# india

**Famine doesn’t cause war ---- it makes people too hungry to fight**

**Barnett in ’00** (Jon, Australian Research Council fellow and Senior Lecturer in Development Studies @ Melbourne U. School of Social and Environmental Enquiry, Review of International Studies, “Destabilizing the environment-conflict Thesis”, 26:271-288, Cambridge Journals Online)

Considerable attention has been paid to the links between population, the environment and conflict. The standard argument is that population growth will overextend the natural resources of the immediate environs, leading to deprivation which, it is assumed, will lead to conflict and instability either directly through competition for scarce resources, or indirectly through the generation of ‘environmental refugees’. For example, according to Myers: ‘so great are the stresses generated by too many people making too many demands on their natural-resource stocks and their institutional support systems, that the pressures often create first-rate breeding grounds for conflict’.37 The ways in which population growth leads to environmental degradation are reasonably well known. However, the particular ways in which this leads to conflict are difficult to prove. In the absence of proof there is a negative style of argumentation, and there are blanket assertions and abrogations; for example: ‘the relationship is rarely causative in a direct fashion’, but ‘we may surmise that conflict would not arise so readily, nor would it prove so acute, if the associated factor of population growth were occurring at a more manageable rate’.38 It is possible though, that rather than inducing warfare, overpopulation and famine reduce the capacity of a people to wage war. Indeed, it is less the case that famines in Africa in recent decades have produced ‘first rate breeding grounds for conflict’; the more important, pressing, and avoidable product is widespread malnutrition and large loss of life.

**Empirically resource wars don’t escalate**

**Maximus ‘8** (Fabius Maximus April 29, 2008 “Higher food prices , riots, shortages = what is going on?” http://fabiusmaximus.wordpress.com/2008/04/29/inflation/)

Perhaps there will be wars over resources. But perhaps not. The historical record does not strongly support the theory that resource scarcities increase violent conflicts. But wars are not the only bad effect of rising food prices, whatever the causes. A last quote from Oldskeptic: Variability in food production (the cycles) in the past meant 2nd and 3rd world countries going hungry, as we in the rich countries out bid them for it (or even just take it as the British did to India in 1942, killing millions of Indians). For the 3rd world that is still true. But some of these countries can now bid with us for food, so that mechanism has gone for maintaining OUR cheap food supply.

### Intrinsicness is answered in the 2nc.

### overview

#### US Russia cooperation is key to avoiding a global nuclear war – that’s Allison – multiple areas of discontent could escalate.

#### AND – the threshold is small – indifference towards RUSSIA has a high probability of escalating to nuclear use

Krieger & Starr 12 - President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation & Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility. [David Krieger & Steven Starr, “A Nuclear Nightmare in the Making: NATO, Missile Defense and Russian Insecurity,” **Nuclear Age Peace Foundation**, January 03, 2012 http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/db\_article.php?article\_id=321

This is a dangerous scenario, no matter which NATO we are talking about, the real one or the hypothetical one.  Continued **US indifference to Russian security concerns could have dire consequences: a breakdown in US-Russian relations; regression to a new nuclear-armed standoff** in Europe; **Russian withdrawal from** New **START; a new nuclear arms race** between the two countries; **a breakdown of the** Nuclear **N**on-**P**roliferation **T**reaty **leading to new nuclear weapon states; and a higher probability of nuclear weapons use by accident or design**.  This is a scenario for nuclear disaster, and it is being provoked by US hubris in pursuing missile defenses, a technology that is unlikely ever to be effective, but which Russian leaders must view in terms of a worst-case scenario.

In the event of increased US-Russian tensions, the worst-case scenario from the Russian perspective would be a US first-strike nuclear attack on Russia, taking out most of the Russian nuclear retaliatory capability.  The Russians believe the US would be emboldened to make a first-strike attack by having the US-NATO missile defense installations located near the Russian border, which the US could believe capable of shooting down any Russian missiles that survived its first-strike attack.

**The path to a US-Russian nuclear war could** also **begin with a conventional military confrontation via NATO**. The expansion of NATO to the borders of Russia has created the potential for a local military conflict with Russia to quickly escalate into a nuclear war.  **It is now Russian policy to respond with** tactical **nuclear weapons if faced with overwhelmingly superior conventional forces, such as those of NATO**.   In the event of war, the “nuclear umbrella” of NATO guarantees that NATO members will be protected by US nuclear weapons that are already forward-based in Europe.

