### AT: Reasonability

#### This is infinitely regressive—

There is no bright line for determining what is and isn’t “reasonable.” The combination of all “reasonable” interpretations would saddle the neg with a massive research burden. The term “reasonable” is vague and arbitrary.

Stone 1923—Justice in the Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit [Sussex Land & Live Stock Co. v. Midwest Refining Co., 294 F. 597; 1923 U.S. App. LEXIS 2531; 34 A.L.R. 249, No. 6192; No. 6193, Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, December 5, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis]

Where the use of land affects others, the use must be "reasonable" to escape liability for resultant damage to others. What is "reasonable" depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances. It is an elastic term which is of uncertain value in a definition. It has been well said that "reasonable," means with regard to all the interest affected, his own and his neighbor's and also having in view public policy. But, elastic as this rule is, both reason and authority have declared certain limitations beyond which it cannot extend. One of these limitations is that it is "unreasonable" and unlawful for one owner to physically invade the land of another owner. There can be no damnum absque injuria where there is such a trespass.

### AT: Inev

#### The transition turns their impacts---severe economic and political dislocation mean it’s try or die for the neg

Wagstyl 12 Stefan Wagstyl is the FT's emerging markets editor. He has been covering emerging markets for over 20 years, and was previously central and east Europe editor, New Delhi bureau chief, and Tokyo bureau chief for the FT. "Oil prices: the key to Putin’s future" March 5 2012 blogs.ft.com/beyond-brics/2012/03/05/oil-prices-the-key-to-putins-future/

The oil price is critical:

The path of oil prices will be critical to what happens next. If oil prices hover around $110-130pb, the authorities might be able to sustain the current model, although this is likely to deliver fairly disappointing rates of growth. Alternatively, a sharp drop in oil prices might force a switch to an investment-led model of development capable of delivering higher rates of growth, although this would come at the cost of severe near-term economic, financial and political dislocation. Either way, Putin’s reputation as the guarantor of stability is likely to be called into question.

Putin’s first presidency began with a round of economic reform, including replacing a swathe of complex tax rates and exemptions with a single flat rate of 13 per cent. Putin-backers argue that this time around too, he will go for reform, since the current model cannot deliver results for much longer.

#### Reforms coming now but oil is key in the short-term

Trenin et. al 12 Dr. Dmitri Trenin is director of the Moscow Center of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Previously he has been a Senior Research Fellow at the NATO Defense College and a fellow at the Institute of Europe., AND MARIA LIPMAN is Editor of Pro et Contra at the Carnegie Moscow Center., AND Alexey Malashenko is the co-chair of the Carnegie Moscow Center's Religion, AND Nikolay Petrov is the chair of the Carnegie Moscow Center's Society and Regions Program. Society and Security Program "Russia on the Move" June 2012 carnegieeurope.eu/publications/?fa=48309

Yet, Putin is not lacking in ambition. He has called for the creation of 25 million high-technology jobs by 2020, an increase in the rate of investment to 27 percent of the gross domestic product by 2018 from the current 10 percent, an increase in the high-technology sector’s share of the economy by 30 percent in six years, and an uptick in labor productivity by 50 percent in the same period. He also seeks to elevate Russia from 120th to 50th place on the World Bank’s Doing Business Index by 2015 and to 20th place by 2018. Moving up so significantly would require a massive overhaul in a number of functional areas, starting with the notoriously sluggish Federal Customs Service, and it will be impossible without a drastic reduction in the level of corruption.

Putin’s popularity—and ultimately his power base—hinges on his capacity to fulfill his massive campaign promises of social spending, which amount to 1.5 percent of the GDP. At the same time, Putin’s political priority is a balanced budget. So far, high oil prices have helped the Russian economy, but, unlike in the past decade, they will not be enough to assure success. To balance the budget today, the price of oil must be at least around $110 per barrel; that target was $40 in 2007. A prolonged period of sluggish or zero growth in Europe and the deceleration of the Chinese economy could decrease both the oil price and the volume of Russia’s energy exports, which would be destabilizing, both economically and socially. Putin realizes that and has ordered contingency plans for the possible drop in the oil price to $80.

