFIL patrol. Even in southern Lebanon, where the Lebanese Army and UNIFIL are ostensibly providing security, Hezbollah has been successful in rearming with anti-tank missiles and Katyusha rockets hidden in villages and camouflaged bun­kers, according to the Israel Defense Force (IDF).73 The Ship-borne Scud Threat Among the threats outlined in the 1998 Rumsfeld Commis­sion Report is the one posed by ballistic missiles launched from vessels such as freighters, tankers, or container ships close to the American coastline. Such a danger has only in­creased in the past decade. In August 2004, then Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld emphasized that “One of the nations in the Middle East had launched a ballistic missile from a cargo vessel. They had taken a short-range, probably Scud missile, put it on a transporter-erector launcher, lowered it in, tak­en the vessel out into the water, peeled back the top, erect­ed it, fired it, lowered it, covered it up. And the ship that they used was using a radar and electronic equipment that was no different than 50, 60, 100 other ships operating in the im­mediate area.”74 U.S. officials have suggested that Rumsfeld was referring to Iran, which tested a ship-launched missile in the late 1990s.75 This ship-borne ballistic capability could be used to launch EMP attacks from locations off the U.S. coastline with devastating effects (more below). Asymmetric Proliferation In 2002, writing in the Financial Times, Defense Science Board chairman William Schneider described the mechan­ics by which North Korea has managed to acquire nuclear capabilities as the quintessential “twenty-first century tem­plate for proliferation.” The rapid, clandestine acquisition of critical mass in Pyongyang’s nuclear program, according to Schneider, reflects the existence of a vibrant, and self-sus­taining, proliferation architecture in today’s internation­al system.76 Schneider was referring to what has now been deemed “second-tier proliferation,” whereby “states in the developing world with varying technical capabilities trade among themselves to bolster one another’s nuclear and stra­tegic weapons efforts.”77 North Korea is a prime example of this trend. The devel­opment of the Al-Kibar reactor in Syria, destroyed by an Is­raeli airstrike in September 2007, is believed to have been greatly aided by North Korea. In fact, North Korea went so far as to send personnel to help construct the reactor. Be­yond its nuclear proliferation efforts, the Kim Jong-Il regime has become a principal supplier of ballistic missile compo­nents and associated technologies to the Middle East. The Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) estimates that North Korea has exported more than 1,000 Scud missiles along with mis­sile-related parts to the Middle East region. Missile exports, which net North Korea around $1.5 billion a year, constitute one of its largest sources of revenue. North Korea has since expanded this trade, and is now believed to be offering tech­nologies associated with its advanced Taepo Dong 2 ICBM to a number of regional client states, including Syria and Iran.78 Moreover, North Korea has sold missiles to Pakistan in exchange for nuclear technologies,a trade facilitated in large part by A.Q. Khan’s proliferation network (see below for more on A.Q. Khan).79 China has also used the transfer of nuclear and ballistic missile technologies as a tool of global influence and a mon­ey-making enterprise. Extensive Chinese assistance has been instrumental to North Korea’s development of the Taepo Dong 2, and it has played a central role in Pakistan’s development of nuclear capabilities. This cooperation has led to a trilater­al “proliferation axis” that has given Pakistan access to North Korean ballistic missiles and allowed Pakistani nuclear know-how to flow to North Korea.80 Chinese defense companies have also been complicit in aiding Iran’s progress on ballistic missile technology. The United States responded by impos­ing penalties on these companies for exporting to Iran highperformance metals and other components that can be used to extend the range of Tehran’s missile arsenal.81 Furthermore, such activities are not confined to state ac­tors. In late 2003, the discovery of the clandestine nucle­ar cartel headed by Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan exposed an alarming web of WMD and ballistic missile prolifera­tion. Khan confessed that he had provided Libya, Iran, and North Korea with technical assistance and components for manufacturing high-speed centrifuges.82 The government of Pakistan also revealed that he “gave some centrifuges to Iran,” and U.S. intelligence officials believe that North Ko­rea purchased high-speed centrifuges from the Khan net­work.83 Perhaps most troubling was the discovery of a nu­clear weapon design in 2008 on the computer hard drives of several members of Khan’s network.84 The bomb design is a miniaturized implosion device cable of fitting on North Korea’s No Dong missiles, as well as Iran’s Shahab and Pak­istan’s Hatf-5 (Ghauri) missiles. Depending on how much the design allows for warhead size reduction, these coun­tries may be able to make significant advances in their MIRV warhead programs. The EMP Threat According to the 2004 report of the EMP Commission,85 the United States faces a threat from EMP that could have cata­strophic consequences based on even a single nuclear war­head. EMP is generated by any nuclear weapon burst at any altitude above a few dozen kilometers, with the height ofburst being significant in determining the area exposed to EMP. The EMP threat arises from the ability, whether by ter­rorists or states, to launch relatively unsophisticated mis­siles with nuclear warheads to detonate at altitudes from 40 to 400 kilometers above the earth’s surface. The rationale for such action would be the high political-military payoff in the form of devastating consequences. An EMP attack would constitute a highly successful asymmetric strategy against a society as heavily dependent as the United States is on electronics, energy, telecommunications networks, transportation systems, the movement of inventories in its manufacturing sector, and food processing and distribution capabilities. As noted in the EMP Commission report, EMP was an unintended result of a nuclear detonation at an al­titude of about 400 kilometers during the Starfish nuclear weapons tests above Johnstone Island in the Central Pacif­ic in 1962. The effects, felt some 1400 kilometers away in Ha­waii, included “the failure of street lighting systems, tripping of circuit breakers, triggering of burglar alarms, and damage to a telecommunications relay facility.” Nuclear tests con­ducted by the Soviet Union, also in 1962, produced damage to overhead and underground buried cables at distances as far away as 600 kilometers, together with surge arrest­er burnout, spark-gap breakdown, blown fuses, and power-supply breakdown.86 The destruction and mayhem caused by an EMP explosion would be far more substantial today given the ubiquity of electronics and society’s increased re­liance on them to run critical infrastructures. Several potential enemies either already have, or could soon acquire, the capability to attack the United States with a high-altitude nuclear explosion EMP that would cover a wide geographic region. Such a weapon need not be deto­nated directly over the United States itself to produce ma­jor damage to America’s critical infrastructures such as telecommunications, banking and finance, fuel/energy, transportation, food and water supply, emergency servic­es, government activities, and space systems. U.S. satellites, both civilian and military, are vulnerable to a range of at­tacks that include EMP, especially in low-earth orbits. Again, as the EMP Commission concluded, “The national security and homeland security communities use commercial satel­lites for critical activities, including direct and backup com­munications, emergency response services, and continuity of operations during emergencies.”87 Such satellites could be disabled by collateral radiation effects from an EMP at­tack on ground targets. Thus it is obvious that an interdependence exists between the objects of a potential EMP attack. Disabling one of the infrastructures, such as telecommunications or electricity, would have severe consequences for others, with cascading effects from which an advanced, technologically dependent society such as the United States might not easily recover. An EMP attack mounted against the United States would have far broader international consequences, given the in­terdependence of America and other economies in an era of globalization. An EMP attack against other economies, such as Japan or a European nation, would have major effects in the United States, and on other countries if the attack was on the United States. The services that would be essential to cope with the consequences of a terrorist attack, such as hospitals and emergency services, themselves might be dis­abled and therefore would not be available when and where they were most needed. As Senator John Kyl has pointed out, “A terrorist organization might have trouble putting a nu­clear warhead ‘on target’ with a Scud, but it would be much easier to simply launch and detonate in the atmosphere. No need for the risk and difficulty trying to smuggle a nuclear weapon over the border or hit a particular city. Just launch a cheap missile from a freighter in international waters – al-Qaeda is believed to own about eighty such vessels – and make sure to get it a few miles in the air.”88 Notably, Russia has considered attack options that in­clude EMP. During the May 1999 NATO air campaign against Serbia, members of the Russian Duma, meeting with U.S. congressional counterparts, reportedly speculated about the paralyzing effects of an EMP attack on the United States.89 To amplify on the Rumsfeld statement cited under “Ship-borne Scud Threat,” above, Iran is reported to have tested whether its ballistic missiles, such as the Shahab-3 or the Scud, could be detonated by remote control while still in high-altitude flight. The most plausible explanation for such tests is that Iran is developing the capability to explode a high-altitude nuclear weapon that could destroy critical electronic and technological infrastructures.90 Without aneffective missile defense the United States will remain vul­nerable to the EMP threat given its extensive dependence on high-tech, electronic infrastructure that cannot easily be hardened to withstand such an attack. The ability to launch an incapacitating EMP strike against the United States pro­vides enemies with an asymmetric threat that would not only inhibit U.S. military action but would also strike a se­vere economic and psychological blow. The ResponseGiven this multiplicity of ballistic missile threats, the Unit­ed States must deploy a missile defense that deters hostile states from developing or acquiring missile capabilities that could threaten the United States, its allies and coalition part­ners, and its forces deployed abroad. Furthermore, America’s missile defense R&D programs, together with planned de­ployments, must be sufficiently robust to dissuade would-be missile possessors from attempting to challenge the United States. Washington must deter future enemies from acquir­ing ballistic missiles, just as in the past it dissuaded them from developing strategic bombers because of America’s abil­ity to overwhelm such systems. Finally, U.S. missile defense must be capable of defeating those ballistic missiles, what­ever their range and type, that could be launched against the United States. U.S. and allied ballistic missile defense capabilities are an essential element of a broader damage limitation strat­egy. The purpose of this strategy is to protect and defend the people, territory, infrastructure, and institutions of the United States and its allies to the greatest extent possible. This strategy is a marked departure from the retaliation-based deterrence strategy of the Cold War. It is a strategy specifically tailored to meeting the security demands result­ing from the emerging multi-polar world, which has been brought about, at least in part, by the proliferation of bal­listic missiles and nuclear weapons. A mix of offensive and defensive strategic forces, which are modernized to meet the new and challenging requirements of this strategy, will be necessary. Thus, a global and layered ballistic missile de­fense system must be intricately linked to other strategic forces, where the broader strategic posture of the U.S. and its allies results in security benefits that are greater than the sum of its parts. As the United States dissuades future potential possess­ors, it must recognize that threats are increasing at a pace that no longer allows the luxury of long lead times within which a missile defense could be developed and deployed. Therefore, the United States must develop and rapidly field a missile defense with global reach, capable of coping with threats against the United States and its forces and allies from any direction. At the same time, America must attempt to dissuade hostile actors from acquiring missiles by render­ing such investments a poor use of limited resources. Ad­ditionally, given the uncertainty in predicting where, when, and by whom missiles might be launched – and what their targets may be – constant defenses are called for that are capable of intercepting missiles irrespective of their geo­graphic origin. Other things being equal, it is preferable to intercept threatening ballistic missiles as far away from their intend­ed targets and as early in their flight trajectory as possible. Best of all would be to have the capability to destroy an at­tacking missile shortly after it is launched, while its rockets still burn and any perturbation will lead to its destruction – with, in many cases, the debris falling back onto the area from which the attack was launched in the first place. The ca­pability to interdict a missile and its warheads in any phases of their flight (boost, midcourse, and terminal) requires an ability to detect and intercept the attack within a very few minutes and to track and destroy the attacking missile and its warheads during their longer midcourse traverse through space before they reenter the atmosphere. Finally, the last-ditch defense would be to destroy the attacking missiles as they reenter and pass through the atmosphere – and as ac­companying debris and decoys burn up on reentry – in the terminal phase en route to their targets. The best defense ca­pability would be layered so that it could provide opportuni­ties for destruction in all three phases of flight. Only space-based defenses inherently have this global capability and permanence. While sea-based defenses can move freely through the two-thirds of the earth’s surface that are oceans, their capability is limited by geography and by the specific operations of the fleet – including where the sea-based missile defense happens to be deployed at any given time, and how quickly it could be redeployed to meet a crisis situation. Air-based and ground-based defenses, meanwhile, can have global capabilities, but frequently take considerable time to deploy when and where needed and are also depen­dent on the cooperation of U.S. friends and allies in permit­ting the necessary supporting activities on their territories. Thus, only a space-based missile defense will possess both constancy and global availability, irrespective of allied sup­port and agreement. As such, space-based missile defense constitutes the only truly global system, with all the rest be­ing either regional or local.91In the case of sea-based systems, namely the Aegis pro­gram discussed in section 2, we have a regional system ca­pable of boost-phase, midcourse, and terminal intercept de­pending on where and how it is positioned, or vectored. It has a near-global application for regional operations, be­cause it is sea-based and theoretically it can be deployed over any portion of the earth’s surface covered by oceans. A land-based system can theoretically be deployed anywhere over about one-third of the world’s surface and, depending on how it is vectored, under some limited conditions would also be capable of boost-phase, midcourse, and terminal in­terception. Yet space-based missile defense alone is truly global in reach because of the medium in which it oper­ates, unconstrained by overflight or territorial restrictions. It also offers inherent interdiction advantages, described in greater detail below.

