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### 1NC

#### Bipartisanship and Biden’s PC guarantees passage of Chinese competitiveness legislation now.

Todd Young, Congress Could Have China Competition Bill in Weeks Bloomberg MarketsBalance of Power May 25th, 2022, 12:06 PM EDT https://www.bloomberg.com/news/videos/2022-05-25/congress-could-have-china-competition-bill-in-weeks-video

Todd Young: Well listen I have to commend the Democratic leadership in the Senate. I told Senator Schumer we are only going to work together on this if we make it a very transparent and inclusive process and he has kept that promise for me, so we got buy in from roughly 70 U.S. senators, bipartisan, and we got a really big vote out of the Senate and we hope to maintain that moving forward. Unfortunately, the administration and Democratic leadership got districted along the way with something called Build Back Better and so for the better part of a year they let our Senate bill lay dormant essentially, instead of being reconciled with the House version. Right now we are in the negotiation process – the House has passed their bill – it was kind of a partisan bill – we still have that Senate bill. We are in the process of negotiation. I think within the next couple of weeks we are going to end up with a final compromise bill that will look a lot like the Senate bill and then it will be signed into law by the President of the United States. So, I’m guardedly optimistic but its very important that for those that feel strongly we need to get this done for the good of the country and that this place can still work in a bipartisan way when it has to. We need to press our senators and our members of Congress to get this thing done rather than focusing on election year politics. David Westin: So senator, let me push you on the guardedly optimistic and see if I can get you to confident because as a practical matter isn’t there a deadline of this summer of that summer recess given the fact that we have midterm elections in the fall – you’ve got to get it done by the middle of the summer. Are you confident you can get it done? Senator Young: I know we can get it done as long as President Biden has the will to press Democrats to get it done. I know that Republicans here in the US Senate are on board. I think the Democrats in the Senate are on board. I think the real challenge will be in the House of Representatives, but all of that can be addressed if the President says “listen we are going to make sure this thing remains bipartisan, we are going to make sure this is a priority even during an election year. And I believe it will happen because, you know what, it has to happen.

#### \*\*\*\*insert link\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### Increasing US competitiveness with China is key to increase cooperation on global issues like climate change

Campbell and Sullivan 2019. KURT M. CAMPBELL is Chair and CEO of the Asia Group. He is 2018-19 Kissinger Fellow at the McCain Institute and was U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from 2009 to 2013. JAKE SULLIVAN is a Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He served as National Security Adviser to the U.S. Vice President in 2013-14 and as Director of Policy Planning at the U.S. Department of State in 2011-13. “Competition Without Catastrophe: How America Can Both Challenge and Coexist With China” Foreign Affairs September/October 2019. Business Insights. Accessed 3/21/21. ARJH