Putin’s larger goal, however, is to change the structure of the Russian economy. His plans to diversify Russia’s economy center on the idea of state-promoted reindustrialization. He has prioritized several areas: aerospace, pharmaceuticals and medical equipment, shipbuilding, electronics, and agriculture. A separate priority is the development of Russia’s Far Eastern and Siberian provinces. To be successful, these plans demand investments and technology transfers from advanced economies, primarily European Union countries. Russia’s accession to the World Trade Organization in mid-2012 is an important step toward closer economic relations with the EU.

### 2nc accidents

Russian economic collapse causes accidental nuclear use

Oliker and Charlick-Paley, 2 (Olga and Tanya, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/)

What challenges does today’s Russia pose for the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. military as a whole? Certainly Russia cannot present even a fraction of the threat the Soviet monolith posed and for which the United States prepared for decades. Yet, if certain negative trends continue, they may create a new set of dangers that can in some ways prove even more real, and therefore more frightening, than the far-off specter of Russian attack ever was. As a weak state, Russia shares some attributes with “failed” or “failing” states, which the academic literature agrees increase the likelihood of internal and interstate conflict and upheaval. Tracing through the specifics of these processes in Russia reveals a great many additional dangers, both humanitarian and strategic. Moscow’s efforts to reassert central control show that much control is already lost, perhaps irretrievably. This is manifested both in center-periphery relations and in the increasing failure of law and order throughout the country, most clearly seen in the increasing institutionalization of corruption and crime. Although Russia’s weakened armed forces are unlikely, by temperament and history, to carry out a coup, real concerns exist that the forces may grow less inclined to go along with aspects of government policy, particularly if they are increasingly used as instruments of internal control as in Chechnya. Moreover, the fact that the Russian military is unlikely to attempt to take power does not mean that it will not seek to increase its influence over policymaking and policy-makers. The uncertainties of military command and control threaten the possibility of accidental (or intentional) nuclear weapon use, while deterioration in the civilian nuclear sector increases the risk of a tragic accident**.** Russia’s demographic trajectory of ill health and male mortality bodes ill for the nation’s ability to resolve its economic troubles (given an increasingly graying population) and creates concerns about its continued capacity to maintain a fighting force even at current levels of effectiveness. Finally, the fact that economic, political, and demographic declines affect parts of Russia very differently, combined with increased regional political autonomy over the course of Russian independence and continuing concerns about interethnic and interregional tension, creates a danger that locality and/or ethnicity could become rallying cries for internal conflict. While some might argue that Russia’s weakness, or even the potential for its eventual collapse, has little to do with the United States, the truth is that a range of U.S. interests is directly affected by Russia’s deterioration and the threats that it embodies. The dangers of proliferation or use of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), heightened by Russian weakness, quite directly threaten the United States and its vital interests. Organized crime in Russia is linked to a large and growing multinational network of criminal groups that threatens the United States and its economy both directly and through links with (and support of) global and local terrorist organizations. Russia is also a major energy producer and a transit state for oil and gas from the Caspian at a time when the U.S. government has identified that region, and energy interests in general, as key to its national security. Washington’s allies, closer to Russia physically, are not only the customers for much of this energy but are also the likely victims of any refugee flows, environmental crises, or potential flare-ups of violence that Russian decline may spur. Finally, recent history suggests a strong possibility that the Untied States would play a role in seeking to alleviate a humanitarian crisis on or near Russian soil, whether it was caused by epidemic, war, or a nuclear/industrial catastrophe.