Korea war causes extinction

**Hayes and Hamel-Green, ‘10** Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development, AND \*\* Executive Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development act Victoria University – 1/5/10, Executive Dean at Victoria, “The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia,” <http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf> [H-Triv modified]

The international community is increasingly aware that cooperative diplomacy is the most productive way to tackle the multiple, interconnected global challenges facing humanity, not least of which is the increasing proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Korea and Northeast Asia are instances where risks of nuclear proliferation and actual nuclear use arguably have increased in recent years. This negative trend is a product of continued US nuclear threat projection against the DPRK as part of a general program of coercive diplomacy in this region, North Korea’s nuclear weapons programme, the breakdown in the Chinese-hosted Six Party Talks towards the end of the Bush Administration, regional concerns over China’s increasing military power, and concerns within some quarters in regional states (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan) about whether US extended deterrence (“nuclear umbrella”) afforded under bilateral security treaties can be relied upon for protection. The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the **possibility of nuclear attack**1, whether by **intention, miscalculation, or merely accident**, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. **Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a [catastrophe] of unprecedented proportions.** But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could **make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison**. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with **subsequent nuclear breakout** and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and **aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states.** The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

Bioweapons cause extinction

Richard J Ochs, 6-9-2002, frmr president of the Aberdeen Proving Ground Superfund Citizens Coalition, member of the Depleted Uranium Task force of the Military Toxics Project and a member of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, “Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately,” http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html

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

# Cap K

Aff’s capitalist

**Sheppard, ‘90**

E Sheppard, "Transportation in a capitalist space-economy: transportation demand, circulation time, and transportation innovations," 1990, <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a221007>/

Transportation, as the service of moving commodities between places, plays a unique role in a fully competitive capitalist space-economy. The commodity of transportation is consumed as a part of virtually every economic transaction, linking the production and consumption of a commodity; demand for transportation is derived from spatial configurations rather than being fixed by socially necessary techniques and real wages; and the circulation time taken in transportation is a deduction from capitalists' profits. The impact of circulation time on profits may be calculated precisely. The derived nature of the demand for transportation adds a level of uncertainty to the impact of cost-reducing technical change on profit rates. Given this, cost-reducing and time-reducing technical change in the transportation commodity is one of the few ways of ensur[es]ing an increased rate of profit for capitalis[m]ts, ceteris paribus. The public nature of transportation improvements and the high investments in fixed capital that are required help to explain the central role of the state in capitalism in the improvement of transportation and thus in underwriting capital accumulation.

Extinction

Ljubodrag Simonovic, Ph.D., Philosophy; M.A., Law; published author of seven books, 2007, A New World is Possible, “Basis of contemporary critical theory of capitalism.”

The final stage of a mortal combat between mankind and capitalism is in progress. A specificity of capitalism is that, in contrast to "classical" barbarism (which is of destructive, murderous and plundering nature), it annihilates life by creating a "new world" – a "technical civilization" and an adequate, dehumanized and denaturalized man. Capitalism has eradicated man from his (natural) environment and has cut off the roots through which he had drawn life-creating force. Cities are "gardens" of capitalism where degenerated creatures "grow". Dog excrement, gasoline and sewerage stench, glaring advertisements and police car rotating lights that howl through the night - this is the environment of the "free world" man. By destroying the natural environment capitalism creates increasingly extreme climatic conditions in which man is struggling harder and harder to survive – and creates artificial living conditions accessible solely to the richest layer of population, which cause definitive degeneration of man as a natural being. "Humanization of life" is being limited to creation of micro-climatic conditions, of special capitalistic incubators - completely commercialized artificial living conditions to which degenerated people are appropriate. The most dramatic truth is: capitalism can survive the death of man as a human and biological being. For capitalism a "traditional man" is merely a temporary means of its own reproduction. "Consumer-man" represents a transitional phase in the capitalism-caused process of mutation of man towards the "highest" form of capitalistic man: a robot-man. "Terminators" and other robotized freaks which are products of the Hollywood entertainment industry which creates a "vision of the future" degenerated in a capitalist manner, incarnate creative powers, alienated from man, which become vehicles for destruction of man and life. A new "super race" of robotized humanoids is being created, which should clash with "traditional mankind", meaning with people capable of loving, thinking, daydreaming, fighting for freedom and survival - and impose their rule over the Earth. Instead of the new world, the "new man" is being created – who has been reduced to a level of humanity which cannot jeopardize the ruling order. Science and technique have become the basic lever of capital for the destruction of the world and the creation of "technical civilization". It is not only about destruction achieved by the use of technical means. It is about technicization of social institutions, of interpersonal relations, of the human body. Increasing transformation of nature into a surrogate of "nature", increasing dehumanization of the society and increasing denaturalization of man are direct consequences of capital's effort, within an increasingly merciless global economic war, to achieve complete commercialization of both natural and the social environment. The optimism of the Enlightenment could hardly be unreservedly supported nowadays, the notion of Marx that man imposes on himself only such tasks as he can solve, particularly the optimism based on the myth of the "omnipotence" of science and technique. The race for profits has already caused irreparable and still unpredictable damage to both man and his environment. By the creation of "consumer society", which means through the transition of capitalism into a phase of pure destruction, such a qualitative rise in destruction of nature and mankind has been performed that life on the planet is literally facing a "countdown". Instead of the "withering away" (Engels) of institutions of the capitalist society, the withering away of life is taking place. / The thesis of conservative bourgeois theoreticians, according to which the history of mankind ends with capitalism, becomes more and more convincing. Unless it is prevented, capitalism will, already by the beginning of the third millennium, finish off what remains of the world. Scientists are a human form in which capitalism instrumentalizes natural forces in order to control men and nature. They have been reduced to specialty-idiots who, in a "technical world", where everything operates by "pressing a button" and where "everything is under control", see an ideal world that should be longed for, and in a machine-man the "culmination of progress". Scientists, for whom "obtaining expertise" is paid for with their humanity, perceive people as enemies and machines as "friends". The same way profit and not man is essential to capitalists, "progress" and not man is essential to scientists - progress being another name for profit, and "profit" being another name for destruction. "The technical intelligentsia" are mutilated people not able to express their humanity. Fear of people transforms into hatred of people. They consciously deprive themselves of all those features that make them men, and they escape into a technical world where they can "experiment" with machines, people, the living world.… The power of science and technique becomes the power of manipulation and dest