Even as China emerges as a more formidable competitor than the Soviet Union, it has also become an essential U.S. partner. Global problems that are difficult enough to solve even when the United States and China work together will be impossible to solve if they fail to do so--climate change foremost among them, given that the United States and China are the two biggest polluters. A host of other transnational challenges--economic crises, nuclear proliferation, global pandemics--also demand some degree of joint effort. This imperative for cooperation has little parallel in the Cold War. While the notion of a new Cold War has brought calls for an updated version of containment, resistance to such thinking has come from advocates of an accommodative "grand bargain" with China. Such a bargain would go well beyond the terms of U.S.-Soviet detente: in this scenario, the United States would effectively concede to China a sphere of influence in Asia. Proponents defend this concession as necessary given the United States' domestic headwinds and relative decline. This position is sold as realistic, but it is no more tenable than containment. Ceding the world's most dynamic region to China would do long-term harm to American workers and businesses. It would damage American allies and values by turning sovereign partners into bargaining chips. A grand bargain would also require stark and permanent U.S. concessions, such as the abrogation of U.S. alliances or even of the right to operate in the western Pacific, for speculative promises. Not only are these costs unacceptable; a grand bargain would also be unenforceable. A rising China would likely violate the agreement when its preferences and power changed. Advocates of neo-containment tend to see any call for managed coexistence as an argument for a version of the grand bargain; advocates of a grand bargain tend to see any suggestion of sustained competition as a case for a version of containment. That divide obscures a course between these extremes--one that is not premised on Chinese capitulation or on U.S.-Chinese condominium. Instead, the goal should be to establish favorable terms of coexistence with Beijing in four key competitive domains--military, economic, political, and global governance--thereby securing U.S. interests without triggering the kind of threat perceptions that characterized the U.S.-Soviet rivalry. Washington should heed the lessons of the Cold War while rejecting the idea that its logic still applies. TOWARD SUSTAINABLE DETERRENCE In contrast to the military competition of the Cold War, which was a truly global struggle, the dangers for Washington and Beijing are likely to be confined to the Indo-Pacific. Even so, the region features at least four potential hot spots: the South China Sea, the East China Sea, the Taiwan Strait, and the Korean Peninsula. Neither side wishes for conflict, but tensions are rising as both invest in offensive capabilities, boost their military presence in the region, and operate in ever-closer proximity. Washington fears that China is trying to push U.S. forces out of the western Pacific, and Beijing fears that the United States is trying to hem it in. Given China's harassment of U.S. aircraft and naval vessels, minor incidents risk escalating into major military confrontations; Admiral Wu Shengli, the former naval commander of the People's Liberation Army, has warned that any such incident "could spark war." But coexistence in the Indo-Pacific by both militaries should not be dismissed as impossible. The United States must accept that military primacy will be difficult to restore, given the reach of China's weapons, and instead focus on deterring China from interfering with its freedom of maneuver and from physically coercing U.S. allies and partners. Beijing will have to accept that the United States will remain a resident power in the region, with a major military presence, naval operations in its major waterways, and a network of alliances and partnerships. Taiwan and the South China Sea are likely to present the most significant challenges to this overall approach. A military provocation or misunderstanding in either case could easily trigger a larger conflagration, with devastating consequences, and this risk must increasingly animate the thinking of senior leaders in both Washington and Beijing. On Taiwan, a tacit commitment not to unilaterally alter the status quo is perhaps the best that can be hoped for given the historical complexities involved. Yet Taiwan is not only a potential flash point; it is also the greatest unclaimed success in the history of U.S.-Chinese relations. The island has grown, prospered, and democratized in the ambiguous space between the United States and China as a result of the flexible and nuanced approach generally adopted by both sides. In this way, the diplomacy surrounding Taiwan could serve as a model for the increasingly challenging diplomacy between Washington and Beijing on a variety of other issues, which are similarly likely to include intense engagement, mutual vigilance and a degree of distrust, and a measure of patience and necessary restraint. Meanwhile, in the South China Sea, Beijing's understanding that threats to freedom of navigation could have devastating consequences for China's own economy might help--when combined with U.S. deterrence--modulate its more nationalist sentiments. To achieve such coexistence, Washington will need to enhance both U.S.-Chinese crisis management and its own capacity for deterrence. Even as Cold War adversaries, the United States and the Soviet Union worked concertedly to reduce the risk that an accidental collision would escalate to nuclear war; they set up military hot lines, established codes of conduct, and signed arms control agreements. The United States and China lack similar instruments to manage crises at a time when new domains of potential conflict, such as space and cyberspace, have increased the risk of escalation. In every military domain, the two countries need agreements that are at least as formal and detailed as the U.S.-Soviet Incidents at Sea Agreement, a 1972 deal that established a set of specific rules aimed at avoiding maritime misunderstandings. The United States and China also need more communication channels and mechanisms to avoid conflict--especially in the South China Sea--to allow each side to quickly clarify the other's intentions during an incident. The bilateral military relationship should no longer be held hostage to political disagreements, and senior military officials on both sides should engage in more frequent and substantive discussions to build personal ties as well as understandings of each side's operations. Historically, progress on some of these efforts, especially crisis communication, has proved difficult: Chinese leaders fear that crisis communication could embolden the United States to act with impunity and would require devolving too much authority to senior military officers in the field. But these worries may be easing, given China's growing power and military reforms. Effective U.S. strategy in this domain requires not just reducing the risk of unintentional conflict but also deterring intentional conflict. Beijing cannot be allowed to use the threat of force to pursue a fait accompli in territorial disputes. Yet managing this risk does not require U.S. military primacy within the region. As the former Trump administration defense official Elbridge Colby has argued, "deterrence without dominance--even against a very great and fearsome opponent--is possible." To ensure deterrence in the Indo-Pacific, Washington should reorient its investments away from expensive and vulnerable platforms, such as aircraft carriers, and toward cheaper asymmetric capabilities designed to discourage Chinese adventurism without spending vast sums. This calls for taking a page from Beijing's own playbook. Just as China has relied on relatively cheap antiship cruise and ballistic missiles, the United States should embrace long-range unmanned carrier-based strike aircraft, unmanned underwater vehicles, guided missile submarines, and high-speed strike weapons. All these weapons could protect U.S. and allied interests, even as they dent China's confidence that its offensive operations will succeed and reduce the risk of collision and miscalculation. The United States should also diversify some of its military presence toward Southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean, making use of access agreements rather than permanent basing when necessary. This would place some U.S. forces beyond China's precision-strike complex, preserving their ability to promptly address crises. It would also preposition them to address a wide range of contingencies beyond conflicts involving China, including humanitarian assistance, disaster relief, and antipiracy missions. ESTABLISHING RECIPROCITY Unlike the Soviet Union, which focused its resources on military power, China views geoeconomics as the primary arena of competition. With an eye toward the future, it has invested heavily in emerging industries and technologies, including artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced manufacturing, and biotechnology. China seeks dominance in these fields in part by denying Western companies reciprocal treatment. The United States granted China permanent normal trade relations, supported its entry into the World Trade Organization, and has generally maintained one of the world's most open markets. But through a combination of industrial policy, protectionism, and outright theft, China has put in place a range of formal and informal barriers to its markets and has exploited American openness. This structural imbalance has eroded support for stable U.S.