#### Greatest existential risk

Bostrom 2 [\*Gannon Award winner, Prof at Oxford, Nick Bostrom, Professor of philosophy at Oxford University, 2002, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html]

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal.There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4]  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately**.** There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

### AT U overhwlems

#### Group their uniqueness arguments.

#### Obama will win but its very very close.

Jackson 11-4

Obama-Romney: Too close to call David Jackson

President Obama and Mitt Romney are scrambling for last minute votes on Sunday and Monday in what could turn out to be an historically close presidential election. How close, you ask? The average of polls compiled by the Real Clear Politics website gives Obama a lead of 0.2 percent in the popular vote -- 47.4% to 47.2^%. That would leave 5.4% undecided. In terms of the Electoral College -- which will decide the race -- Real Clear Politics now lists 11 states as toss-ups, totaling 146 electoral votes. Among presumably solid states, Obama leads Romney by only 201 electoral votes to 191, according to RCP -- it takes 270 to win the White House. If current polls are correct -- and of course many are disputed -- Obama would win the Electoral College by 290-248. But the Romney forces believe they are on the move in states like Pennsylvania and Ohio, more than enough to reverse the result. Hurricane Sandy further scrambled Election Day predictions. Will Obama benefit from a show of presidential leadership? Or will the damage prevent some people from voting, particularly in the suddenly close state of Pennsylvania? The polls are clear -- this race is too close to call. The candidates make their arguments on Sunday and Monday -- the voters have their final say on Tuesday.

#### Obama will win – but the last days matter – he has the edge and math to get it done – that’s Silver.

#### And he’s winning on FIVETHIRTYEIGHT & betting markets

BLODGET 11 – 1 – 12 co-founder, CEO and Editor-In Chief of Business Insider [Henry Blodget, NATE SILVER: Obama's Odds Of Winning Have Now Hit 79%, <http://www.businessinsider.com/nate-silver-election-odds-2012-10-c>]

Obama's odds of winning re-election have now hit 79%, according to New York Times polling guru Nate Silver. That's up from 77% yesterday.

Obama's lead on betting markets Intrade and Betfair has also continued to increase.

These assessments come despite the continued release of some national polls, namely Gallup, that look good for Romney. The difference between the national polls and the betting markets, some polling experts say, is that the national polls focus on the popular vote, whereas Silver's odds focus on state-by-state polls aimed at determining the winner of the electoral college--and, with it, the Presidency.

Let's go to the data...

### AT Too Late

#### Last week matters – opinion can change and outcome isn’t guaranteed

GELMAN 10 – 30 – 12 professor of statistics and political science and director of the Applied Statistics Center at Columbia [Andrew Gelman, What Too Close to Call Really Means, http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/30/what-too-close-to-call-really-means/?ref=unitedstatespolitics in case you haven't seen this yet]

Obsession with this question is not confined to the United States. Last week I was interviewed by a reporter from France, who asked me who I thought would win the election. I said, it’s too close to call. He said, but Nate Silver’s FiveThirtyEight blog on NYTimes.com currently gives Obama a 72.9 percent chance. I think Nate is great, and I was thrilled to have the opportunity to contribute to his blog for a while. But I’d still say the election is too close to call.

Let’s dig and see what this means. If we ran the election 100 times, Silver was saying that Obama would win 72 of them — but we’ll only be running it once. Silver was predicting an approximate 50.3 percent of the two-party vote share for Obama, but shifts of as large as 1 percent of the vote could happen at any time. (Ultimately, of course, we care about the Electoral College, not the popular vote. But a lot of research on polls and elections has shown that opinion swings and vote swings tend to be national.)

The online betting service Intrade gives Obama a 62 percent chance of winning, and I respect this number too, as it reflects the opinions of people who are willing to put money on the line. The difference between 63 percent and 75 percent may sound like a lot, but it corresponds to something like a difference of half a percentage point in Obama’s forecast vote share. Put differently, a change in 0.5 percent in the forecast of Obama’s vote share corresponds to a change in a bit more than 10 percent in his probability of winning. Either way, the uncertainty is larger than the best guess at the vote margin.