ruction. For them the "technical world" becomes the "natural" world and the highest esthetic challenge, like Eiffel's tower, this capitalistic Tyrannosaurus, which symbolizes domination of "technical civilization" over man. It becomes more and more obvious that capitalism creates an increasingly deep social and ecological crisis that it cannot control. The transition of capitalism is going on, from the stage of "controlled" into a stage of uncontrolled chaos which is the ultimate "answer" of the ruling order to its own incapacity to manage the increasingly dramatic existential crisis – out of which either the tearing down of capitalism and the creating of the new world, or the destruction of mankind and life on Earth, can be generated. The consequences of capitalism cannot be controlled by means of social institutions, for those have also become tools of capitalist corporations and are being used to achieve their interests. Men are deprived of basic human rights: the right to live, to labor, to a healthy environment, family, happiness, a future... A process of depersonalization by the capitalist governance shows no responsibility for its own actions. Invisible and impossible to seize, the spirit of capitalism, which becomes the fatal force of destiny, rules the world. Multinational corporations destroy the international legal system, democratic institutions, the "social state"... The political arena becomes a political circus, politicians become capital's court jesters. Public disputes on essential social issues are being replaced with fabricated affairs. "Rule of law" becomes an ideological mask of capitalist tyranny. Eventually, the political sphere becomes a vehicle of the ruling class used for depoliticization of citizens and extermination of trust in democratic institutions and hope for the possibility of creating a rational social order that would be an incarnation of the guiding principles of the French Revolution - upon which modern humanism is based. It turned out that (Western) democracy is a political form of the rule of capital over man. Multinational corporations destroy the emancipating legacy of civil society, and the institutions that should offer a possibility for expressi5on of the citizens' political will become the means for achieving their interests instead. The possibilities for the political articulation of increasing citizens' discontent through institutions are diminishing. A declining number of issues determining the destiny of men are being raised in "representative bodies". A declining number of people take an active part in the elections. Instead of being a political subject, the citizen becomes a consumer of political programs. Everything occurs in accordance with the principles of market economics, within which good advertising is of utmost importance for the sale of products. "Money does not stink!" becomes the basic political principle. Politics becomes an industry for production of "democratic" falsehoods and illusions. The more the crisis of capitalism develops, accompanied by the increasing discontent of people – which unavoidably generates the need for creation of the new world, for this is an existential imperative – the more aggressive are the efforts of the ruling class to prevent its disintegration. The most important task of the governing politics is to make it impossible that the objective possibilities for the change of the existing world become real potential for changes, through the change-oriented practice of the oppressed. Therefore, destruction of (critical) mind and "pacification" of the oppressed through idiotization become the most important task of the governing propaganda machinery. Degenerated capitalist rulers of the world develop increasingly horrible mechanisms for physical and mental destruction of people. Governing politics is limited to technique for the manipulation of the oppressed by which the emancipating legacy of civil society is being annihilated while an increasingly aggressive relationship between races, nations, religions, genders is being developed... Artificially provoked and controlled conflicts between people are being imposed, in which trust in man and change-oriented energy should burn out. "General suspects" are being labeled so as to be accountable for the causes of discontent and at which anger of citizens deprived of their rights should be vented. In this manner a critical and change-oriented relation towards the world and any class awareness are being annihilated, while contemporary fascism is being created. Production of fear, used to prepare the public for the use of the means of mass destruction (including atomic and neutron bombs) by the "bad guys" around the globe, becomes the most important task of the ruling propaganda machinery. The capitalist perpetuum mobile is in action: capitalism generates increasing discontent which is transformed, by means of politics limited to the technique of redirection of people's discontent toward the accomplishment of anti-human political and economic goals, into a driving power for repression and destruction. The governing regime tries to accomplish total criminalizing of the society, which means that chaos is created – controlled by that very way of life based on the totalizing principle of "Big fish devours small fish!"- within which all efforts to create a human world are being degenerated. Criminalizing of the society becomes the most important form of integration of the oppressed into a spiritual and existential orbit of capitalism and a way of dealing with the libertarian (class) struggle. The specifics of the capitalist criminalizing of the society go toward the expectation that it should eliminate a population "surplus", in other words, the "non usable labor force". Biological destruction of the oppressed becomes the most efficient way of controlling them. This method was "successfully" used by the American administration with Indians in "reservations" all over the USA: methanol and blankets infected with smallpox once played the role now assigned to AIDS, cigarettes, drugs, poisoned food...The faster the operating of capital, the less space remains for humanity. Capitalism destroys the family and all other forms of social life and produces the lonely man, for whom it becomes increasingly difficult to accept responsibility and to oppose the capitalist craze. This is a psychological moment of extraordinary importance for the ruling order. The growing misfortune becomes a generator of the growing evil into which the average citizen (petit bourgeois) masochistically blends so as to avoid responsibility for the annihilation of the world - in which process he, actively or passively, participates. No one raises the issue in public any more of man's responsibility for the established global "development" – for this responsibility implies the right to freedom and life. Therefore, the concept of "future happiness" was replaced by the fear for life as the main behavioral motivation factor. Capitalistically degenerated man has lost faith that he can do anything in the social area, so he tries to barricade himself within his own atomized hopelessness and to create his own micro-world. "Freedom" of the slaves of capitalism is limited to the possibility of purchasing an increasing variety of ever more destructive ways to "escape" from everyday life offered by the entertainment industry. Capitalism generates the pathological man that accepts destruction as way of life - the petit bourgeois is a man degenerated in a capitalist way. He has become a victim of capitalist nothingness to such an extent that he finds relief from the everyday agony he experiences in a vision of an ultimate and spectacular annihilation of mankind: instinct for life transforms into instinct for destruction. Capitalism as a totalitarian order crushes the emancipating legacy of civil society which opens a possibility for creation of the new world - and it produces forms of political struggle that have a destructive nature. Terrorism is a capitalistically degenerated form of the fight against capitalism – destructive violence that uses capitalist means and methods - and only contributes to the intensification of the process of destruction. It does not long for creation of the new world, but for annihilation of the existing world. This is the essential difference between revolutionary struggle and terrorist actions. Fanaticism, and not a visionary conscious based on reason and freedom, dominates terrorist violence. Fanaticism is a consequence of an increasingly merciless destruction of the world and people performed by capitalist monopolies. A typical example is so-called "Muslim extremism": it is an unavoidable consequence of the more and more obvious Western effort to crush the Muslims and take full control over oil deposits. At the same time, the "fight against terrorism" is a new ideological mask of American imperialism which is analogous to the "fight against Judaic bolshevism", a mask of the Nazi Drang nach Osten, annihilation of Jews and Slavs and conquering of Lebensraum for German capital. "Fight against terrorism" becomes a pretext for introduction of global terror by the most powerful capitalist corporations. Those who terrorize the world in the form of the "fight against terrorism" try to crush all those who threaten their efforts to transform the entire world into their own concentration camp. The offered "protection" from terrorism is of a mafia nature: those who do not accept the iron embrace of the "global policeman" will be exposed to the worst American terror. "Global terrorism" becomes the "main danger that threatens mankind" - this is being constantly repeated by servants of the American politics around the globe. From its position toward terrorism one can view the real outreach and the real objectives of the American politics: terrorism is neither ideological nor alignment-related, but of a global and anti-existential nature. Ruling oligarchies of the most developed capitalist countries are "solving" the increasingly deep existential crisis within their respective societies by shifting it onto the shoulders of the poor of the world. The survival of capitalism is directly conditioned by the robbing and destruction of the entire world. Contemporary imperialism (which has been named "globalism" by Coca Cola intellectuals), unlike its earlier historical forms that were exploitative (Rob!) and genocidal (Kill!) in nature, is of an ecocidal nature (Annihilate!). NATO, IMF and other "international organizations" are only a vehicle the West uses for carrying out its ecocide terrorism and the genocide politics based on it. A new fascism is being established, based on total global capitalist terror: each part of the planet, and each segment of life become means for capitalist reproduction - which means that life itself becomes terror over man and the destruction of humanity. The always more intensive destruction of life leads toward a radicalization of the genocide politics: destruction of an increasingly large number of people becomes a precondition for the survival of an ever-smaller number of people. Within that context a theory of the "golden billion" has been established which represents a strategic landmark for the political practice of the most developed capitalist countries. This ecocide capitalist craze generates a growing fear for survival and consequently, based on this fear, establishes conditions for radicalization of political decisions and political action. The use of atomic and neutron bombs, artificial viruses (such as HIV) and other lethal means becomes a legitimate "defense" tool. In almost all reports produced by the Western "experts", "overpopulation" of the planet is "the greatest danger for survival of mankind". Fear for survival is being redirected toward nations of the world that "excessively procreate" thus jeopardizing the survival of all. The solution is being imposed by itself: destruction of the billions of "superfluous" is essential for the survival of mankind. Those who unsparingly destroy nature and exterminate peoples become "saviors of mankind". The West has ample experience with destruction of nations: extermination of the North American Indians by American capitalism, and the Chinese and the Australian Aborigines by British imperialism - show the Western "traditions" of elimination of the "surplus" of humanity. At the same time, based on the American "new world order", "globalism" provides conditions for establishing new "national" genocide plutocracies that have the task of destroying the "excessive population" in their respective territory, by applying of economic and other measures. Further development of capitalism will be paid for by billions of innocent people, by a growing number of wildlife species that are facing extinction, by the entire living world... Eventually, it all serves to enable several million of the mentally degenerated "rich" to continue "enjoying" the material wealth created for them from the ashes and blood, tolerance for which is being provided by the use of police, mafia and military tyranny, and the illusions created by the entertainment industry. Fanatics of capitalism are the worst sort of terrorists: they are destroying life on Earth. The economic logic of monopolist capitalism, which is based upon the notion of "Big fish devours small fish!", has become the ruling political rationale that determines relations between states. What the Nazis did not achieve with weapons and concentration camps, the Western capitalist corporations accomplished with money and economic extortion: the transformation of former "Eastern block" countries into their own "living space", while transforming their citizens into contemporary (Coca Cola) slaves. The ruling European political circles identify Europe with the "European Union" in the same way as the Nazi ideologists declared Europe "the new European order". It is exactly those who advocate Europe as a community of equal nations and who insist on its emancipating heritage - who are the most bitter enemies of the "European Union" as a vehicle for the largest European corporations toward their destruction of the emancipating heritage of European nations. The so called "European Union" is being built upon an illusion that joining the "Union" guarantees all European nations "prosperity and a better life". It should be remembered here that the main goal proclaimed by the Nazi "new European order" was to make "all European nations happy"! The "European Union" is an anti-human and destructive order based upon the ruling principles of monopolist capitalism, "Big fish devours small fish!" and "Money does not stink!"; its ruling political sphere does not provide opportunity for expression of the citizens' political will but represents a political form of the rule of capital over people; the entire institutional, normative and propaganda area of that order is directed toward destruction of the cultural and libertarian self-conscious of people and toward their integration into a spiritual orbit of capitalism at the level of the idiotized labor-consumer "mass". The "European Union" is not a "democratic community of nations", but a form of integration of the European multinational corporations in their fight against the American corporations - which use the American state as a vehicle for the achievement of their interest at the global level. The "European Union" is not based upon the emancipating traditions of European nations, but upon the imperialist traditions of European capitalism. It is not a humanistic goal but a vehicle of the most powerful capitalist corporations for the achievement, by economic and political "measures", of the very same goals that Hitler was expected to achieve for German capital - by military means. It is a transitional phase in "European development" that leads toward the creation of a new (ecocide) fascist order. Appropriately, this violent, capitalistically established "integration of European nations" cause nationalism and racism to thrive in response to people's deprivation of basic human and civil rights - which is an introduction to new increasingly dramatic clashes that will develop based on the prevalent logic impose by monopolist capitalism, and also based on the increasingly contaminated natural environment and on the biological deterioration of European nations. The ecocide capitalist terrorism unavoidably generates nationalism which is no longer based on the struggle to obtain and preserve a job or a living standard, but on the struggle for survival. It becomes more and more obvious that "the uniting of Europe", instead of developing optimism and an atmosphere of tolerance, which would correspond to the "humanist ideals" referred to by politicians, the citizens' fear of the future and intolerance are growing. "Humanist speeches" cannot conceal the growing crime, unemployment, falling apart of the "welfare state" and, along with it, of social protection, devastation of environment, drug abuse, violence, suicides, fanaticism, extremism, the flourishing of Satanist sects and of fascism, the breaking up of the family, the growing number of parentless children, human-trafficking and child-trafficking aimed at sexual abuse or the taking of their lives to "obtain" organs (in England alone more than 40,000 underage children "disappear" annually), the spreading of AIDS and other diseases that would decimate the poor, loneliness that has achieved epidemic dimensions... The "United Europe" generates racism, similar to that developed in the USA. East European and Balkan peoples are getting the status of "people with no culture", which means "lesser creatures". The languages spoken by the Gastarbeiter population are not being perceived as part of the European cultural heritage, but become a motive for discrimination. As a mass phenomenon, migrant labourers keep their children from learning their own mother tongue in order to mask their origin and avoid humiliation. Bearing in mind that an insignificant number of children of migrant labor achieve college and university educations, it becomes clear that depriving them of their mother tongue represents obliteration of their cultural being, through which act they are predestined to be the "dirty labour force" predestined to perform the hardest and the most dangerous jobs. Within the "European Union" one can clearly discern the racist pyramid of power based upon economic, political and military supremacy: Germany, France and England are on the top, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium... are bellow them, the Balkan peoples are located at the bottom the pyramid. In the "United Europe", the place reserved for them is the one Afro-Americans occupy in the United States of America. On the "road toward Europe" the Balkan nations will lose their own historical (cultural) self-conscious and libertarian dignity in order to become a garbage collector labour force, while the Balkans become the septic tank of Europe. The Balkan peoples are commanded to renounce the libertarian myths that are the basis of their historical and libertarian self-conscious, while at the same time, they are expected to cling to the myth of "Europe" as a "community of free nations": libertarian myths are being replaced by colonial ones. The "uniting of Europe" in accordance with the American model, which means to be based upon the interests of multinational corporations and their struggle for supremacy, leads towards annihilation of "nationalism" which translates into annihilation of the cultural heritage of European nations and their right to make sovereign political decisions.