-Chinese economic ties, and the relationship faces a heightened risk of rupture even if Xi and U.S. President Donald Trump are able to reach a near-term trade truce. Many in the American business community are no longer willing to tolerate China's unfair practices, which include employing state hackers to steal intellectual property, forcing foreign companies to localize their operations and engage in joint ventures, subsidizing state champions, and otherwise discriminating against foreign companies. Alleviating these growing frictions while protecting American workers and innovation will require making China's full access to major markets around the world contingent on its willingness to adopt economic reforms at home. Washington, for its part, will have to invest in the core sources of American economic strength, build a united front of like-minded partners to help establish reciprocity, and safeguard its technological leadership while avoiding self-inflicted wounds. The most decisive factor in the economic competition with China is U.S. domestic policy. The notion of a new "Sputnik moment"--one that galvanizes public research as powerfully as seeing the Soviet Union launch the world's first satellite did--may be overstating the point, but government does have a role to play in advancing American economic and technological leadership. Yet the United States has turned away from precisely the kinds of ambitious public investments it made during that period--such as the Interstate Highway System championed by President Dwight Eisenhower and the basic research initiatives pushed by the scientist Vannevar Bush--even as it faces a more challenging economic competitor. Washington must dramatically increase funds for basic science research and invest in clean energy, biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and computing power. At the same time, the federal government should scale up its investments in education at all levels and in infrastructure, and it should adopt immigration policies that continue to enhance the United States' demographic and skills advantage. Calling for a tougher line on China while starving public investments is self-defeating; describing these investments as "socialist," given the competition, is especially ironic. Indeed, such strange ideological bedfellows as Senator Elizabeth Warren, Democrat of Massachusetts, and Senator Marco Rubio, Republican of Florida, are making a convincing case for a new U.S. industrial policy. On top of this domestic foundation, Washington should work with like-minded nations to define a new set of standards on issues that the World Trade Organization does not currently address, from state-owned enterprises to indigenous innovation policies to digital trade. Ideally, these standards would connect Asia and Europe. To this end, the United States should consider starting a rules-setting initiative of market democracies layered over the WTO system, which would fill these gaps. The logic is straightforward. If China hopes to enjoy equal access to this new economic community, its own economic and regulatory frameworks must meet the same standards. The combined gravitational pull of this community would present China with a choice: either curb its free-riding and start complying with trade rules, or accept less favorable terms from more than half of the global economy. If Beijing chooses to hold to the line that the necessary reforms amount to economic regime change, it can certainly do so, but the world would be well within its rights to offer China reciprocal treatment. In some cases, Washington may still need to impose reciprocal measures on China unilaterally, by treating its exports and investments the same way Beijing handles U.S. exports and investments. These efforts will be challenging and costly, which is precisely why the Trump administration's decision to pick trade fights with U.S. allies rather than rally them to a common position vis-a-vis China is such a waste of American leverage. The United States will also have to safeguard its technological advantages in the face of China's intellectual property theft, targeted industrial policies, and commingling of its economic and security sectors. Doing so will require some enhanced restrictions on the flow of technology investment and trade in both directions, but these efforts should be pursued selectively rather than wholesale, imposing curbs on technologies that are critical to national security and human rights and allowing regular trade and investment to continue for those that are not. Even these targeted restrictions must be undertaken in consultation with industry and other governments; failing to do so could Balkanize the global technology ecosystem by impeding flows of knowledge and talent. Such a development would neutralize a key U.S. competitive advantage relative to China: an open economy that can source the best global talent and synthesize the biggest breakthroughs from around the world. Meanwhile, overreach on technology restrictions could drive other countries toward China, especially since China is already the largest trading partner for most. In this respect, the Trump administration's loud and largely unilateral campaign against the participation of the Chinese company Huawei in the development of 5G infrastructure may provide a cautionary lesson. Had the administration coordinated with allies and partners in advance and tried some creative policymaking--for example, establishing a multilateral lending initiative to subsidize the purchase of alternatives to Huawei's equipment--it might have had more success in convincing states to consider other vendors. It then might have been able to make the most of the two-year delay Huawei now faces in rolling out 5G following its placement on the U.S. Department of Commerce's list of entities that cannot be supplied with American technology. Future efforts to restrict trade with China in the technology sector will require careful deliberation, advance planning, and multilateral support if they are to be successful; otherwise, they will risk undermining U.S. innovation. PRO-DEMOCRACY, NOT ANTI-CHINA U.S.-Chinese economic and technological competition suggests an emerging contest of models. But unlike the Cold War, with its sharp ideological divide between two rival blocs, the lines of demarcation are fuzzier here. Although neither Washington nor Beijing is engaging in the kind of proselytizing characteristic of the Cold War, China may ultimately present a stronger ideological challenge than the Soviet Union did, even if it does not explicitly seek to export its system. If the international order is a reflection of its most powerful states, then China's rise to superpower status will exert a pull toward autocracy. China's fusion of authoritarian capitalism and digital surveillance may prove more durable and attractive than Marxism, and its support for autocrats and democratic backsliders will challenge American values and provide China cover for its own egregious practices, including the detention of more than one million ethnic Uighurs in northwestern China. Some may question whether the erosion of democratic governance across the world matters for U.S. interests; it does. Democratic governments are more likely to align with American values, pursue good governance, treat their people well, and respect other open societies, and all of this tends to make them more trustworthy and transparent and, in turn, better economic and security partners. Washington can best establish favorable terms of coexistence with China in the political realm by focusing on advancing the appeal of these values for their own sake, not to score points in the context of U.S.-Chinese competition. As China's presence around the world grows, the United States should avoid a tendency that was all too common during the Cold War: to see third countries only in terms of their relationship to a rival government. Some of the Trump administration's policies--such as invoking the Monroe Doctrine in Latin America and delivering an address on Africa that is largely about countering China--echo this old approach. A tack that intentionally engages states on their own terms would do more to advance American interests and values than knee-jerk responses to Chinese initiatives that leave states feeling that Washington cares about them only as battlegrounds in its competition with Beijing. China's Belt and Road Initiative offers the most obvious opportunity to apply this principle in practice. Rather than fight China at every turn--on every port, bridge, and rail line--the United States and its partners should make their own affirmative pitch to countries about the kinds of high-quality, high-standard investments that will best serve progress. Supporting investments not because they are anti-Chinese but because they are pro-growth, pro-sustainability, and pro-freedom will be much more effective over the long term--especially because China's state-led investments have provoked a degree of backlash in countries over cost overruns, no-bid contracts, corruption, environmental degradation, and poor working conditions. In this light, the best defense of democracy is to stress the values that are essential to good governance, especially transparency and accountability, and to support civil society, independent media, and the free flow of information. Together, these steps could lower the risk of democratic backsliding, improve lives in the developing world, and reduce Chinese influence. This course of action will require an injection of multilateral funding from the United States and its allies and partners that can give countries genuine alternatives. But it will require something more fundamental, too: the United States needs to have greater confidence in the belief that investing in human capital and good governance will work out better over the long run than China's extractive approach. Focusing on principles rather than scorekeeping will also be essential for setting norms for new technologies that raise hard questions about human ethics. From artificial intelligence to biotechnology, autonomous weapons to gene-edited humans, there will be a crucial struggle in the years ahead to define appropriate conduct and then pressure laggards to get in line. Washington should start shaping the parameters of these debates without further delay. Finally, coexistence with China does not, and cannot, preclude the United States from speaking out against China's egregious and inhumane treatment of its own citizens and the arbitrary detention of foreign nongovernmental organization workers. The West's relative silence on Beijing's internment of Uighurs has left a moral stain, and so the United States and its partners should mobilize international pressure to demand neutral third-party access to those who are detained and the sanctioning of the individuals and companies that are complicit in the detention. China may well threaten that such pressure will destabilize ties. Yet Washington should make speaking out on human rights abuses a predictable and routine part of the relationship. SEQUENCING COMPETITION AND COOPERATION It is often taken as an article of faith that as the U.S.-Chinese relationship becomes more competitive, the space for cooperation will shrink, if not disappear. But even as adversaries, the United States and the Soviet Union found ways to cooperate on a number of issues, including space exploration, contagious diseases, the environment, and the global commons. The need for cooperation between Washington and Beijing is far more acute, given the nature of contemporary challenges. Leaders in both countries should consider cooperation on such transnational challenges not as a concession by one party but as an essential need for both. To get the balance between cooperation and competition right, Washington has to consider the sequencing of each. The United States has historically sought to cooperate first and compete second with China. Beijing, meanwhile, has become quite comfortable competing first and cooperating second, linking--either explicitly or implicitly--offers of cooperation to U.S. concessions in areas of strategic interest. Going forward, Washington should avoid becoming an eager suitor on transnational challenges. Eagerness can actually limit the scope for cooperation by making it a bargaining chip. Although it may seem counterintuitive, competition is likely essential to effective cooperation with Beijing. In the zero-sum strategic mindset of many Chinese officials, perceptions of U.S. power and resolve matter enormously, and the Chinese bureaucracy has long focused on shifts in both. Given this sensitivity, it can be as important for Washington to demonstrate an ability to stand firm, and even to impose costs, as it is for it to speak earnestly about finding common cause. The best approach, then, will be to lead with competition, follow with offers of cooperation, and refuse to negotiate any linkages between Chinese assistance on global challenges and concessions on U.S. interests.