Even a limited exchange would cause extinction

Helfand and Pastore, 9 [Ira Helfand, M.D., and John O. Pastore, M.D., are past presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility, March 31, “U.S.-Russia nuclear war still a threat”, http://www.projo.com/opinion/contributors/content/CT\_pastoreline\_03-31-09\_EODSCAO\_v15.bbdf23.html]

Since the end of the Cold War, many have acted as though the danger of nuclear war has ended. It has not. There remain in the world more than 20,000 nuclear weapons. Alarmingly, more than 2,000 of these weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals remain on ready-alert status, commonly known as hair-trigger alert. They can be fired within five minutes and reach targets in the other country 30 minutes later. Just one of these weapons can destroy a city. A war involving a substantial number would cause devastation on a scale unprecedented in human history. A study conducted by Physicians for Social Responsibility in 2002 showed that if only 500 of the Russian weapons on high alert exploded over our cities, 100 million Americans would die in the first 30 minutes. An attack of this magnitude also would destroy the entire economic, communications and transportation infrastructure on which we all depend. Those who survived the initial attack would inhabit a nightmare landscape with huge swaths of the country blanketed with radioactive fallout and epidemic diseases rampant. They would have no food, no fuel, no electricity, no medicine, and certainly no organized health care. In the following months it is likely the vast majority of the U.S. population would die. Recent studies by the eminent climatologists Toon and Robock have shown that such a war would have a huge and immediate impact on climate world wide. If all of the warheads in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals were drawn into the conflict, the firestorms they caused would loft 180 million tons of soot and debris into the upper atmosphere — blotting out the sun. Temperatures across the globe would fall an average of 18 degrees Fahrenheit to levels not seen on earth since the depth of the last ice age, 18,000 years ago. Agriculture would stop, eco-systems would collapse, and many species, including perhaps our own, would become extinct. It is common to discuss nuclear war as a low-probabillity event. But is this true? We know of five occcasions during the last 30 years when either the U.S. or Russia believed it was under attack and prepared a counter-attack. The most recent of these near misses occurred after the end of the Cold War on Jan. 25, 1995, when the Russians mistook a U.S. weather rocket launched from Norway for a possible attack. Jan. 25, 1995, was an ordinary day with no major crisis involving the U.S. and Russia. But, unknown to almost every inhabitant on the planet, a misunderstanding led to the potential for a nuclear war. The ready alert status of nuclear weapons that existed in 1995 remains in place today. The nuclear danger will not pass until the U.S. and Russia lead the other nuclear states to a Nuclear Weapons Convention that seeks to abolish these weapons forever. As a critical first step the U.S. and Russia must take their weapons off ready-alert status. Presidents Obama and Medvedev can do this on their own by executive order.

### at: other competitors

<also in uniqueness>

Russia is tightening its grip – multiple projects ensure it retains dominance – only US exports are cheap enough to threaten it

OBG 10 Oxford Business Group, The Report: Algeria 2010, “Pipeline player: Expanding LNG infrastructure could boost future exports” http://www.oxfordbusinessgroup.com/news/pipeline-player-expanding-lng-infrastructure-could-boost-future-exports

Of course, they are far from the only majors eyeing the project and, if Europe is looking to limit its dependency on Gazprom, it must move more determinedly. Gazprom has already established a foothold in Nigeria in a bid to increase its presence in Africa and improve its strategic standing in the European market. In 2009 Gazprom announced a $2.5bn agreement with the state-owned Nigerian National Petroleum Company. Inked only days before the trans-Saharan pipeline signing ceremony, the agreement will improve refining and transportation capacity in Nigeria’s gas network – including in the first phase of the trans-Saharan pipeline – through a new joint venture, Nigaz. ¶ Moscow is consolidating its grip on supplies closer to home as well. Hedging its bets, it is also looking to increase its involvement with pipelines in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The €6.5bn Nord Stream project, which would pump Russian gas via the Baltic Sea to Germany, is one such development; the €24bn South Stream project, which would stretch from Russia to Bulgaria, is another. The new pipelines have attracted support from Western European countries, with Italy’s Eni and France’s GDF Suez and EDF taking stakes in the projects. However, while both routes open up new capacity for Europe and bypass current transit states like Poland and Ukraine, they still rely on Russian gas.