Vote neg as an abandonment of belief in capitalism

Adrian Johnston, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of New Mexico, 2004, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, Volume 9 // Issue 3

Perhaps the absence of a detailed practical roadmap in Žižek’s political writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby truly to open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance 127 (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle 128). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining just an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the earlier analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing 93 more than a kind of “magic,” that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The “external” obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, “internally” believe in it—capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socioperformative force emanating from this same material.

# Heg

Heg is unsustainable – emerging powers, wealth transfer, and nonstate actors

US National Intel Council Report, ‘08

(National Intelligence Council, U.S. National Intelligence Agency Mid-Term and Long-Term Thinking, Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, p.vi)

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

Unipolar system creates recalcitrant power backlash which leads to proliferation and war

Monteiro 12- Professor of Political Science at Yale, PhD in Political Science from UChicago

(Nuno, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity is Not Peaceful,” MIT Press Journals, International Security Vol. 36, No. 3, Pages 9-40)

In an international system with more than one great power, recalcitrant mi-nor powers would, in principle, be able to balance externally by finding a great power sponsor.70 In unipolarity, however, no such sponsors exist.71 Only major powers are available, but because their survival is already guaranteed, they are likely to accommodate the unipole. And even if some do not, they are unlikely to meet a recalcitrant minor power’s security needs given that they possess only limited power-projection capabilities.72 As such, recalcitrant minor pow-ers must defend themselves, which puts them in a position of extreme self-help. There are four characteristics common to states in this position: (1) anarchy,(2) uncertainty about other states’ intentions, (3) insufficient capabilities to de-ter a great power, and (4) no potential great power sponsor with whom to forma balancing coalition. The first two characteristics are common to all states in all types of polarity. The third is part of the rough-and-tumble of minor power sin any system. The fourth, however, is unique to recalcitrant minor powers in unipolarity. This dire situation places recalcitrant minor powers at risk for as long as they lack the capability to defend themselves. They depend on the goodwill of the unipole and must worry that the unipole will shift to a strategy of offensive dominance or disengagement. Recalcitrant minor powers will therefore attempt to bolster their capabilities through internal balancing. To deter an eventual attack by the unipole and bolster their chances of sur-vival in the event deterrence fails, recalcitrant minor powers will attempt to re-inforce their conventional defenses, develop the most effective asymmetric strategies possible, and, most likely in the nuclear age, try to acquire the ulti-mate deterrent—survivable nuclear weapons.73 In so doing, they seek to become major powers.

Extinction

Asal and Beardsley 09 (Victor, Department of Political Science, State University of New York, Albany, and Kyle, Department of Political Science, Emory University, Winning with the Bomb, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/uploads/Beardsley-Asal_Winning_with_the_Bomb.pdf>)

Conclusion Why do states proliferate? Nuclear weapons and the programs necessary to create them are expensive. They are dangerous. Other countries may attack a state while it is trying to create a nuclear arsenal and there is always the risk of a catastrophic accident. They may help generate existential threats by encouraging first strike incentives amongst a state's opponents. This paper has explored the incentives that make nuclear weapons attractive to a wide range of states despite their costly and dangerous nature. We have found that nuclear weapons provide more than prestige, they provide leverage. They are useful in coercive diplomacy, and this must be central to any explanation of why states acquire them. Since 9 August 1945 no state has used a nuclear weapon against another state, but we find evidence that the possession of nuclear weapons helps states to succeed in their confrontations with other states even when they do not “use” them. Conflict with nuclear actors carries with it a potential danger that conflict with other states simply does not have. Even though the probability of full escalation is presumably low, the evidence confirms that the immense damage from the possibility of such escalation is enough to make an opponent eager to offer concessions. Asymmetric crises allow nuclear states to use their leverage to good effect. When crises involve a severe threat – and nuclear use is not completely ruled out – the advantage that nuclear actors have is substantial. Nuclear weapons help states win concessions quickly in 25 salient conflicts. Consistent with the other papers in this issue and the editors’ introduction (Gartzke and Kroenig this issue), we report that nuclear weapons confer tangible benefits to the possessors. These benefits imply that there should be a general level of demand for nuclear weapons, which means that explanations for why so few states have actually proliferated should focus more on the supply side, as applied by Matthew Kroenig (this issue) and Matthew Fuhrmann (this issue). The findings here importantly suggest an additional reason why “proliferation begets proliferation,” in the words of George Shultz (Shultz 1984, 18). If both parties to a crisis have nuclear weapons, the advantage is effectively cancelled out. When states develop nuclear weapons, doing so may encourage their rivals to also proliferate for fear of being exploited by the shifting bargaining positions. And once the rivals proliferate, the initial proliferator no longer has much bargaining advantage. On the one hand, this dynamic adds some restraint to initial proliferation within a rivalry relationship: states fear that their arsenal will encourage their rivals to pursue nuclear weapons, which will leave them no better off (Davis 1993; Cirincione 2007). On the other hand, once proliferation has occurred, all other states that are likely to experience coercive bargaining with the new nuclear state will also want nuclear weapons. The rate of proliferation has the potential to accelerate because the desire to posses the “equalizer” will increase as the number of nuclear powers slowly rises. Our theoretical framework and empirical findings are complementary to Gartzke and Jo (this issue), who posit and find that nuclear states enjoy greater influence in the international realm. An interesting dynamic emerges when comparing the results to Rauchhaus (this issue), who finds that nuclear weapons in asymmetric dyads tend to increase the propensity for escalation. We have argued that nuclear weapons improve the bargaining leverage of the 26 possessors and tested that proposition directly. It is important to note that the factors that shape conflict initiation and escalation are not necessarily the same factors that most shape the outcome of the conflict. Even so, one explanation for why a stronger bargaining position does not necessarily produce less escalation is that escalation is a function of decisions by both sides, and even though the opponent of a nuclear state is more willing to back down, the nuclear state should be more willing to raise its demands and push for a harder bargain in order to maximize the benefits from the nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons appear to need ever-greater shares of their bargains in order to be satisfied, which helps to explain both their proclivity to win and their proclivity toward aggressive coercive diplomacy. An important implication in light of these findings is thus that even though nuclear weapon states tend to fare better at the end of their crises, this does not necessarily mean that the weapons are a net benefit for peace and stability.

# Soybeans

China investing in Africa to bolster food security

Vidal (environment editor, The Guardian ) 12

(John, “Chinese food security may be motivating investments in Africa,” May 10, 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2012/may/10/chinese-food-security-investments-africa)

Future need to import more food a possible influence in China's engagement with African agriculture, claims study. [China](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/china)'s long-term motivation for investing in African farming could be to export food back to its home markets, a [research paper from Standard Chartered bank](https://research.standardchartered.com/researchdocuments/Pages/ResearchArticle.aspx?&R=93266) has warned. The world's largest country is more or less self-sufficient in grains, but within 20-30 years it is expected to need to import an extra 100m tonnes of food a year to meet the growing appetites of its middle classes. "Where China will turn to meet these agricultural needs is the key question," said the paper's authors, who have analysed China's involvement in African farming. "Concerns about global [food security](http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/food-security)have raised questions over whether investments in African agriculture are for export. While we do not see investment as securing Chinese food security for now, this could be a longer-term motivation." China's investment in African agriculture is still insignificant compared with the money it has ploughed into African oil, gas, mineral resources and infrastructure. Of an estimated $67bn of large-scale investments in[Africa](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/africa) from 2006 to 2012, only $3.5bn was invested in agriculture according to the bank, which earns 90% of its profits from Africa, Asia and the Middle East. But there are strong signals that China is getting more interested in African farming. It has pledged to provide, in the next few years, up to 3,000 experts for technical assistance and training, as well as training 2,000 African agricultural technicians and setting up 14 major agricultural technology centres. Africa's population is expected to match or overtake China's by 2050, but the paper says China will soon need to develop deeper trade ties with key African countries to help feed its 1.3 billion population. "China's current engagement in African agriculture is primarily aimed at addressing African food security," said the report. "[But] by investing in the region with the greatest agricultural potential, China could also be seeking to support its long-term food security." China, along with Middle East countries and India, has been accused of["land grabbing" in Africa](http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2012/apr/27/international-land-deals-database-africa), but this may have been exaggerated, according to the paper. "Reports that China's ZTE Agribusiness Corporation is leasing 3m ha [hectares, 7.4m acres] to produce palm oil in the Democratic Republic of [the] Congo appear overstated," said the study. "In reality, this is likely to be closer to a total 100,000 ha. The leasing of land by Chinese companies across Africa is small compared with that of India and the Middle East."