#### Warming outweighs the case---its *irreversible* and exacerbates biodiversity loss, conflict, disease

Torres 16 (Phil Torres; author, Affiliate Scholar @ Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, founder of the X-Risks Institute, published articles for Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Salon, Journal of Future Studies, and the Journal of Evolution and Technology; 7-22-2016, "Op-ed: Climate Change Is the Most Urgent Existential Risk," FLI - Future of Life Institute, http://futureoflife.org/2016/07/22/climate-change-is-the-most-urgent-existential-risk/, accessed 8-9-2016)

For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as [a 2016 study](http://www.climate.unibe.ch/~stocker/papers/clark16natcc.pdf) published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, [a recent article](http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/1/5/e1400253.full?con=&dom=pscau&src=syndication) in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet [another study](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html) suggests that we could be approaching a sudden, irreversible, catastrophic collapse of the global ecosystem. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars, nuclear terrorism, engineered pandemics, a superintelligence takeover, and perhaps even an [impact winter](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_winter), it ought to take precedence over all other risk concerns — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.

### 2NC - Overview

**The plan prevents passage of China competitiveness legislation. This allows for the dominance of China on the global economic and security stage. This prevents the cooperation with China necessary to avoid the extinction level impacts of global warming.**

#### Irreversibility is the metric for weighing impacts- any other impact has a chance of the world returning

Sunstein 2007Cass R.—Professor in the Department of Political Science and at the Law School of the University of Chicago (“Worst-Case Scenarios”, Harvard University Press)

Most worst-case scenarios appear to have an element of irreversibility. Once a species is lost, it is lost forever. The special concern for endangered species stems from the permanence of their loss (outside of Jurassic Park). One of the most serious fears associated with genetically modified organisms is that they might lead to irreversible ecological harm. Because some **greenhouse gases stay in the atmosphere for centuries, the problem of climate change may be irreversible, at least for all practical purposes**. Transgenic crops can impose irreversible losses too, because they can make pests more resistant to pesticides. If we invest significant wealth in one source of energy and neglect others, we may be effectively stuck forever, or at least for a long time. One objection to capital punishment is that errors cannot be reversed. In ordinary life, **our judgments** about worst-case scenarios **have everything to do with irreversibility**. Of course an action may be hard but not impossible to undo, and so there may be a continuum of cases, with different degrees of difficulty in reversing. A marriage can be reversed, but divorce is rarely easy; having a child is very close to irreversible; moving from New York to Paris is reversible, but moving back may be difficult. People often take steps to avoid courses of action that are burdensome rather than literally impossible to reverse. **In this light, we might identify an Irreversible Harm Precautionary Principle, applicable to a subset of risks**.' As a rough first approximation, the principle says this: Sp**ecial steps should be taken to avoid irreversible harms, through precautions that go well beyond those that would be taken if irreversibility were not a problem.** The general attitude here is "act, then learn**," as opposed to the tempting alternative of "wait and learn."** In the case of climate change, some people believe that research should be our first line of defense. In **their view, we should refuse to commit substantial resources to the problem until e**vidence of serious harm is unmistakably clear.' But even assuming that the evidence is not so clear,research **without action allows greenhouse gas emissions** to continue, which might **produce risks that are irreversible**, or at best difficult and expensive to reverse. For this reason, **the best course of action might well be to take precautions now as a way of preserving flexibility for future generations. In the environmental context in general, this principle suggests that regulators should proceed with far more aggressive measures than would otherwise seem justified**.