### 2NC Unipolarity Fails

#### Unipolarity causes global backlash and resistance that makes it impossible for the U.S. to achieve its foreign policy goals

Richard Maher 11, Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute and Visiting Lecturer in the Political Science Department at Brown University, Winter 2011, “The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World,” Orbis, Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 53-68

Creation of Feelings of Enmity and Anti-Americanism. It is not necessary that everyone admire the United States or accept its ideals, values, and goals. Indeed, such dramatic imbalances of power that characterize world politics today almost always produce in others feelings of mistrust, resentment, and outright hostility. At the same time, it is easier for the United States to realize its own goals and values when these are shared by others, and are viewed as legitimate and in the common interest. As a result of both its vast power but also some of the decisions it has made, particularly over the past eight years, feelings of resentment and hostility toward the United States have grown, and perceptions of the legitimacy of its role and place in the world have correspondingly declined.

Multiple factors give rise toanti-American sentiment, and anti-Americanism takes different shapes and forms.17 It emerges partly as a response to the vast disparity in power the United States enjoys over other states. Taking satisfaction in themissteps and indiscretions of the imposing Gulliver is a natural reaction. In societies that globalization (which in many parts of the world is interpreted as equivalent to Americanization) has largely passed over, resentment and alienation are felt when comparing one’s own impoverished, ill-governed, unstable society with the wealth, stability, and influence enjoyed by the United States.18 Anti-Americanism also emerges as a consequence of specific American actions and certain values and principles to which the United States ascribes. Opinion polls showed that a dramatic rise in anti-American sentiment followed the perceived unilateral decision to invade Iraq (under pretences that failed to convince much of the rest of the world) and to depose Saddam Hussein and his government and replace itwith a governmentmuchmore friendly to the United States. To many, this appeared as an arrogant and completely unilateral decision by a single state to decide for itselfwhen—and under what conditions—military force could be used. A number of other policy decisions by not just the George W. Bush but also the Clinton and Obama administrations have provoked feelings of anti-American sentiment.

However, it seemed that a large portion of the world had a particular animus for George W. Bush and a number of policy decisions of his administration, from voiding the U.S. signature on the International Criminal Court (ICC), resisting a global climate change treaty, detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib in Iraq and at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, and what many viewed as a simplistic worldview that declared a ‘‘war’’ on terrorism and the division of theworld between goodand evil.Withpopulations around the world mobilized and politicized to a degree never before seen—let alone barely contemplated—such feelings of anti-American sentiment makes it more difficult for the United States to convince other governments that the U.S.’ own preferences and priorities are legitimate and worthy of emulation.

### 2NC Heg---War Defense

#### Empirically proven

Geller 99**---**Geller and Singer, 99 – \*Chair of the Department of Political Science @ Wayne State University (Daniel S and Joel David, Nations at war: a scientific study of international conflict, p. 116-117)

**Note – Hopf = Visiting Professor of Peace Research, The Mershon Center, Ohio State University PhD in pol sci from Columbia.**

**Levy = Board of Governors’ Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University and an Affiliate at the Arnold A. Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Past president of the International Studies Association and of the Peace Science Society. Has held tenured positions at the UT Austin, and U Minnesota, and visiting positions at Stanford, Harvard, Yale University, Columbia, Tulane, and NYU. Received the American Political Science Association’s Award for the best dissertation in IR as well as the Distinguished Scholar Award from the Foreign Policy Analysis Section of the International Studies Association. PhD**

Hopf (1991) and Levy (1984) examine the frequency, magnitude and severity of wars using polarity (Hopf) and “system size” (Levy) as predictors. Hopf’s database includes warfare in the European subsystems for the restricted temporal period of 1495–1559. The system is classified as multipolar for the years 1495–1520 and as bipolar for the years 1521–1559. Hopf reports that the amount of warfare during those two periods was essentially equivalent. He concludes that polarity has little relationship to patterns of war for the historical period under examination. Levy (1984) explores a possible linear association between the number of great powers (system size) and war for the extended temporal span of 1495 – 1974. His findings coincide with those of Hopf; he reports that the frequency, magnitude and severity of war in the international system is unrelated to the number of major powers in the system.