No CCP collapse-strong legitimacy and stable now. Even if dissatisfaction exists, it will be directed to the lower levels of government.

Bell ( Zhiyuan Chair Professor at Jiaotong University (Shanghai) and professor of political theory and director of the Center for Comparative and International Political Philosophy at Tsinghua University (Beijing)) 12

(Daniel A., “Why China Won't Collapse (Soon),” July 9, 12, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-a-bell/chinese-government-legitimacy_b_1658006.html>)

The purge of Chongqing's Party chief Bo Xilai is China's most serious political crisis in recent decades. What seemed like a relatively stable system of political transition -- two five year terms for top leaders -- has been thrown into chaos. Or so we are told. Such predictions about the collapse of China'spolitical system have been constantly repeated since the suppression of the pro-democracy uprisings in 1989. But the system didn't collapse then, and it won't collapse now. The key reason such dire predictions are taken seriously -- especially in the West -- is that non-democratic regimes are seen to lack legitimacy. A political regime that is morally justified in the eyes of the people must be chosen by the people. In the case of China, the political leadership is a self-selected elite. Such mode of rule is fragile, as the Arab Spring has shown. But this view assumes the people are dissatisfied with the regime. In fact, the large majority of Chinese people support the single-party state structure. Since the 1990s, scholars in the West and China have carried out many large scale surveys into the legitimacy of Chinese political power and by now they have virtually arrived at a consensus: the degree of legitimacy of the Chinese political system is very high. Surveys have been modified to prevent people from telling lies and the results are always the same. To the extent there is dissatisfaction, it is largely directed at the lower levels of government. The central government is viewed as the most legitimate part of the Chinese political apparatus. How can it be that the Chinese government managed to achieve a high level of political legitimacy without adopting free and fair competitive elections for the country's leaders? However paradoxical it may sound to Westernears, the Chinese government has succeeded by drawing upon sources of non-democratic legitimacy. The first source of non-democratic legitimacy can be termed performance legitimacy, meaning that the government's first priority should be the material well-being of the people. This idea has long roots in China -- Confucius himself said the government should make the people prosperous -- and the Chinese Communist Party has also put poverty alleviation at the top of its political agenda. Hence, the government derives much, if not most, of its legitimacy by its ability to provide for the material welfare of Chinese citizens. It has substantially increased the life expectancy of Chinese people, and the reform era has seen perhaps the most impressive poverty alleviation achievement in history, with several hundred million people being lifted out of poverty. The second source of non-democratic legitimacy can be termed political meritocracy: the idea that political leaders should have above average ability to make morally informed political judgments.It too has deep historical roots. In Imperial China, scholar-officials proved their ability in a fair and open examination system, and consequently they were granted uncommon (by Western standards) amounts of respect, authority, and legitimacy. Political surveys have shown that Chinese still endorse the view that it is more important to have high-quality politicians who care about the people's needs than to worry about procedural arrangements ensuring people's rights to choose their leaders. In recent decades, the Chinese Communist Party has increased its legitimacy by transforming itself into a more meritocratic political organization, with renewed emphasis on examinations and education as criteria for political leadership. The third source of non-democratic legitimacy is nationalism. An important part of legitimacy can be termed "ideological legitimacy": the regime seeks to be seen as morally justified in the eyes ofthe people by virtue of certain ideas that it expresses in its educational system, political speeches, and public policies. The CCP was of course founded on Marxist principles, but the problem is that few believe in the communist ideal anymore. Hence, the regime has increasingly turned to nationalism to secure "ideological legitimacy". Nationalism has more recent roots in China: in Imperial China, the political elites tended to view their "country" as the center of the world. But this vision collapsed when China was subject to the incursions of Western colonial powers in the mid-twentieth century, leading to a "century of humiliation" at hands of foreign powers. The CCP put a symbolic end to abuse and bullying by foreign powers with the establishment of a relatively secure state in 1949 and it constantly reminds Chinese of its function as protector of the Chinese nation. In short, it should not be surprising that the CCP is widely seen to be legitimate in the eyes of the people, and barring unforeseen events there is no reason to expect imminent collapse of the regime.But the key word is "imminent". In the absence of substantial political reform, China'snon-democratic sources of political legitimacy may not be sustainable in the long term.

No impact-global food shocks are happening now. Chinese political stability tip over brink should have already been triggered and plan can’t solve for non-soybean food shocks.

ABC Rural 12

(“Food shock warning as global grain deteriorates,” July 24, 2012, http://www.abc.net.au/rural/content/2012/s3552099.htm)

It’s just a few years since vast parts of Australia emerged from a decade long drought, so the tales from the United States of wilting crops and ‘dust bowl’ paddocks are enough to bring to mind how devastating weather can be. As Australian farmers know, the repercussions of drought aren’t just the immediate weeks, but the months ahead when grain stocks around the world start to shrink and prices soar for feed and basic food supplies Already some experts are warning of a similar food crisis to that experienced in 2008 when riots in parts of South America, Africa and the Middle East demonstrated just how tenuous the global food situation was. In 2008 it was wheat and rice. In 2012 it’s corn and soybeans. As well, and perhaps the most critical factor, is that global grain stocks are at new lows and many countries have run down their reserves leaving little room to manoeuvre when it comes to grain imports. But as US farmers face their worse drought since 1956, a heat wave is also sweeping across Europe which accounts for around 16 per cent of global corn exports. India is also delaying sowing because of a late monsoon, with many states there also experiencing drought. More than half the United States is now in moderate, or worse drought. And the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Climate Prediction Centre is warning the drought is likely to continue into October. It’s also said the January-June half year was America’s hottest on record. It’s now expecting an El Nino pattern could develop by the end of the year, prolonging drought conditions. The big questions are how small will the crops be, and how high can grain prices go? Already the Chicago Board of Trade has set records for September delivered corn, while soybeans and wheat also surge. And while that’s [good news for Australia’s wheat farmers](http://www.abc.net.au/rural/news/content/201207/s3543336.htm)amidst a high dollar, it’s bad news for those in livestock and food prices generally.

Alt cause-pig iron for US car companies and logging

Hance citing Greenpeace 12

Jeremy, “[U.S. car manufacturers linked to Amazon destruction, slave labor](http://news.mongabay.com/2012/0514-hance-pig-iron-amazon.html),” May 14, 2012, http://news.mongabay.com/2012/0514-hance-pig-iron-amazon.html

According to a [new report](http://www.greenpeace.org/international/driving-destruction/) by Greenpeace, top U.S. car companies such as Ford, General Motors, and Nissan are sourcing pig iron that has resulted in the destruction of Amazon rainforests, slave labor, and land conflict with indigenous tribes. Spending two years documenting the pig iron trade between northeastern Brazil and the U.S., Greenpeace has discovered that rainforests are cut and burned to power blast furnaces that produce pig iron, which is then shipped to the U.S. for steel production. "Despite attention to the problem over the years, little has been done and household consumer products in the U.S. can still be traced back to illegalities and forest destruction in the Amazon," the Greenpeace report reads. Brazil's Carajás region is home to 43 blast furnaces used by 18 different companies, of which Viena is the largest. The blast furnaces depend largely on illegal camps that cut and burn rainforest for charcoal. "These camps are built in a matter of days, located in difficult to access areas and, if shut down by authorities, frequently spring up again in another location. They are built next to wood sources, including illegally in protected areas and indigenous lands," the report reads, noting that labor conditions in the area are often similar to slavery. Often forced to work seven-days-a-week in hazardous and toxic conditions, workers are fleeced of salaries by imaginary debts. The massive pig iron production in the region has been actively promoted by the Brazilian government and financed in the past by the World Bank, the European Economic Community, and the Japanese government. However, such promotion has not kept the industry clean as Greenpeace documented several types of fraud, from running an operation without a license to creating fake companies to keep timber sources hidden. Not surprisingly, much of the fuel comes from illegal logging. Greenpeace linked two of the largest pig iron companies, Viena and Sidepar, to a steel mill in the U.S. run by Severstal and from there to major car manufacturers like Ford, General Motors, BMW, Nissan, and Mercedes. Viena also exports its pig iron to Cargill, Environmental Materials Corporation, and National Material Trading, which in turn sells the steel to John Deere. "Greenpeace's research found Viena and Sidepar fueling their foundries with illegal charcoal connected to the region’s pandemic illegalities including slavery, illegal logging and deforestation, and invasions into indigenous lands," reads the report. Around 70-80 percent of the region's forests have been lost already, with the bulk of it since pig iron production began in the mid-1980s. With forest running out in the region, loggers are now entering indigenous lands and conservation areas. Some indigenous tribes, such as the Awá and the Alto Rio Guamá, have lost over 30 percent of their land to the illegal loggers. "Loggers flagrantly violate the law and bring in multiple trucks for hauling away timber and often enter indigenous lands well armed," reads the Greenpeace report. Despite this issue being in the media since 2006, companies have taken little action or responsibility according to Greenpeace
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Zakaria et al, ‘05

(Fareed, NewsWeek Staff Correspondent, Melinda, Beijing Bureau Chief, Rod, Chief Foreign Correspondent, and Dr. Paul, Lead Epidemiologist Bayor College of Medicine Flu Research Center, October 31, “A Threat Worse than Terror,” NewsWeek, \*\*http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9787690/site/newsweek/\*\*).