**But also, Chinese tech leadership leads to nuclear war**

**Kroenig 2018**,Deputy Director for Strategy, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Georgetown University (Matthew, Nov 12, 2018, “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” *BAS*, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war>)

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause **nuclear conflict**: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response. For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack. Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched. If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem. According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities. This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly. Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The **dominant theory** of the causes of war in the academy is the “**bargaining model** of war.” This theory **identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power** as a primary cause of conflict. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the **balance of power** are problematic because they **undermine effective bargaining.** After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage. You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially **destabilizing shifts** in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as **China has increased its military capabilities**. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be **decisive** for the future of **military acquisitions and warfare**, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.” If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local **military advantage** over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate **conflict over Taiwan**. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, **there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through** limited nuclear war strategies, **nuclear brinkmanship, or** simple accident or **inadvertent escalation**. This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean **nuclear Armageddon**.

## Uniqueness Extension

### 2NC ---UQ

#### China competitiveness package is coming now, it’s the only bipartisan policy Biden can get done, it’s key to further bipart outreach, his PC is only thing keeping precarious bipartisanship on this issue alive. Has to be done by August Recess. 1NC Young evidence says it will happen as long as capital and focus is maintained.

#### China competitiveness bill will pass – in a final push to reconcile and wide agreement on overall intent

John Russell June 22, 2022 Is Time Running Out for Compromise on America COMPETES/USICA Act? https://www.hpcwire.com/2022/06/22/is-time-running-out-for-compromise-on-america-competes-usica-act/

You may recall that efforts proposed in 2020 to [remake](https://www.hpcwire.com/2020/05/27/100b-plan-submitted-for-massive-remake-and-expansion-of-nsf/) the National Science Foundation (Endless Frontier Act) have since expanded and morphed into two gigantic bills, the America COMPETES Act in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act in the U.S. Senate. So far, efforts to reconcile the two pieces of legislation have snagged and a final push to reconcile narrower versions of the competing bills will occur before recent reports suggest the July 4th break. In late March, the Senate voted 68-28 to substitute the text of H.R. 4521, the America COMPETES Act of 2022, with the text of the Senate’s U.S. Innovation and Competition (USICA) of 2021, and sent it back to the House, which as expected, rejected the substituted legislation and requested a conference to reconcile the differences. It is a sprawling piece of legislation that morphed during the pandemic to encompass supply chain issues, science security, NSF priorities, and direct support for the U.S. semiconductor industry to name just a few of its provisions. Here’s the summary of the [version](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/4521) sent to House for reconciliation, excerpted directly from House legislation tracking records: “Passed Senate (03/28/2022) “United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021 “This bill addresses U.S. technology and communications, foreign relations and national security, domestic manufacturing, education, trade, and other matters. “Among other provisions, the bill provides funding for FY2022-FY2026 to support U.S. semiconductor manufacturing, research and development, and supply chain security; provides funding for wireless supply chain innovation; establishes a Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation; extends through 2025 the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to lease its non-excess real property and related personal property; authorizes various programs and policies related to space exploration; authorizes various international affairs programs and activities, including foreign assistance for the Indo-Pacific region; requires federal infrastructure programs to provide for the use of materials produced in the United States; imposes sanctions on China for cybersecurity and human rights abuses; requires the Department of Health and Human Services to consider national security risks associated with sensitive genetic information; includes initiatives related to elementary and secondary education, including those to increase computer science education; contains provisions related to higher education, including those reauthorizing through FY2027 international education programs and addressing China’s influence on institutions of higher education; modifies and expands the schedule for graduated merger filing fees; prohibits federal funding for the Wuhan Institute of Virology; requires the U.S. Trade Representative to take certain actions related to digital trade and censorship practices; and extends through 2027 the Generalized System of Preferences.” Sorting through the bill’s many provisions is daunting task. Earlier this month, Science (AAAS) reported on one of the sticking points related to NSF’s EPSCoR program. “[T]he bills, which Democratic leaders hope to reconcile by the end of the month, differ when it comes to how NSF should address geographic imbalance. The Senate’s version, a nearly 2500-page package called the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA), mandates a 10-fold budget increase for the NSF program that steers funding to have-not states called EPSCoR (Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research). The similarly mammoth House version, called the America COMPETES Act, would create new competitive NSF programs targeting poorly funded institutions in any state,” [reported](https://www.science.org/content/article/researchers-criticize-senate-plan-to-steer-more-nsf-funding-to-have-not-states) Science There’s also argument about the size (currently roughly $52 billion) and manner of support to provide to the U.S. semiconductor manufacturing industry. These are just two points of contention; there are several more but there is also agreement on the overall intent.

#### Will pass – joint commitments to pass and act before the August recess

Margaret Harding McGill and Ina Fried June 24 2022 Chip makers warn Congress’ delay could threaten U.S. expansion https://www.axios.com/2022/06/24/congress-delay-chips-semiconductors-intel

Lawmakers are working toward a compromise on House and Senate versions of the legislation as the August recess looms. After a meeting Tuesday to discuss the bipartisan legislation's path forward, Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said in a joint statement that Democrats believe "there is no reason that we should not pass this bill through Congress in July."

Momentum toward passage – industry CEO pressure

Fox Business - Jun 15 2022 China competition bill in Congress gets support from more than 100 CEOs https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/china-competition-bill-in-congress-gets-support-from-more-than-100-ceos/ar-AAYuhhB?li=BBnbcA1

Chief executives from Alphabet Inc, Amazon.com Inc and Microsoft Corp on Wednesday called on Congress to pass legislation aimed at boosting U.S. economic competitiveness against China, including in chip manufacturing. Those executives and more than 100 others signed a letter urging the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, which each have passed different versions of the legislation, to reach an agreement and send a bill to President Joe Biden for his signature. Legislators will break for a summer recess in August, after which most observers expect lawmakers to shift their attention to this fall's midterm elections. "Our global competitors are investing in their industry, their workers, and their economies, and it is imperative that Congress act to enhance U.S. competitiveness," said the letter.