#### Prefer our ev

Layne 6**---**pol sci prof, A&M (Christopher, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present, Cornell University Press, p. 185-186)

The fundamental problem with all these scenarios, both historical and hypothetical, is that distant peer competitors have never been able to do the one thing they would need to do to challenge the United States in its own neighborhood: move freely across the sea. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the United States has been able to generate more than enough naval (and strategic air) power to stop dead in the water any distant rival that might attempt to take on the United States over here. And, if anything, since 1945 nuclear weapons have made America's regional primacy all but unassailable.83 Rather than detracting from U.S. security, nuclear weapons enhanced it significantly. These overblown notions of American vulnerability to a Eurasian hegemon reflect an underlying worldview shared by U.S. policy-makers and popularized by Wilson and FDR: that in the modern world, the United States lives perpetually under the shadow of war. This grand strategic narrative rests on two key assumptions. First, because of advances in modern military technology, others can acquire the means to inflict grave damage on the United States. Second, the world is shrinking. As a result, the argument goes, the United States itself is at risk and must involve itself in the security affairs of distant regions to ward off threats to the American homeland. These arguments have a very familiar ring, because they have been invoked by the Bush II administration to justify expanding the war on terror and the invasion of Iraq. Although a straight line connects the administration's grand strategic narrative with those of Wilson and FDR, the conception of American security embodied in these narratives always has been based on a deeply flawed premise. For, far from shrinking the world grand strategically, for the United States, modern weaponry naval and strategic airpower, intercontinental delivery systems, and nuclear weapons has widened it. Proponents of offshore balancing are sensitive to the fact that the threat posed by potential Eurasian hegemons has often been exaggerated deliberately and used as a pretext for intervening in conflicts where America's security clearly has not been at risk. When policymakers use arguments about technology and a shrinking world to warn of American vulnerability, they are, as Michael S. Sherry notes, doing a lot more than simply depicting reality. They are trying to shape public perceptions and to create a new reality, which is why this narrative of U.S. national security is "an ideological construction, not merely a perceptual reaction."84 To be blunt, U.S. officials often have invoked the specter of a Eurasian hegemon to rationalize the pursuit of America's own hegemonic, Open Door-driven ambitions. Although it is always possible that the threat of a Eurasian hegemon justifiably might compel U.S. intervention, whenever this argument is made to justify a specific intervention, red lights should flash and it should be scrutinized very carefully, because U.S. officials have cried wolf way too many times in the past.

#### Their scenario happened in the 90s – no war resulted

Fettweis, 11 Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

### 2NC Global Econ Resilient

#### Global economy is decoupled---no risk of global shocks---only nuclear war can collapse it, so the DA turns the case

Wolf 11 – Martin Wolf 11 is chief economics commentator at the Financial Times "In the grip of a great convergence" Financial Times Jan 5

What is unprecedented this time is **not convergence, but the scale**. Suppose China were to follow Japan’s path during the 1950s and 1960s. Then it would still have 20 years of very fast growth in front of it, reaching some 70 per cent of US output per head by 2030. At that point, **its economy would be a little less than three times as large as that of the US**, at PPP, and larger than that of the US and western Europe combined. India is further behind. At recent rates of growth, India’s economy would be about 80 per cent of that of the US by 2030, though its gross domestic product per head would still be less than a fifth of US levels.

China is today where Japan was in 1950, relative to US levels at that time. But its output per head is far higher in absolute terms, since US levels have themselves risen threefold. Today, China’s real GDP per head is roughly where Japan’s was in the mid-1960s and South Korea’s in the mid-1980s. India’s are where Japan was in the early 1950s and South Korea in the early 1970s.

In short, today’s divergent rates of growth between successful emerging economies and the high-income economies reflects the speed of the convergence of incomes between them. This divergence in growth is staggering. In an important speech in November, Ben Bernanke, chairman of the US Federal Reserve, noted that in the second quarter of 2010, the aggregate real output of emerging economies was 41 per cent higher than at the start of 2005. It was 70 per cent higher in China and about 55 per cent higher in India. But, in the advanced economies, real output was just 5 per cent higher. **For emerging countries,** the “great recession” was a blip. **For high-income countries, it was calamitous.**

The great convergence is a world-transforming event. Today, the west – defined to include western Europe and its “colonial offshoots” (the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) – contains 11 per cent of the world’s population. But China and India contain 37 per cent. The present position of the former group of countries will not be sustained. It is a product of the great divergence. It will end with the great convergence.