A flu **pandemic** is the ***most dangerous* threat** the United States faces today," says Richard Falkenrath, who until recently served in the Bush administration as deputy Homeland Security adviser. "It's a bigger threat than terrorism. In fact it's bigger than anything I dealt with when I was in government." One makes a threat assessment on the basis of two factors: the probability of the event, and the loss of life if it happened. On both counts, a pandemic ranks higher than a major terror **attack**, even one **involving** weapons of mass destruction. A crude nuclear device would probably kill hundreds of thousands. A flu pandemic could easily kill millions. Whether this particular virus makes the final, fatal mutation that allows it to move from human to human, one day some virus will. The basic factor that is fueling this surge of viruses is China's growth. (China is the natural habitat of the influenza virus.) As China develops, it urbanizes, and its forests and wetlands shrink. That forces migratory birds to gather closer together-and closer to human habitation--which increases the chances of a virus spreading from one species to the next. Also, growth means a huge rise in chicken consumption. Across thousands of homes in China every day, chickens are slaughtered in highly unhygienic ways. "**Every day** the chances that this virus or another such virus will move from one species to another grow," says Laurie Garrett, author of "The Coming Plague," who has been writing brilliantly on this topic for years. Nobody really disputes that we are ***badly unprepared*** for this threat. "If something like this pandemic were to happen today," says Falkenrath, "the government would be mostly an observer, not a manager." The **government *can't*** even ***give*** intelligent ***advice*** to its citizens because it doesn't actually know what to say. We don't know whether people should stay put, leave cities, stay home or go to the nearest hospital. During the cold war, hundreds of people in government participated in **dozens of** crisis ***simulations of nuclear wars***, accidents and incidents. These "tabletop exercises" were conducted so that if and when a real crisis hit, policymakers would not be confronting critical decisions for the first time. ***No*** such ***expertise* exists** for today's deadliest threat. Beyond short-term measures for this virus--mainly stocking up on Tamiflu--the ***only credible response*** is the **development of *countermeasures***. The best response would be a general vaccine that would work against all strains of the flu. That's a tall order, but it could be achieved. The model of the Manhattan Project is often bandied about loosely, but this is a case in which it makes sense. We need a massive biomedical project aimed at tackling these kinds of diseases, whether they're natural or engineered by terrorists. The total funding request for influenza-related research this year is about $119 million. To put this in perspective, we are spending well over $10 billion to research and develop ballistic-missile defenses, which protect us against an unlikely threat (even if they worked). We are spending $4.5 billion a year on R&D—drawings—for the Pentagon's new joint strike fighter. Do we have our priorities right?

[\_] Korea war outweighs – creates East Asian instability which is the highest risk of escalating

Landay, 2k

(Jonathon S, national security and intelligence correspondent, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts”, Knight Ridder)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster."

a.) Crashes the housing market

**Pie** 12/4/**07**, Protect Illinois’ Environment, grass-roots organization concerned with environmental preservation in Illinois, <http://www.protectillinoisenvironment.com/>

Opponents of industrial farms have long known that property values decline when wind turbines are erected. Strong evidence now exists that allowing the construction of industrial wind turbines near residential properties causes a decrease in the value of said property. According to a survey taken by the Lincoln Township (WI) Moratorium Committee, 74% of survey respondents said they would not build or buy within one quarter mile of wind turbines; 61% stated they would not build or buy within one half mile of wind turbines, and 41% of survey respondents said they would have to be two or more miles away from any wind turbines in order to build or buy residential properties. Sales within one mile away from the turbines prior to construction in this area were at 104% of assessed value. Properties selling in the same area after construction of the turbines sold at 78% of assessed value. Nothing changed in the area except the construction of the turbines, so it is reasonable to believe that the 26% drop in value was due to turbine construction alone.

That collapses the economy

**Fraser**, 12/9/**07** (Steve, writer and editor and author of "Wall Street: America's Dream Palace" to be published by Yale University Press, p. LA Times)

No one wants to utter the word "depression." But the truth of the matter is that the American economy may be entering a state of free fall. Every day brings more bad news about the sub-prime mortgage debacle, about home foreclosures, construction industry slowdowns, a credit drought for consumers and businesses, oil price shocks and the open-ended devaluation of the dollar. Where is it all leading? Together with the debacle in Iraq and the political implosion of the Republican Party, this economic collapse could make the presidential election of 2008 a turning point in American political history. Conservatism first triumphed over New Deal liberalism thanks in part to the same deadly combination in the late 1970s: a lost war and an economic crisis. The Vietnam War plus stagflation and deindustrialization gave us Ronald Reagan. Now history is returning the favor, as the free-market conservative political order of the last generation faces a systemic crisis from which there is no easy escape. Even the soberest economy watchers, pundits with doctorates -- whose dismal record in predicting anything tempts me not to mention this -- are prophesying dark times ahead. A depression, or a slump so deep it's not worth quibbling about the difference**,** appears to be on the way, if indeed it is notalready underway**.** Start with the confidence game being run out of Wall Street. The sub-prime mortgage crisis occupies newspaper front pages day after outrageous day. Certainly, these tales of greed and financial malfeasance are numbingly familiar. Yet precisely that sense of deja vu -- ofEnron revisited, of an endless cascade of scandalous, irrational behavior affecting the central financial institutions of our world -- suggests just how dire things have become.

Wind Turbines devastate whale populations

Dona **Tracy**, August 21st, 20**07** (reporter, Gather, “Greenpeace: Promotes Deadly Hazard to Whales and Dolphins,” <http://www.gather.com/viewArticle.jsp?articleId=281474977092483> >:)

There was a time when Greenpeace would throw itself in front of whaling boats to protect whales from harm but, now, this same organization, funded by tax deductible contributions from whale lovers, is throwing itself and its money, $40,000, behind a two week political ad campaign to promote an industrial development, Cape Wind (a 130 440 foot tall wind turbine project slated for 25 square miles of the Nantucket Sound off the coast of Cape Cod, MA), that can cause serious effects to those same endangered marine mammals. According to The Whale and Dolphin Society new studies show off shore wind farms pose potentially devastating threats to whales and dolphins during and after construction. The acoustic impact of pile driving, can be heard by marine creatures in shallow water up to 80km (50 miles) away, permanently damaging their hearing at close range and causing dramatic changes to their behavior at distances of 20km (approximately 12.5 miles). Additionally, the laying of cables and disturbance from service vessels will mean the damage will continue long after construction is over.

Extinction

**Barstow ’89** (Robbins, PhD, Exec Dir – Cetasean Society International, The Magazine of the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, No. 2, Autumn, http://www.highnorth.no/Library/Movements/General/be-wh-s2.htm)

My own rationale for asking the IWC to decide to adopt a management regime of permanent protection for whales from consumptive commercial exploitation on a global basis is both simple and complex. It is grounded i pragmatic practicalities of both fact and feeling regarding 'Whales in a Modern World'. I am not here arguing for the sanctity of all life on earth. I am not advocating equal rights for all animal species. I am seeking to set forth a rational and moral basis for a future determination by one, specialised, international, human agency that one order of marine mammals should be managed in this manner. Why whales? My rationale most simply is that whales are uniquely special! They really are in a class by themselves. Let me cite four major categories of uniqueness. First, whales are biologically special. Whales include by far the largest animals on earth, growing to be over 30 metres in length - the blue whale (Balenoptera musculus). Whales include the possessors of by far the largest brain of any creature ever to have lived on our planet, weighing four or five times as much as the human brain - the sperm whale (Physeter macrocephalus). Whales include the creators of the most complex, long - lasting, repetitive sound patterns of any non - human animal - the humpback whale (Megaptera novaeangliae). And whales include species (Tursiops truncatus and some other odontocetes) which exceed humans and all other groups as well in convolutedness or fissurisation of the cerebral cortex. Marine mammal veterinarian Sam Ridgway, of the U.S. Naval Ocean Systems Centre in San Diego, has reported findings that the bottlenose dolphin, in particular, by a variety of measurements (encephalisation quotient, volume of cortex, ratio of brain weight to spinal cord weight, etc.) ranks just below humans and considerably above other higher primates, including gorillas, chimpanzees, and orangutans. In all these ways whales are truly unique biologically! Second, whales are ecologically special. Whales have evolved as marine mammals over millions of years, with both baleen and toothed whales probably appearing up to 25 million years ago, long before the development of human beings and the latter's intrusion in the ocean ecosystem. Whales are at the top of the vast food chain of the sea. Baleen whales consume the largest amount of zooplankton, and the killer whale (Orcinus orca) is the world's greatest non- human predator. Whales affect the ocean ecosystem in a uniquely global manner, and any exploitation of other marine resources, whether krill or fish, must uniquely take into account cetaceans. Human life depends upon a proper balance in the amount of oxygen in earth's atmosphere produced from the plankton that is kept in check most critically by whale consumption.

US radar is key to maintain the missile defense shield and deter attacks from rogue states

Agence France Presse, **AFP**, July 8th, 20**08** (global news agency, “Russia threatens to ‘react’ against US missile shield,” <http://www.canada.com/topics/news/story.html?id=d20546d6-cbf0-4584-8079-74532c8c50d6>)

The deal with Prague permits the siting of a tracking radar station and American troops on Czech soil. It is part of an extended shield that Washington says is necessary to ward off potential attacks by so-called "rogue" states such as Iran. The US also wants a radar system twinned with interceptor missiles in neighbouring Poland, although negotiations with Warsaw have becomed bogged down with Polish demands for additional security guarantees.Former Soviet state Lithuania has offered itself as an alternative site should the Polish talks stall.

Don’t buy their impact defense—the west underestimates Syrian bioweapons

Dekker, ‘07 - consultant to the NATO Defense Establishment in bio-warfare and counter terrorism, Jill, “Syria’s Bio-Warfare Threat: an interview with Dr. Jill Dekker”, Interviewed by Jerry Gordon in the New English Review, Dec, http://www.newenglishreview.org/custpage.cfm/frm/13108/sec\_id/13108

Dekker: It is similar to the US negligent underestimation and denial that the Soviets had a massive biological weapons program. The US Intelligence Community negligently underestimates and denies the sophistication of the Syrian biological weapons programs which is very unfortunate. I think it has been very difficult for the US Intelligence Community to procure knowledgeable sources due to internal institutional problems. Former US Ambassador to the UN, John Bolton has tried since 2001 to warn the US about the threat the Syrian biological weapons programs poses. His warnings have fallen on deaf ears. I hope Israel is helping the United States because it would appear the US is really not up to this challenge. The US public should demand that our military is first and foremost protected. Every soldier should carry Factor Seven and should be vaccinated against smallpox, have botulinium anti-toxin available and anthrax vaccine. This should be standard protection for our military personnel operating in the Middle East. Obviously in other areas we need counter medical measures to prevent VHF's (Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers). The US public needs to be informed that the intelligence community is falling far short here in protecting them. Other US allies are not, they are up to speed. Again as an American citizen it is unbelievable to see such negligence in the US intelligence community. Having lived in Europe for 20 years and working as a defense consultant on Category A warfare agents, this is not the standard approach of other NATO nations. There is something deeply disturbing with the US approach. Time will tell as unfortunately it did with 9/11. Gordon: In your opinion, what has prevented the US from recognizing the significance of the Syrian bio-warfare threat and developing effective counter measures? Dekker: I believe there is a specific mind-set within the US intelligence community which makes it difficult for them to procure sources in the Middle East and of course the lack of language ability is a problem for them as well. I’ve lived outside the US for nearly 20 years now and what I’ve seen in their approach is not reassuring. Most of their experienced officers are gone. The US State Dept. moves their staff about every three years which is not compatible with building long-term relationships. They appear not to have the Human Intelligence (HUMINT) resources required for long term assessment of WMD programs. Because they have not taken appropriate defensive measures in view of the potential consequences of a WMD attack, they have left the US exposed. It’s also problematic that the US relies heavily on technology and has done so for a number of years. Biological weapons cannot be assessed by satellites anymore. Perhaps during the old Soviet era but now science has moved beyond this. I believe the US incompetence in this field and its arrogance could eventually lead to a successful strike on the US by a rogue nation-possibly in the very near future.
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China not buying estimated amount of soybeans