#### Will pass – bipartisan agreement on getting it completed before August recess

John Russell June 22, 2022 Is Time Running Out for Compromise on America COMPETES/USICA Act? https://www.hpcwire.com/2022/06/22/is-time-running-out-for-compromise-on-america-competes-usica-act/

The Semiconductor Industry Association (SIA), which organized the letter signing, said the letter was the largest group of corporate leaders so far to endorse the bill. The legislation includes $52 billion in federal funding to expand U.S. semiconductor manufacturing capacity, which happens in factories called "fabs," short for fabrication plants. "The leaders of our industry are under pressure to get fabs up to respond to the growing demand for chips. And they can't wait," said SIA CEO John Neuffer, adding that the bill would "ensure that more of those fabs are going to be built in the U.S. rather than overseas." SENATE ACTS TO LAUNCH FORMAL TALKS ON CHINA COMPETITION BILL The SIA is also calling for an investment tax credit for semiconductor manufacturing and design in the competitiveness legislation. Democratic House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer said he hoped lawmakers could complete the legislation by the end of the month. He added that Republican Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell told him "he is not going to do anything to oppose or undermine consideration of this bill."

#### Will pass – bipartisan negotiation process already underway.

By Zach C. Cohen May 12, 2022 5:31 AM China Competition Bill Talks Commence With Obstacles Looming https://about.bgov.com/news/china-competition-bill-talks-commence-with-obstacles-looming/

House and Senate members will start to hash out their differences Thursday on a multi-billion-dollar manufacturing and innovation bill that could be one of the last major legislative accomplishments before the midterm elections. The negotiations over the final shape of the package intended to enhance US competitiveness with China are likely to touch on a wide range of subjects including computer chips, trade, immigration, and even Wisconsin mink farming. The opening public session kicks off what’s become an increasingly rare bicameral conference committee process. Over 100 members of Congress are slated to give brief opening statements at an hours-long meeting of the conference committee tasked with coming up with an agreement on a bill ([H.R. 4521](https://www.bgov.com/core/legislation/federal/bills/#!/6986990763783225434)) known in the House as the America COMPETES Act. Sen. Roger Wicker (R-Miss), the Senate Commerce Committee’s ranking member, said the first meeting gives lawmakers a chance to “touch gloves” before squaring off over the bill’s contents. Negotiators will then be able to debate individual provisions privately in the coming weeks or months. “There’s about eight different committees with different issues, so probably a lot of those issues will break out into those smaller groups,” said Senate Commerce Committee Chair Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), who also heads the conference committee. Former Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) said it’s been a long time since lawmakers held a formal conference, and they may struggle with the proceedings. “But I think they’re going to get that done and a lot of people are interested in it because the chip money is there,” said Lott, a principal and director at Crossroads Strategies who represents the Nissan Motor Co. While there’s widespread support for the bill’s $52 billion for computer chip development, there’s billions of dollars worth of authorizations that lawmakers will need to agree on before a final package wins the approval of both chambers of Congress and President Joe Biden. Senators of both parties are hoping the base text of negotiations is the US Innovation and Competition Act ([S. 1260](https://www.bgov.com/core/legislation/federal/bills/#!/6953589245503340555)), which more than two-thirds of the Senate voted to pass last year. By contrast, Democrats passed the House version this year with the lone Republican vote in support coming from retiring Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-Ill.). “I think all the Republican conferees are taking the position that the base bill that we need to negotiate on in the conference is the Senate bill,” said Sen. Mike Crapo (R-Idaho), the ranking member of the Finance Committee. “It’s already been bipartisan and negotiated.”

#### Will pass and be done by July 4

By Reuters May 19, 2022, at 11:15 a.m. Pelosi Says She Hopes U.S. Congress Can Pass China Competition Bill by July 4 https://www.usnews.com/news/top-news/articles/2022-05-19/pelosi-says-she-hopes-u-s-congress-can-pass-china-competition-bill-by-july-4

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - U.S. House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi said on Thursday she hoped the Congress can pass the legislation authorizing hundreds of billions of dollars to boost the country's ability to compete with Chinese technology, by July 4. Congress has been working on China competition legislation for more than a year. The legislation called the COMPETES Act authorizes almost $300 billion for research and development, including $52 billion to subsidize semiconductor manufacturing and research.

#### Bipartisanship and Biden’s PC guarantees passage of Chinese competitiveness legislation now.

Sarah Mucha April 13 2022, a politics reporter at Axios, covering the Biden administration and Congress; 4/13/2022, "Biden to push Congress on China competition bill," <https://www.axios.com/biden-pressure-congress-competition-bill-north-carolina-844fe9a0-0dc0-48c0-aa22-097c455591db.html>