This assumes that the convergence itself will continue, if not necessarily at recent speeds. The best response to those who doubt this is: why not? Powerful market and technological forces are spreading the stock of knowledge across the globe. No one doubts that Chinese and Indian people are capable of applying it. They are quite as entrepreneurial and driven as westerners. Being poorer, they are surely far more so.

Until recently, political, social and policy obstacles were decisive. **This has not been true for several decades. Why should these re-emerge?** True, many reforms will be required if growth is to proceed, but growth itself is likely to transform societies and politics in needed directions. True, neither China nor India may surpass US output per head: Japan failed to do so. But they are far away today. Why should they be unable to reach, say, half of US productivity? That is Portugal’s level. Can China match Portugal? Surely.

Of course, catastrophes may intervene. But it is striking that even world wars and depressions merely interrupted the rise of earlier industrialisers. **If we** leave aside nuclear war, nothing **seems likely to halt the ascent of the big emerging countries,** though it may well be delayed. China and India are big enough to drive growth from their domestic markets if protectionism takes hold. Indeed, they are big enough to drive growth even in other emerging countries as well.

In the past few centuries, **what was once the European and then American periphery** became the core of the world economy. Now, the economies that became the periphery are re-emerging as the core. This is transforming the entire world.

#### New ev

Businessweek 11, 3-17-11, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2011-03-17/japan-s-9-of-global-gdp-means-expansion-won-t-become-unhinged.html

“The global economy should pass these stress tests and see continued prosperity,” said Edward Yardeni, president and chief investment strategist at Yardeni Research Inc. in New York. Investors will buy equities “if and when Japan’s nuclear problems are contained.”

Yardeni -- famous for coining the phrase “bond vigilantes” to describe investors who punish profligate governments -- predicts that global growth of about 5 percent this year will help spur a 15 percent rebound in the MSCI World Index of developed-nation equities from 1279.69 yesterday, and a increase in the Standard & Poor’s 500 Index of stocks to 1,500 by year-end from 1273.72.

Economists at Goldman Sachs Group Inc. and JPMorgan Chase & Co. also see the world economy bearing up in the face of the twin blows from Japan and oil. Goldman Sachs forecasts expansion of 4.8 percent this year, while JPMorgan predicts 4.4 percent, surpassing the 3.4 percent average of the past two decades.

“There’s a fair amount of resiliency to absorb this level of shocks,” said David Hensley, director of global economic coordination at JPMorgan Chase in New York and a former economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Tsunami Destruction

### 2NC US Econ Resil

#### No risk of another depression—government intervention checks

Zakaria 9—Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed Is Good,” 13 June 2009, http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935)

Note—Laurie Garrett=science and health writer, winner of the Pulitzer, Polk, and Peabody Prize

One can see this same pattern of mistakes in discussions of the global economic crisis. Over the last six months, the doomsday industry has moved into high gear. Economists and business pundits are competing with each other to describe the next Great Depression. Except that the world we live in bears little resemblance to the 1930s. There is much greater and more widespread wealth in Western societies, with middle classes that can withstand job losses in ways that they could not in the 1930s. Bear in mind, unemployment in the non-farm sector in America rose to 37 percent in the 1930s. Unemployment in the United States today is 8.9 percent. And government benefits—nonexistent in the '30s—play a vast role in cushioning the blow from an economic slowdown.¶ The biggest difference between the 1930s and today, however, lies in the human response. Governments across the world have reacted with amazing speed and scale, lowering interest rates, recapitalizing banks and budgeting for large government expenditures. In total, all the various fiscal--stimulus packages amount to something in the range of $2 trillion. Central banks—mainly the Federal Reserve—have pumped in much larger amounts of cash into the economy. While we debate the intricacies of each and every move—is the TALF well -structured?—the basic reality is that governments have thrown everything but the kitchen sink at this problem and, taking into account the inevitable time lag, their actions are already taking effect. That does not mean a painless recovery or a return to robust growth. But it does mean that we should retire the analogies to the Great Depression, when -policymakers—especially cen-tral banks—did everything wrong. We're living in a dangerous world. But we are also living in a world in which deep, structural forces create stability. We have learned from history and built some reasonably effective mechanisms to handle crises. Does that mean we shouldn't panic? Yes, except that it is the sense of urgency that makes people act—even overreact—and ensures that a crisis doesn't mutate into a disaster. Here's the paradox: if policymakers hadn't been scared of another Great Depression, there might well have been one.