Where is this uncertainty coming from? First, public opinion can shift quickly during the last week of campaigning, as news arrives and as voters make their final decisions. Second, the polls aren’t perfect. Nonresponse rates continue to rise and, although pollsters are working on more and more sophisticated methods for correcting for this problem — an area of my research — we cannot always catch up. Even an average of polls can be wrong, but it’s hard to know in advance of the election how wrong they will be, or in which direction.

#### Small Changes have big impacts, now is key

SILVER 10 – 20 – 12 Elections Guru [nate Silver, Oct. 20: Calm Day in Forecast, but Volatility Ahead, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/20/oct-20-calm-day-in-forecast-but-volatility-ahead/>]

What makes this challenging is that although something like a half-point shift is hard to detect in the polls, it is also potentially meaningful given how late it is in the race and how close the contest is.

The most natural analogy might be to a baseball game. Scoring a run in the first inning is worth something, but it won’t shift the win probabilities all that much: there’s too much that can happen later on in the game.

We’re now in the political equivalent of the eighth inning, however. A run scored in the eight inning is potentially much more important than one in the first.

The reason I say “potentially” is that it makes a tremendous difference depending what the score is. In a blowout, the eighth inning won’t matter at all. A team down 9-1 is almost certainly going to lose; but so will one that gets a solo home run and trails 9-2 instead.

(The political equivalent: Walter Mondale, in 1984, improved to a 17-point deficit from a 20-point deficit in national polls after his first debate with Ronald Reagan. This may have helped him to carry his home state of Minnesota, and lose the Electoral College 525-13 rather than 535-3.)

But if the score is tied, or if it’s a one-run game, a run scored in the eighth will make a huge difference.

That’s where we find ourselves right now in the presidential race. This election is close and is likely to end up that way. There’s about a 50-50 chance that the election will end up within 2.5 percentage points, according to the forecast, against only a 15 percent chance that either candidate will win by five points or more.

For this reason, the percentage estimates in the forecast are likely to be volatile from here on out.

### Their silver cards they’ve tagged pretty good but the card just says hell win the electoral college… all our cards answer that.

#### -not just polls

#### -polls obviously affect elections

### they say turnout, not our internal link, its about lobbies and groups that have traditionally supported Obama

#### enviros key

Bloomberg 11 [Mark Drajem and Jim Efstathiou Jr. “Green Vote Cools Toward Obama Risking A Replay Of Gore-Nader,” Aug 30,http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-31/green-vote-cools-to-obama-over-pipeline-concerns.html]

Democratic Vice President Al **Gore paid a price in his 2000 presidential campaign for the splintering of environmentalists’ votes. Leaders of some groups**, including in Florida, **endorsed** the independent candidacy of Ralph **Nader instead**. Gore, who later won the Nobel Peace Prize for his advocacy of limits on greenhouse-gas emissions, lost Florida by 537 votes in the official tally, making Republican George W. Bush president. Nader garnered 97,488 votes in the state.

Nader predicted in April that Obama will win re-election, in part because “the liberal base has nowhere to go to send a message” this time. Still, **apathy among voters sympathetic to environmentalist goals may prove costly to Obama**, according to Doug Schoen, who was **a strategist for** President Bill **Clinton**.

“**Obama won the election because the left, young people who are disproportionately environmentalists, came out in huge numbers**,” Schoen said in an interview yesterday. “**If he doesn’t have the kind of support he had from the left, from young people, from environmentalists, he is not going to be re- elected. It’s as simple as that**.”

### this card just says young people will compensate, but they are non-unique…that will happen regardless. You alienate groups that would be on the fence, which is still aggregately less people.