President Biden is planning to pressure Congress to pass an innovation and competition bill that would boost the semiconductor industry, among others, when he travels to Greensboro, N.C., on Thursday, Axios has learned. Why it matters: The administration knows voters want to see it taking action on inflation and supply-chain issues. It’s especially cognizant of the effect raising food and gas prices are having on voters’ pocketbooks in the buildup to this fall's midterms. Recent international sanctions on Russia have shown how any country that’s too reliant on one export — energy exports, in Moscow's case — can be hurt economically. The bill is meant to increase U.S. competition globally but especially with China. The trip to North Carolina comes after a visit by the president on Tuesday to Menlo, Iowa, where he discussed a plan to lower gas prices in part by granting a waiver to use cheaper ethanol fuel into this summer. The details: The full force of the administration will be behind the innovation and competition effort. Cabinet members will be fanning out across the country and airwaves in the upcoming days and weeks to campaign for the bill. Labor Secretary Marty Walsh is traveling to Los Angeles on April 19-21, and to northeast Ohio on April 29, Axios has learned. Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm will join Walsh on April 21 at a cleantech incubator in Los Angeles. Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo, who's been sidelined after a COVID-19 diagnosis, will be holding regional press calls in states like Texas, Pennsylvania, Utah and Idaho. She's played an active role in shepherding the bill through Congress. That travel and outreach will follow a visit to Oregon on Wednesday by U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai, during which she talked about the innovation bill. On Thursday, the president will tour the new Harold L. Martin Sr. Engineering Research & Innovation Complex at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University. The big picture: The bill proposes investments in research and development and advanced manufacturing. Passing it, though, has been an arduous process. In June, 19 Senate Republicans voted in favor of the United States Innovation and Competition Act [USICA], raising the prospect of an easy bipartisan victory for Biden. But after the House debated its version of the bill, the COMPETES Act, Republican support slipped away. Now, 107 Democrats and Republicans between the House and Senate are working out the differences between the two bills in conference committee. The goal is to reach a bipartisan agreement that can be forwarded to Biden for his signature.

#### China competition bill passes now. New legislation weighs down passage and Biden PC is key.

Charles Cooper 4/20/22. “China Competition Legislation is Well Positioned, But Not Without Risk” <https://signaldc.com/china-competition-legislation-is-well-positioned-but-not-without-risk/>

There has been significant focus in the 117th Congress on finding a legislative solution for addressing the U.S.’s ability to compete​ with China on a more level playing field – both economically and in terms of national security. The Senate introduced the U.S. Innovation & Competition Act in April last year, which was then passed by a bipartisan vote of 68-32 in June. The House introduced the America COMPETES act in July last year, which was then passed by a party-line vote of 222-210 in February this year. House and Senate leadership remain optimistic that they will be able to reach a consensus on a final package by July 4th. China competition legislation is the most likely near-term bipartisan “win” of significance in Congress. With few other major bills on the horizon that have a chance of reaching the President’s desk (the National Defense Authorization Act being an exception), this legislation is well-positioned to be prioritized by policymakers on both sides of the aisle who could benefit from a major policy win this year. **Why** This Legislation Has Momentum **Bipartisanship Rules in DC:** Other than reconciliation (which has yet to be a successful strategy for legislation this Congress), virtually all other bills require bipartisan support to reach the President’s desk. In an era where partisanship is at an all-time high, the fact that a version of this legislation passed with 68 votes in the Senate is significant and an advantage of many competing bills. **Big Funding Opportunities and Industry Wins:** For those that follow the money, there are literally billions for programs that would increase U.S. supply chain resiliency, boost domestic manufacturing, strengthen the U.S. economy, and improve resources for innovation across all sectors. Furthermore, reforms to the Section 301 tariff process will help create additional certainty and transparency around tariffs on products imported from China, which has been a major priority for industry. **A Focus on China:** Policymakers that are on the far right and the far left (and many in between) share a common focus around concerns related to China and an interest in spurring more domestic job growth, rebuilding a domestic manufacturing sector, and strengthening national security. From manufacturing incentives to export controls, this legislation seeks to strengthen our position domestically through many programs that are broadly supported across Congress. **The** President is Engaged**:** The President appreciates the potential for this legislation to be a signature “win” to pair with the bipartisan infrastructure package he previously signed into law. The White House remains engaged and is using the same platform they did to get the infrastructure bill over the finish line. Why This Legislation May Face Hurdles It’s Political Season: It goes without saying that a “win” with only 200 days left until the election may not be something all policymakers are willing to give to the President. Given that this is increasingly a time of political risk and opportunity, this legislation (like every major bill) will be viewed, in part, through a political lens. Some Provisions Will Be Tough to Reconcile: The bills include provisions that are both controversial and not universally supported. Negotiations will be tough and require significant compromise. The emergence of factions within each party adds complexities to an already delicate legislative dance. From labor provisions to technical trade reforms, the potential for a provision(s) to slow down the process (or stop it altogether) is real. Other Bills May Weigh It Down: Without question, there are many sponsors of bills that have less potential for movement that are looking at China competition legislation as a potential legislative vehicle for their initiatives. While this is not unusual (especially when there are not many big bills moving) and often works seamlessly, it does bring additional risk to China competition legislation. Other Priorities Could Take Focus Away From China Competition Legislation: There is no shortage of challenges that Congress and the White House will need to focus on, including the war in Ukraine, Fiscal Year 2023 funding, and the COVID Pandemic. It is entirely possible that one of these (or others not yet on the radar) could cause a significant shift in the agenda, which would create a significant hurdle for China competition legislation. As negotiations continue for this legislation, policies are being ironed out in real time. For those seeking to influence the process, it is not too late…but the process is already crowded and noisy. While the July 4th timeline is certainly guiding negotiators, deadlines are aspirational and are likely to be extended.

#### Passage is likely, but complicated---focus from White House officials is key. Any delay risks collapsing negotiations.