#### Tech and foreign investment checks

Bloomberg 9—Mayer of NYC. BS in electrical engineering, Johns Hopkins. MBA in Harvard Business School. (Michael, The Vibrant Promise of Cities, 13 August 2009, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/09\_34/b4144053830583.htm?chan=magazine+channel\_special+report)

**What a disaster the past year has been**. Fannie Mae (FNM), Freddie Mac (FRE), Lehman Brothers, Bear Stearns, AIG (AIG), Merrill Lynch (BAC), Chrysler, General Motors (GM), and other major enterprises—along with Washington Mutual (WAMUQ)) and more than 70 other banks—all collapsed. The stock market plunged, with many Americans losing much of their retirement savings. Housing foreclosures hit record highs, threatening the health of many neighborhoods. Unemployment soared to its highest level in 26 years. The pain is spread wide. Here in New York City, I hear it on the subways and in neighborhood diners—jarring stories of struggle and hardship. And we may not have hit bottom yet. So what is there to be optimistic about? Plenty, actually. This recession may well prove to be longer and deeper than the 1981-82 downturn. But the nation is better positioned to rebound than it was back then. One reason for this: America's urban revival. In the early '80s the future of American cities—historically the engines of economic growth—looked bleak. Violent crime was out of control. Factories were closing. Housing abandonment was common. The transportation infrastructure was crumbling. THE ADVENTUROUS YOUNG Today, though, many cities, including mine, have succeeded in cutting crime. (Far be it from me to boast—a New Yorker would never do that—but when you see people lounging on beach chairs in a traffic-free Times Square with no fear of being mugged, you know things have changed.) Safer streets have helped attract creative, entrepreneurial, ambitious people—especially the young—to once-blighted neighborhoods. Even in the area of domestic manufacturing, where cities have experienced a steady decline as the economy has gone global, there is reason for optimism. New York was once the garment-making capital of the world. Today our production is a fraction of what it used to be, as factories have moved overseas. But a crucial sector of the industry—design—has remained. It's the sector that relies on ideas. And to paraphrase Harvard University economist Edward Glaeser, the demand for ideas isn't going away. That's why even though the financial services industry has contracted around the world, other innovative and high-tech industries are stepping in, working to strengthen and stabilize cities like New York. Then there's our nation's entrepreneurial edge. Technology has stretched the bounds of entrepreneurialism. If you can dream it, you can build it, and the U.S. has always been a nation of dreamers, even in the toughest times. Indeed, a recent report by the Kauffman Foundation, which studies entrepreneurialism, points out that half of today's Fortune 500 companies were founded during a recession or a bear market. Consider this partial list: Procter & Gamble (PG) (1837), Hewlett-Packard (HPQ) (1939), FedEx (FDX) (1973), CNN (TWX)(1980), and one close to my heart, Bloomberg (1981). After being laid off from a Wall Street job in a downturn, I started Bloomberg as a four-person company with the aim of building a computer terminal that could give up-to-the-minute financial information to analysts and traders. Today the company employs 10,000 people. The current recession, too, will give rise to a new wave of entrepreneurs. The challenge that state and local governments face—one that Washington, too, should take up—is finding ways to encourage and attract this potential. In New York City, we're expecting a big payoff from what we're doing: opening business incubators, holding boot camps for entrepreneurs, organizing business-plan competitions, expanding the amount of early-stage seed capital for startups, and cutting taxes for the smallest small businesses. GLOBAL MAGNET As countries such as India and China expand their economies, the U.S. will profit, too. The businesses they create will open offices in areas with the highest concentrations of educated, highly skilled workers. America's deep pool of talent and technological knowhow will continue to make it a highly desirable location—and investment opportunity. And if Congress has the sense to fix our broken immigration system, our open society and world-class universities will remain a magnet for the world's best and brightest. That's important: Economists have estimated that every person arriving on an H1-B visa creates jobs for five native-born Americans. Competing for talent and capital will also require all levels of government to invest more in our quality of life—mass transit, parks, schools, and so forth. That will help raise our long-term standard of living, even if real incomes don't rise appreciably in the near term.