#### Support for new reactors really low – prefer our ev, anything from NEI is biased

Mariotte 6/5/12 –(Michael, executive director and the chief spokesperson for NIRS, has testified in the United States Senate and before the U.S. House of Representatives on nuclear power. "Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say" http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say]

Conclusion 3: On new reactors, how one asks the question matters. Gallup and the Nuclear Energy Institute ask the same question: “Overall, do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the U.S.?” This question doesn’t really get to the issue of support for new nuclear reactors, although NEI typically tries to spin it that way. Although a question of support for current reactors wasn’t asked in any recent poll we saw, **the public traditionally has been more supportive of existing reactors than new ones**, and the question above could easily be interpreted as support for existing reactors, or even simple recognition that they exist. The results may also be skewed by the pollsters throwing nuclear in as “one of the ways,” without a context of how large a way. Nonetheless, despite asking the same question, Gallup and NEI can’t agree on the answer. NEI, for example, in November 2011 asserted that 28% of the public strongly favors nuclear power with an additional 35% somewhat in favor. NEI found only 13% strongly opposed and another 21% somewhat opposed. A May 2012 NEI poll did not publicly break down the numbers into strongly vs somewhat, but claimed a similar 64-33% split between support for nuclear power and opposition. Gallup, asking the same question in March 2012, found a narrower split. A smaller number was strongly in favor (23%, a drop of 5%) and a larger number strongly opposed (24%, increase of 3%)—overall an 8-point anti-nuclear swing among those with strong opinions. Those in the middle were 34% somewhat favor vs 16% somewhat opposed. The 2012 numbers were slightly worse for nuclear power than the identical question asked in March 2011, just before Fukushima.

But other polls suggest that Gallup and NEI may be asking the wrong question. For example, the LA Times reported on **a Yale-George Mason University poll in April 2012 that found that support for new nuclear power had dropped significantly, from 61% in 2008 to 42% today**.

Even **Rasmussen** in its May 2012 poll **found that only 44% support building new reactors.** That was good news for Rasmussen since it found that only 38% oppose them, with a surprising 18% undecided (surprising because no other poll we saw had such a high undecided contingent for any nuclear-related question). Meanwhile the March 2012 ORC International poll found that:

“**Nearly six in 10 Americans** (57 percent) **are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis**, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. Those who say they are more supportive of nuclear power a year after Fukushima account for well under a third (28 percent) of all Americans, little changed from the 24 percent who shared that view in 2011.”

But perhaps the most telling, and easily the most interesting, poll comes from a March 2012 poll from the Yale Project on Climate Change Communications**. Participants were asked, “When you think of nuclear power, what is the first word or phrase that comes to your mind**?”

**29%** of those polled **said “disaster**.” Another **24% said “bad**.” **Only** about **15% said “good”** and that was **the only measurable group that had anything positive to say**. That poll also found that, “…only 47 percent of Americans in May 2011 supported building more nuclear power plants, down 6 points from the prior year (June 2010), while only 33 percent supported building a nuclear power plant in their own local area.”

Conclusions **Americans are not exactly wild about the idea of building new nuclear reactors**. Polls asking the question different ways arrive at different results; at the lowest common denominator it is safe to say the country is divided on the issue. But **Americans clearly don’t want to pay for construction of new reactors**. And the reality is that no utility wants to or even can spend its own money building new reactors—they’re just too expensive. Congress, State legislatures and Public Service Commissions would do well to heed that warning, especially since it crosses all party and political lines. It is also clear that the American public does not see nuclear power as a “clean energy” source (nor, for that matter, “clean” coal or natural gas fracking). Congressional or state efforts to include these technologies in a “clean energy standard” or a clean energy bank concept are bound to fail.

**SMRs are politically “nuclear”**

**Fairley 10** Peter, IEEE Spectrum, May, "Downsizing Nuclear Power Plants,” spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0

However, **there are political objections to SMRs. Precisely because they are more affordable, they may** well **increase the risk of proliferation by bringing the cost and power output of nuclear reactors within the reach of poorer countries**.

Russia’s first SMR, which the nuclear engineering group Rosatom expects to complete next year, is of particular concern. The Akademik Lomonosov is a floating nuclear power plant sporting two 35-MW reactors, which Rosatom expects to have tethered to an Arctic oil and gas operation by 2012. The reactor’s portability prompted Greenpeace Russia to call this floating plant the world’s most dangerous nuclear project in a decade.

**SMRs may be smaller than today’s reactors. But, politically at least, they’re just as nuclear**.

**The plan’s explosive with the public – Fukushima had a chilling effect**

CSI 12 [Civil Society Institute. “SURVEY: AMERICANS NOT WARMING UP TO NUCLEAR POWER ONE YEAR AFTER FUKUSHIMA,” 3/7, http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm]

Contrary **to Industry Predictions, Reactor Disaster Seen As Having a "Lasting** Chill" on Perceptions; It's Not All Fukushima: 3 in 5 Americans Less Supportive Due to Woes of U.S. Nuclear Industry in Last Year.