Wilson (staff writer for Bloomberg) 12

(Jeff, “Soybean Reserves Shrinking Most Since ’96 Amid Brazil Drought: Commodities,” February 28, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-28/soybean-reserves-shrinking-most-since-96-amid-brazil-drought-commodities.html>) Switching to Corn

“China is not going to buy as many soybeans as people think,” said Chad Henderson, a market analyst at Prime Agricultural Consultants Inc. in Brookfield, [Wisconsin](http://topics.bloomberg.com/wisconsin/). “The global economy is barely treading water, and the European debt crisis isn’t over.” U.S. production may increase more than forecast as higher prices discourage growers from switching to corn. While farmers can still make about $128 an acre more from corn, that compares with $215 in November, according to the Morgan Stanley report. The November soybean contract, reflecting anticipated prices after the U.S. harvest, now costs 2.3 times more than December corn futures, up from a ratio of 1.99 in November, data compiled by Bloomberg show. Drought in [South America](http://topics.bloomberg.com/south-america/), where farmers are harvesting this month, caused “irreversible crop damage” and will reduce global production by 7.2 percent, Hamburg-based research company Oil World said in a report today. The Rosario Cereals Exchange cut its forecast of [Argentina](http://topics.bloomberg.com/argentina/)’s crop on Feb. 23 by 10 percent from its January estimate.

Severe US drought now-can’t solve supply problems

Farchy and Meyer (staff writers for Financial Times) 12

(Jack and Gregory, “World braced for new food crisis,” July 19, 2012, Financial Times, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/9989dc80-d1c5-11e1-badb-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz21YSupe9I)

The world is facing a new food crisis as the worst US drought in more than 50 years pushes agricultural commodity prices to record highs. Corn and soyabean prices surged to record highs on Thursday, surpassing the peaks of the 2007-08 crisis that sparked food riots in more than 30 countries. Wheat prices are not yet at record levels but have rallied more than 50 per cent in five weeks, exceeding prices reached in the wake of Russia’s 2010 export ban. The drought in the US, which supplies nearly half the world’s exports of corn and much of its soyabeans and wheat, will reverberate well beyond its borders, affecting consumers from Egypt to China. “I’ve been in the business more than 30 years and this is by far and away the most serious weather issue and supply and demand problem that I have seen by a mile,” said a senior executive at a trading house. “It’s not even comparable to 2007-08.”

Chinese food production shows increasing trends-food supply stabilized

Zhang (Head and Chair Professor at Hong Kong Baptist University, Department of Biology, Ph.D., specializes in crop research) 11

(Jianhua, “China's success in increasing per capita food production,” May 6, 2011, <http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full>)

China's total grain production was a little over 100 million tons in 1949 and has reached to 500 million tons in 1998 ([Fig. 1](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#F1)). The grain production per capita has increased from about 200 kg per capita in 1949 to about 400 kg in the early 1990s ([Fig. 2](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#F2)). Hunger as a social problem has largely disappeared after being prevalent in China for several thousands of years with the rise and fall of dynasties. This achievement has been accompanied by a 2.5-fold increase in the population and a 4.5-fold increase in total grain production ([Fig. 1](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#F1)). Although total grain production has largely levelled off since 1998, other food production, such as meat and dairy products, has rapidly increased since the 1990s ([Fig. 3](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#F3)). This indicates the increased living standards in China ([Feng, 2007](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full" \l "ref-3)). Although the total cropped land has increased by 20% in some areas, such as in North-East China, the land use per capita for cropping has decreased from 0.18 ha per capita in the 1950s to less than 0.1 ha per capita today ([Fig. 2](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#F2)). Apparently, yield increases and/or improved land productivity is the major contributor to the increase in food production per capita. China's land productivity for major agricultural crops doubled during the period from 1978 to 2007, and wheat had the largest growth in this period with its production 2.49 times more than the 1978 level ([Li, 2009](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#ref-5)). What are the major reasons for such impressive achievement in China's food production? An analysis of China's grain production over the years shows that there was a trend of increasing yields over time, although some significant fluctuations occurred periodically ([Fig. 4](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#F4)). It is concluded that this increasing trend has largely been maintained by technical progress in China's agriculture. Several major breakthroughs can be counted. For example, the First Green Revolution and the adoption of the semi-dwarf trait in rice and wheat breeding greatly increased their yield potential starting from the late 1960s ([Gaud, 1968](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#ref-4); [Wang et al., 2010](http://jxb.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2011/05/06/jxb.err132.full#ref-12)). China's progress in this synchronized with the significant achievements at the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (CIMMYT) and the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), respectively, on wheat and rice.

Cattle ranching is a bigger threat than soy farming

Reuters 9

(“Cattle, not soy, drives Amazon deforestation: report,” April 14, 2009, http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/04/14/us-brazil-amazon-idUSTRE53D65C20090414)

(Reuters) - Cattle ranchers are far bigger culprits in Amazon deforestation than soy farmers, a study showed on Tuesday, as the environmental record of Brazil's commodity exporters comes under increasing international scrutiny. The study, produced jointly by environmental groups and the soy industry, showed that only 12 of 630 sample areas deforested since July 2006 -- or 0.88 percent of 157,896 hectares (390,000 acres) -- were planted with soy. By comparison, nearly 200 were converted into pasture land for cattle. The rest of the deforested areas had not yet been put to use. "The big villain of Amazon destruction is cattle ranching," said Paulo Adario, Amazon campaign coordinator with Greenpeace, one of the groups that sponsored the report. Each year country-sized chunks of the world's largest rain forest are devastated, although the rate has fallen sharply from a few years ago and preliminary data shows it fell further in the past 10 months. In addition to loggers, ranchers and peasants, large-scale farmers are often blamed for contributing to the devastation as Brazil's agricultural frontier has expanded due to strong foreign demand for the country's commodities in recent years. [Brazil](http://www.reuters.com/places/brazil) is the world's biggest beef exporter and the second-largest exporter of soy, much of which is bought by China. Adario said the size of deforested plots had been falling consistently in recent years. That suggests that soy farmers, who require large areas to be efficient, were no longer involved directly in clearing forest.

# Heg

[\_] Here’s more for China.

Ikenberry ‘8

(John, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20080101faessay87102/g-john-ikenberry/the-rise-of-china-and-the-future-of-the-west.html)

The United States' "unipolar moment" will inevitably end. If the defining struggle of the twenty-first century is between China and the United States, China will have the advantage. If the defining struggle is between China and a revived Western system, the West will triumph. TRANSITIONAL ANXIETIES / CHINA IS well on its way to becoming a formidable global power. The size of its economy has quadrupled since the launch of market reforms in the late 1970s and, by some estimates, will double again over the next decade. It has become one of the world's major manufacturing centers and consumes roughly a third of the global supply of iron, steel, and coal. It has accumulated massive foreign reserves, worth more than $1 trillion at the end of 2006. China’s military spending has increased at an inflation-adjusted rate of over 18 percent a year, and its diplomacy has extended its reach not just in Asia but also in Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. Indeed, whereas the Soviet Union rivaled the United States as a military competitor only, China is emerging as both a military and an economic rival—heralding a profound shift in the distribution of global power.

**Here’s new evidence on this question**

Niblett ’12 **–** Director of Chatham House

Robert, Director of Chatham House, Elcano Royal Institute, The Economic Crisis and the Emerging Powers: Towards a New International Order?, http://www.eurasiareview.com/21022012-economic-crisis-and-emerging-powers-towards-a-new-international-order-analysis/

The US does not face the same demographic challenges as its European partners, but it now appears to be facing its own structural economic challenges. For example, US unemployment has been stuck at roughly 9% over the past two years –nearly double its rate in the late 1990s and most of the 2000s, and only a little below the EU-27 rate, which climbed back up to 9.5% in the first half of 2011–. The current high rate of unemployment and slow rate of job creation in the US may not simply reflect the after-effects of credit de-leveraging. As Michael Spence has noted in the July/August 2011 edition of Foreign Affairs, many US multinational companies are now creating more jobs abroad than they are at home, focusing their job creation on the dynamic markets of East Asia with its well-educated and well-priced workforces. Today, the US, Japan and major European economies depend on exports to China and other emerging markets to drive their own marginal rates of growth. In 2010, President Obama made exports a central plan in his growth strategy for the US. Similarly, French, German and British political leaders are beating a path to Beijing and New Delhi to try to secure major new export orders. And the UK has announced a new ‘commercial diplomacy’ that places improved access for UK goods and services to emerging markets at the heart of the Foreign Office’s remit. This economic rebalancing is contributing to a weakening of the West’s strategic influence across the world, from the Middle East and Latin America to South-East Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. First of all, regional powers in each region (Turkey and Iran in the Middle East; Brazil in South America; China in South-East Asia; South Africa in Sub-Saharan Africa) now vie more effectively for influence relative to the US in capitals in these regions, partly because of their own growing economic magnetism and partly because they have taken advantage of the decline in the legitimacy and credibility of US global leadership during and following the George W Bush Administration. Secondly, regional organisations are also challenging US and western influence across the world, whether it is ASEAN, the East Asia Summit, UNASUL, the African Union or the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation. Third, the West’s influence is declining also in the world’s major international institutions, such as the UN, IMF and WTO, where the emerging powers now follow a far more independent line. The most obvious symptom of this shift in institutional power was the nomination of the G20 (at the London 2009 G20 summit) to be the world’s primary forum for international economic coordination, in place of the Western-led G7. Finally, perceptions are also important in the emergence of a new international order. When asked in a 1997 ABC/Washington Post poll which country would be the world’s leading nation in 20 years time, 56% of Americans said the US and only 9% said China. In a similar ABC/Washington Post poll conducted in 2011, only 35% said the US while 38% said China. The growing sense among US citizens of their relative declining power risks becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy, which will then weaken the US and the West’s voice on the international stage.