### AT: Econ High

#### Economy rebounding—QE3 is causing ripple effects throughout the economy

Reuters 9/13 (Wanfeng Zhou, “Fed's stimulus move ignites Wall Street”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/13/us-markets-stocks-idUSBRE8890AY20120913)

(Reuters) - Stocks surged to multi-year highs on Thursday after the Federal Reserve announced an aggressive plan to stimulate the economy, encouraging investors to dive back into the market. The Dow and the S&P 500 both closed at their highest levels since December 2007, while the Nasdaq ended at the highest since November 2000. Major market names were big winners, with Apple Inc (AAPL.O), the most valuable U.S. company, ending at an all-time closing high and No. 2 Exxon Mobil (XOM.N), closing at a four-year high. Nearly 600 shares on the New York Stock Exchange and Nasdaq touched 52-week highs on the day. "There has been a lot of money that's been sitting on the sidelines, and the Fed action is what spurred people to get in," said Tim Ghriskey, chief investment officer at Solaris Asset Management in Bedford Hills, New York. "The spike in volume is certainly heartening." Total volume was 8.14 billion shares, the busiest day of trading since June 22 and above last year's daily average of 7.84 billion. In a significant shift in monetary policy, the Fed said it would buy $40 billion of agency mortgage debt per month and pledged to maintain it until the U.S. unemployment rate, currently at 8.1 percent, significantly improves. "The employment situation ... remains a grave concern," Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke told reporters. "While the economy appears to be on a path of moderate recovery, it isn't growing fast enough to make significant progress reducing the unemployment rate." The Dow Jones industrial average .DJI ended up 206.51 points, or 1.55 percent, to 13,539.86. The Standard & Poor's 500 Index .SPX closed up 23.43 points, or 1.63 percent, to 1,459.99. The Nasdaq Composite Index .IXIC rose 41.51 points, or 1.33 percent, to 3,155.83. Financial, materials and energy shares led the gains given their sensitivity to the economic outlook. Wells Fargo (WFC.N) jumped to a new 52-week high while the PHLX Housing Index .HGX rose 1.91 percent. The buying of mortgage bonds is "very positive for the housing market, and for consumers in general and should really go a long way to helping stabilize the economy," Ghriskey said. Many investors had expected the Fed to act, as reflected in the latest run-up in equity prices, but analysts said there were still some who believed that the Fed would wait until after the November presidential election. "A lot of those doubters had to be brought up to speed here, so to speak," said Ron Rowland, president of Capital Cities Asset Management in Austin, Texas. In an additional move that reflects just how concerned Fed officials are about the economy, officials said they were not likely to raise interest rates from near zero until at least mid-2015. Previously, it had set such guidance at late 2014. Apple's stock (AAPL.O) rose 1.97 percent to $682.98 after analysts said sales of the new iPhone 5 could double those of the previous model in its first week on the market. Exxon Mobil (XOM.N) gained 1.88 percent to $91.23. The S&P financial sector index .GSPF added 2.58 percent. The S&P materials sector index .GSPM advanced 2.56 percent. Some analysts said with the S&P 500 index up 16 percent since the beginning of the year and stocks' recent advance on hopes for help from central banks, the gains may be an opportunity for investors to pare positions.