One year after the disaster at the Fukushima nuclear reactors in Japan, **Americans continue to want to keep the brakes on more nuclear power** in the United States, according to a major new ORC International survey conducted for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI).

To gauge any shift in public attitudes, the new survey was benchmarked to an earlier poll carried out by ORC International in March 2011 for CSI. Conducted February 23-26 2012, the new survey of 1,032 Americans shows that:

• Nearly six **in 10 Americans** (57 percent) **are less supportive of expanding nuclear power** in the United States **than they were before the** Japanese reactor **crisis**, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. This contrasts sharply with pre-Fukushima surveys by Gallup and other organizations showing a 60 percent support level for nuclear power.

• More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) say they are now more supportive than they were a year ago "to using clean renewable energy resources - such as wind and solar - and increased energy efficiency as an alternative to more nuclear power in the United States." This finding edged up from the 2011 survey level of 76 percent.

• **More than three out of four Americans** (77 percent**) would support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors**" in favor of wind and solar power. This level of support was up from the 74 percent finding in the 2011 survey.

• In response to a new question in the 2012 survey, more than **six in 10 Americans** (61 percent**) said they were less supportive** of nuclear power **as a result of reports** in the U.S. during 2011 and so far in **2012 of nuclear reactors that had to be shut down due such factors as natural disasters, equipment failure and radioactive leaks**.

• About **two thirds (**65 percent) of Americans now say they w**ould oppose "the construction of a new nuclear reactor within 50 miles of [their] home**." This figure was roughly the same as the 67 percent opposition level in the March 2011 survey.

### Just about renewables now, irrelevant, you void all of that momentum, that’s our 1nc evidence, not about nuclear, they say Obama pushed that, not an argument made in the 2ac, also their card definitely doesn’t say it, they read that massively out of context, obviously no new reactors now which is our link.

### Their clizza is just a too late card. Gut check, its nuclear power, people will know about it especially given what a change this new reactor is

### No dod shielding, president has to advocate it. this card just says they can invest regardless of power, doesn’t mean the public wont know about it.

They say military spending true, not that type of spending

### Put them in your backyard stupid, and its from the fking nei answered above.

Not resilient war.

#### 1. Larison evidence answers this – it doesn’t matter if its just rhetoric – if someone called you THEIR NUMBER ONE ENEMY and then showed up in charge of negotiations 6 months later it is HIGHLY unlikely you would do anything other than leave the room. That’s what Romney risks.

#### 2. Duma thinks he’s an ass and will be Bush the 3rd.

RT 9 – 3 – 12 Romney’s anti-Russian message won’t win him the White House – Pushkov, <http://rt.com/politics/romney-obama-putin-russia-elections-245/>

The Duma official argued that Romney's inflexible remarks on Russia show all the hallmarks of George W. Bush's eight years in power: "Washington in that period appeared tough, attempting to impose their terms on Moscow, which included an imbalanced approach to missile defense in Eastern Europe, together with lessons on democracy and human rights."

Pushkov’s comparison between Romney and Bush recalls President Vladimir Putin’s speech at the Munich security conference in 2007, midway through Bush’s second term in office.

"The United States has overstepped its borders in all spheres – economic, political and humanitarian, and has imposed itself on other states," Putin said during the conference. “We are increasingly concerned by this…hyper use of force."

In Pushkov’s opinion, Romney will be a regular critic of Putin, as was typical of Bush’s second term in office, when the globe-spanning ‘War on Terror’ was fully underway..

Pushkov also ridiculed Romney’s suggestion that Russians “deserve something better” than Putin’s leadership.

"Romney intends to return to the criticism that suggests the Russian people deserve something better. But we had this "better" in the 1990s when the economic collapse occurred, when child mortality soared 40-fold, and the life expectancy of males dropped to 56 years," Pushkov said.

Romney's policies will find little support outside of America’s radical right wing, he added.