[\_] We’ll magnify it – asymmetry will cause serial policy failure and loss of faith in power

Newmann ‘8

(William, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University, Hegemonic Competition, Hegemonic Disruption and the Current War, p.. 2-4)

Al- Qaeda’s network and ideology is less likely to produce a national champion, such as communism had in the form of the USSR, than to instigate or take advantage of a series of flashpoints where its ideology squares off with local or regional opponents in insurgency or civil war. The conflicts in Iraq, Somalia, and Afghanistan could be seen as visions of the future for many states. Such disruption can be an initial indication of hegemonic decline, leading second-tier powers to sense vulnerability in the US, a vulnerability which may change their calculus of the costs and benefits of balancing against the US or posing a direct challenge. It could also lead the US into overextension, miscalculations in foreign policy priorities, and provocative policies which could alienate allies, threaten fence sitters, and play into the hands of critics or enemies of US hegemony, again changing the cost and benefit estimates for second-tier powers of balancing or challenging the US. A third possibility emerges if the American public loses its commitment to the duties of hegemony and begins to ask its leaders to minimize US involvement in troublesome regions. This too would lead to a reassessment of US hegemony by second-tier powers. The situation in Iraq today provides evidence for all three of these scenarios. In addition, the unique features of US unipolar dominance complicate the strategic calculus of US hegemony. Following the demise of the USSR, the US has taken upon itself, on an inconsistent basis, the task of reconstructing the world in its own image. Both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations have committed the US to a revisionist goal of spreading of liberal-democratic norms around the globe as a first order foreign policy priority.4 As a revisionist hegemon, US power and policy directly challenges non-liberal-democratic nations and ideological movements – an ideological contest that raises the stakes for the US. The survival of al-Qaeda and its revolutionary ideology undermines the foundation of US hegemonic policies as it seeks to spread democracy and free trade. The US cannot ignore al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda is not likely to ignore the US. In this sense, unless the US moves away from its revisionism, accepting a more status quo realist hegemony, its hegemonic future depends, in part, on how well it can compete with al-Qaeda’s revolutionary ideology in nations with substantial Muslim populations. The first section of this essay develops a model of hegemonic disruption in which the al-Qaeda led and inspired global insurgency presents an asymmetric challenge to US hegemony through its violent activities, organizational efforts, and ideological inspiration. A second section places the al-Qaeda network and its role as the vanguard of a revolutionary movement within the context of this model by defining it as a strategic sub-national actor; its firm ideological roots and its power projection capabilities justify its elevation to this status. Third, a discussion of al-Qeada’s “national security strategy” illustrates how its objectives and strategies to achieve those objectives make it a global insurgency acting against US hegemony. Based upon the model of hegemonic disruption and al-Qeada’s strategic relevance, a fourth section presents scenarios of how recent events and potential developments throughout Africa and Asia may impact US hegemony.

**Horizontal Escalation - Inter-state conflicts are inevitable, but nuclear prolif ensures every disagreement turns into a nuclear fireball, the amount of potential routes to extinction makes the turn numerically more probable than their advantages**

Trachtenberg ‘2 (Marc, Prof. Pol. Sci. – UCLA, The National Interest, “Waltzing to Armageddon?” Fall)

Waltz does not approach the problem this way. For him, wars are started by one side or another. There is an attacker and a defender; with nuclear weapons, the attacker is deterred and war is avoided. "Where nuclear weapons threaten to make the cost of wars immense", he asks, "who will dare to start them?" The Soviet Union would have been deterred by any state that might have been able to deliver one or two simple fission bombs on Moscow. Indeed, he argues, "with nuclear weapons, any state will be deterred by another state's second-strike forces." "A nation", he says, "will be deterred from attacking even if it believes there is only a possibility that its adversary will retaliate." There is no doubt in Waltz's mind about this; for him, the deterrent effect is absolute: no one will start a war, and wars-at least major wars, wars in which nuclear weapons will be used-will simply not happen. In the real world, however, wars are often not simply "started" by one side, and the distinction between defender and attacker can be very problematic. In 1914, for example, who "started" the First World War? Germany, by invading Belgium and attacking France? Or Russia, by ordering general mobilization a few days earlier, knowing full well that such action made war virtually inevitable? Who was the "defender"? Austria, supported by Germany, for trying to prevent Serbia from serving as a base for terrorist activities directed against the Habsburg Monarchy? Or Russia, supported by the Western powers, for trying to defend Serbian sovereignty and maintain its own political position in the Balkans? And if all the major powers had been armed with nuclear weapons at the time, is it clear who exactly would have been deterred? Or take the case of the coming of World War II in 1939. If both Britain and Germany had been nuclear powers at the time, again, is it clear who would have been deterred? Waltz thinks that Germany would have backed off: Hitler would not have "started" a war that would destroy the Third Reich. But Hitler did not intend to "start" a war with Britain at that point; his aim was to get Britain to back down in the confrontation over Poland. Nor did Britain intend to start a war with Germany. War broke out not because either side wanted war in late 1939, but rather because neither was willing to give way-and because each was hoping that the other would. Once we get away from the idea that wars are simply "started" by one side and that the "attacker" can be readily identified, the whole problem appears in an entirely different light. If war is seen as the outcome of a process in which two sides interact, it makes no sense to focus simply on the calculations of just one side. Instead, the calculations of both sides, and especially their calculations about each other, have to be taken into account. Each side may be trying to deter the other-to get its way without war if it can. Each side might be afraid of escalation, but those fears are balanced by the knowledge that one's adversary is also afraid, and his fears can be exploited. In the case of a conflict between two nuclear powers, if either side believed that Waltz's analysis was correct-if either side believed that its adversary would give way rather than run any risk of nuclear attack, as long as his vital interests were not threatened-there would be no reason for that country not to take advantage of that situation. That side could threaten its adversary with nuclear attack if its demands were not met in the firm belief that its opponent was bound to give way, and that it would therefore not be running any risk itself. That belief might turn out to be correct, but if it were not-if its rival was unwilling to allow it to score such an easy victory-there could be very serious trouble indeed. And if both sides were convinced by Waltz's arguments, and both adopted strong deterrent strategies, the situation would be particularly dangerous. Each side would dig in its heels, convinced that when confronted with the risk of nuclear war, the other side would ultimately back down. Such a situation could quickly get out of hand. As Dean Rusk pointed out in 1961, "one of the quickest ways to have a nuclear war is to have the two sides persuaded that neither will fight." This is an extreme case, but it illustrates the problem. In the real world, states will not be so sure that their opponent "will be deterred" by the prospect of nuclear war and that they can therefore go as far as they like in a political dispute-say, in the Cold War case, in a dispute over Cuba or Berlin. Nor will they themselves, in all probability, be absolutely deterred by the threat of nuclear war. They would be under a certain competitive pressure to play the same game as their rivals; their rivals could not be allowed to profit so easily from a simple threat-making strategy while themselves running no real risk at all. Each side would be afraid of escalation, but each side would in the final analysis also be willing to run a certain risk. Each side would know that its adversary was also worried about what would happen if things got out of hand, and that an unwillingness to run any risk at all would remove that element of restraint and give the adversary too free a hand. Each side would know that its adversary was probably also willing to run a certain risk for the same reason, which is why each side could not be sure that its opponent would be deterred in a confrontation. In such situations, it is impossible to say how all these calculations would sort themselves out. Deterrence cuts in more than one way, and it for this reason that in a nuclear world, no one can know how far things will go before a conflict is resolved, or whether it even can be resolved before nuclear weapons are actually used. Each side may calculate that if it is just a bit tougher, its opponent may back down. Having gone so far, wouldn't it make sense to go further still? And there is no natural end-point to that process. For Waltz, if deterrence fails, "a few judiciously delivered warheads are likely to produce sobriety in the leaders of all of the countries involved and thus bring rapid deescalation." But it is just as likely that if a few bombs are exploded, the country that had been targeted would choose to retaliate in kind. It might even choose to escalate the conflict. A political dispute can thus become a gigantic poker game, with each side raising the stakes in the hope that its opponent, frightened by the prospect of nuclear war, will fold before things go too far. Conflicts in such a world, as Thomas Schelling argued years ago, would become "contests in risk-taking." The side with the greater resolve, the side more willing to run the risk of nuclear war, has the upper hand and will prevail in a showdown. In the pre-nuclear world, more or less objective factors-above all, the balance of military power-played a key role in determining how political conflicts ran their course. The weak tended to give way to the strong; in an admittedly rough and imperfect way, the military balance gave some indication as to how a dispute would be worked out. But in a world of invulnerable nuclear forces, as Waltz points out, the military balance counts for little. Subjective factors, like will and resolve, would play the key role in determining how political conflicts are worked out. The result is that in such a world there would be a great premium on resolve, on risk-taking, and perhaps ultimately on recklessness. In international politics, as in other areas of life, what you reward is what you get. Resolve would tend to harden, and the parties involved would tend to dig in their heels. A reputation for toughness would be of fundamental importance, since one has to worry not just about the present but about the future, and this would provide further incentive to take a tough stand. And as each side hardens its position, its rival is also led by competitive pressure to do the same. Why would anyone think that a world of that sort, where political outcomes are up for grabs and victory goes to the side with the strongest nerves, would be particularly stable?

US reacts to decline by shifting to offshore balancing – solves war and avoids impact turns

Layne ‘2

(Christopher, Associate Professor of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, “US Response to the ‘Looking Glass’,” Washington Quarterly)

Second, although a competitive component to U.S. relations with the other great powers in a multipolar world would be inescapable, multipolar politics have historically engendered periods of great-power cooperation. On the cooperative side, an offshore balancing strategy would be coupled with a policy of spheres of influence, which have always been an important item in the toolbox of great-power policymakers. By recognizing each other's paramount interests in certain regions, great powers can avoid the kinds of misunderstandings that could trigger conflict. Moreover, the mere act of signaling that one country understands another's larger security stake in a particular region, a stake that it will respect by noninterference, allows states to communicate a nonthreatening posture to one another. By recognizing the legitimacy of other interests, a great power also signals that it accepts them as equals. An offshore balancing strategy would immunize the United States against a post – war-on-terrorism backlash against U.S. hegemony in one other way. By accepting the emergence of new great powers and simultaneously pulling back from its primacy-driven military posture, the United States would reduce perception of a "U.S. threat," thereby lowering the chances that others will view it as an overpowerful hegemon. In this sense, offshore balancing is a strategy of restraint that would allow the United States to minimize the risks of open confrontation with the new great powers.