### Sandy Ext

#### Sandy means no link – plan will be overwhelmed by coverage of the hurricane – no reason a policy that doesn’t even spend would get any coverage

#### Will dominate the news

Smith, 10/26 (Mike, “8AM Friday: Hurricane Sandy Update,” meteorologicalmusings.blogspot.com/2012/10/8am-friday-hurricane-sandy-update.html)

And, if you are planning to travel by air to or through airports between Richmond-Boston Monday through Wednesday, forget it. Here is what you should do, now. Amtrak in the Northeast Corridor will likely have service interruptions.

We are in uncharted territory here. I believe this will be a major storm that will dominate the news for days. Prepare accordingly.

#### Prevents new campaign messages

Barbaro and Shear, 10/26 (MICHAEL BARBARO and MICHAEL D. SHEAR, 10/26/2012, “Fears of Storm Disrupting Final Days of Campaign,” [www.nytimes.com/2012/10/27/us/politics/fears-of-hurricane-sandy-disrupting-final-days-of-campaign.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/27/us/politics/fears-of-hurricane-sandy-disrupting-final-days-of-campaign.html))

Mr. Obama did not campaign in public on Friday, after a two-day blitz. Both campaigns were gearing up for another big push in the final week.

But some of those plans were in doubt Friday as Hurricane Sandy gathered strength in the Atlantic and headed north. Forecasters said it could slam into the coast somewhere between Virginia and New York early next week, potentially disrupting the campaign in its final 10 days.

Sandy is expected to be a strong — perhaps historic — tropical storm that could cause severe coastal flooding, intense wind damage and knock out power to millions of people for days.

The candidates may find it harder to push last-minute messages if they are competing with the images of a large, threatening storm. That could have a particularly outsize impact in Virginia, a key battleground state, if the storm hits that far south.

#### Means Obama wins

Koebler, 10/25 (Jason, 10/25/2012, “Experts: Team Obama Should Root for Hurricane Sandy to Interrupt Election,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/10/25/experts-team-obama-should-root-for-hurricane-sandy-to-interrupt-election>)

**Note --- John Hudak is a governance studies fellow at Brookings**

Though those numbers appear to favor former governor Mitt Romney, Hudak says team Obama should be praying for rain.

“Obama has been effective at getting voters to vote early, so anything affecting turnout on Election Day is likely to be bad news for Romney," he says. Voting during a storm is also easier for urban voters—a group that overwhelmingly supports Obama—who often have a shorter distance to travel to polling sites than rural voters. "It would certainly set up a benefit to the president if a natural disaster did interrupt voting."

### AT: Bio D

#### Species extinction won't cause human extinction – humans and the environment are adaptable

Doremus’ 00

(Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story. That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers [\*46] like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore. The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action . Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211 The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course. Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse.

### AT: China Impact

#### China won’t retaliate --- not in its self interest

Bosco, 9/6 --- senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, was China country director in the office of the secretary of defense from 2005 to 2006 (Joseph A., “China and a Mitt Romney presidency,” washingtonpost.com/opinions/china-and-a-mitt-romney-presidency/2012/09/06/32917432-f76f-11e1-a93b-7185e3f88849\_story.html)

In his Sept. 3 op-ed column, “A foreign policy choice,” Jackson Diehl wrote that a President Romney “will surely drop his threats to start a trade war with China, just as [George W.] Bush and Bill Clinton did.”

First, it takes two to wage a “trade war.” When China realizes that Mr. Romney is serious about declaring it a currency manipulator (which it is), wiser counsel may well prevail in Beijing. Playing by international rules is far more in China’s interest than is retaliating against free and fair trade. China could avoid the choice between dangerous escalation and embarrassing submission by preemptively starting to free its currency before a Romney inauguration.

Second, U.S.-China relations encompass far more than trade: China’s terrible human rights record at home; its support for murderous regimes in Damascus and elsewhere; its proliferation of nuclear and missile technology, and enabling of North Korea’s programs; its increasingly aggressive actions in the East China and South China seas; and its ongoing military threat against Taiwan.

A President Romney will surely continue the diplomatic pivot/rebalancing to Asia begun by President George W. Bush and accelerated by President Obama and, one hopes, will back the rhetoric with military resources.