Pushkov argued that a Romney victory would hurt Washington more than Moscow, since the US needs Russia’s support on a variety of issues.

"In the case of a Romney victory, the deterioration of bilateral relations will cost America much more than Russia,” he said. “Because after admission to the WTO, this country does not need the support of the White House very much, while Americans need Moscow's support on Iran, Afghanistan, North Korea and on the question of nuclear nonproliferation."

US politicians regularly play the ‘Russia card’ during campaign season, a game that could eventually do irreparable damage to Russia-US relations. Due in part to this and similar saber-rattling, America’s political pendulum has swung severely to the right over the past decade. Eight years of Neoconservative-led military expansionism under the Bush II administration only accelerated this trend.

Given Romney’s criticism of Obama’s handling of Russia – which has been anything but amicable – one wonders what the Republican contender would do differently if he were to win the White House in November.

As Pushkov’s comments show, Moscow has no desire to find out if Romney’s rhetoric is real or not.

#### His chief advisor on Russia is a neocon who hates them – he listens

AP 9 – 13 – 12 In crisis abroad, Romney relies on a select few, <http://seattletimes.com/html/politics/2019149765_apusromneyinternationalaffairsadvisers.html>

Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney mitigates his lack of formal foreign policy experience with advice from people who do - a small, ideologically varied group of longtime foreign policy hands and a handful of longtime, loyal staffers. The former Massachusetts governor and businessman hears them out, and then typically has taken a hard line, seizing on incidents abroad to criticize President Barack Obama as a weak leader. Occasionally Romney sidesteps calls for caution from within this select group. That's what he did this week as he signed off on the decision to criticize Obama as a weak leader as unrest in Egypt was unfolding, and before it was known that a U.S. ambassador had died in Libya. Although his campaign claims a long list of foreign policy advisers, Romney consults only about a half dozen people when an international crisis flares. The group includes two former secretaries of state, two former ambassadors, and one former and one current senator. Some in the group typically press for a more conservative - or neoconservative - approach; others are more moderate. Each has a loose portfolio, though they all contribute to the broader foreign affairs discussion. Romney turned to members of this group - and particularly former Missouri Sen. Jim Talent, the candidate's go-to for Russia and defense - after Obama told Russia President Dmitri Medvedev to tell incoming Russian leader Vladimir Putin he would have more flexibility to deal with missile defense after the election. Russia, Romney said afterwards, is America's "No. 1 geopolitical foe." Putin referenced the comment just this week, saying it strengthened his resolve in opposing NATO plans for missile defense installations in Europe. Romney pounced again when Chinese dissident Chen Guangcheng left the protection of the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. He criticized Obama as weak in his dealings with China and portrayed the president as unwilling to stand up for human rights. And then as protesters scaled the walls of the U.S. Embassy in Cairo on Tuesday, Romney's campaign relied heavily on a close adviser - Rich Williamson, a former aide to Sen. John McCain - in drafting a late-night statement accusing Obama of "disgraceful" handling of the attacks. The next day, after drawing strong criticism from Republicans and Democrats alike, members of this group were on conference calls with Romney himself, discussing how to move forward. McCain advised Romney to give a major foreign affairs speech laying out his critique of Obama before the end of the week. Here's a look at Romney's advisers who inform his worldview. -- - Williamson, a Chicago native, held diplomatic posts under the last three Republican presidents and was brought into Romney's inner circle at the behest of McCain, whom Williamson advised in 2008. As Romney's campaign read news reports and tweets Tuesday about the protests in Cairo, Williamson helped draft the statement critical of Obama, part of his role drawing contrasts between Romney and the president on foreign policy. - Talent served on the Senate Armed Services Committee from 2002 to 2007. He's also pushed Romney's tough stances toward Russia, including the candidate's opposition to the New START Treaty. Romney has called that nuclear nonproliferation agreement Obama's "worst foreign policy mistake," claiming it would tie America's hands and cede ground to the Russians.

Plan doesn’t access the impact, rather the case turns it, it is a flashpoint, this was also incredibly underdeveloped.

### They say relations resilient doesn’t assume the change Romney will crease, this cites no leaders at all, it just asserts that coop will prevail this card sucks

Plan doesn’t access the impact, rather the case turns it, it is a flashpoint, this was also incredibly underdeveloped.