Theodoric Meyer March 23 2022 national political reporter and co-author of the Early 202 newsletter; Jacqueline Alemany, the author of The Early 202; 3/23/2022, "Time is running out for a deal on the China competitiveness bill," <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/23/time-is-running-out-deal-china-competitiveness-bill/>

Time is running out for a deal on China competitiveness bill Congress has tied itself into a Gordian knot over one of President Biden’s top legislative priorities: a bill to bolster American semiconductor manufacturing and help the country compete economically with China. It's Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo’s job to help cut it — but time is running out. Raimondo is working to help lawmakers reach an agreement, which would give Democrats another achievement in the midterms. She told reporters in January that Congress “can’t wait until April, May” to pass the bill — a timeline that is now impossible to meet. In an interview, Raimondo told The Early she thought the bill could be done by Memorial Day — maybe sooner. “There’s no deadline, per se,” Raimondo said. “We just have to stay focused on it and do the work — sit at the table and do the work to reconcile the differences.” “I'm going to work on this and talk to members of Congress every single day until it does pass,” she added. While the bill is a top priority for the White House, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to help improve Democrats' standing ahead of the midterms, the negotiations also serve as a political opportunity for Raimondo. The former Rhode Island governor could burnish her reputation as a leading moderate in the party by showing she can help negotiate a deal with Republicans at a time when bitter partisanship reigns. “One of the most impressive things about Secretary Raimondo is that she is as comfortable, willing and happy to call a progressive member from California as a Republican senator from a deep-red state,” said Scott Mulhauser, who worked as a senior adviser to Raimondo for several months last year before returning to his consulting firm. Some Republicans have praised Raimondo's work trying to hash out a compromise. “Amongst many of the Senate Republican staff that I’ve spoken with on this matter, she has been very helpful,” said Ari Zimmerman, a Republican lobbyist at Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck who's lobbied on the bill. “She understands the problem in and out.” But it's still unclear whether a deal will actually come together. A tough deal Congress has been laboring to pass the bill for most of Biden's presidency. The Senate cleared its version in June with 19 Republican voters; the House passed its own bill last month with the support of only a single Republican, Rep. Adam Kinzinger (Ill.). The challenge facing Raimondo and Democratic congressional leaders now is how to strike a deal that keeps at least 10 Senate Republicans on board and still wins the support of wary House Democrats. That task grows harder each day as the midterms approach and Republicans lose any incentive to make compromises that would allow for passage of a bill Democrats could tout ahead of November's elections. Raimondo insists there is a deal to be had and argued that there’s already bipartisan agreement on “the bones of the bill” — a $52 billion program to combat a global shortage of computer chips by subsidizing manufacturing in the United States. But lawmakers are at odds over provisions that fall “outside of the core innovation package,” as she put it, such as climate change, financial services and human trafficking. The biggest gap between the two bills is on trade, according to Raimondo as well as several lobbyists tracking the legislation. “That’s really where the two sides are the farthest apart,” said Brian Pomper, a Democratic lobbyist at Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld who has lobbied on the bill. “And, I mean, they are universes apart.” Republicans and Democrats are preparing to hash out the differences between the two bills in a conference committee. If negotiations falter, though, Pomper said lawmakers might push to scrap the trade provisions and pass a more limited bill. “If you really get jammed up on the trade title, I think you’re going to see some members starting to say, ‘Well, why don’t we just ditch the trade title? And let’s do the rest of this bill, which is going to be a lot easier to figure out,” he said. Not giving up without a fight But stripping out the trade provisions could alienate Senate Republicans whose votes Democrats need to overcome a filibuster. The trade language in the Senate bill “was the linchpin that was needed” to pass it last year, said Clete Willems, a former trade negotiator in Donald Trump’s White House who is now a lobbyist tracking the bill. “So I think it’s going to be ultimately included.” House Democrats who spent months pushing to pass their version of the bill, meanwhile, aren't likely to give up without a fight. “The things that we're proposing are good for American manufacturing,” said Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-Ore.), who backed the trade provisions in the House bill. “They're good for the American consumer. Many of my Republican friends are violently opposed to giving special concessions to China. I wouldn't think this would be a heavy lift.” The China bill, Blumenauer added, is likely the only chance to pass these trade measures before the midterms. “This is one of the few trains leaving the station,” he said.

### 2NC ---AT: Thumpers

#### China bills are a Biden administration top priority

Jenny Leonard and Daniel Flatley | Jun 09 2022 at 11:45 AM | International Trade Biden’s $52 billion chip plan sputters as lawmakers eye election https://ajot.com/news/article/bidenas-52-billion-chip-plan-sputters-as-lawmakers-eye-election

The bill has been a top priority for Joe Biden’s administration, particularly Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo, but some lawmakers fault the White House for not being more engaged. And time is running short for Congress to act on it before lawmakers depart for a summer recess and then the campaign trail, with many issues unresolved, according to people familiar with negotiations.

#### China bill is Biden’s top priority.

Sarah Muca April 13, reporter, 4/13/22, “First look: Biden to push Congress on competition bill,” <https://www.axios.com/biden-pressure-congress-competition-bill-north-carolina-844fe9a0-0dc0-48c0-aa22-097c455591db.html>

President Biden is planning to pressure Congress to pass an innovation and competition bill that would boost the semiconductor industry, among others, when he travels to Greensboro, N.C., on Thursday, Axios has learned. Why it matters: The administration knows voters want to see it taking action on inflation and supply-chain issues. It’s especially cognizant of the effect raising food and gas prices are having on voters’ pocketbooks in the buildup to this fall's midterms. Recent international sanctions on Russia have shown how any country that’s too reliant on one export — energy exports, in Moscow's case — can be hurt economically. The bill is meant to increase U.S. competition globally but especially with China. The trip to North Carolina comes after a visit by the president on Tuesday to Menlo, Iowa, where he discussed a plan to lower gas prices in part by granting a waiver to use cheaper ethanol fuel into this summer. The details: The full force of the administration will be behind the innovation and competition effort.

### A2 Gun Control Thumper

#### Gun control bill momentum came from public desires to address mass shootings and was bipartisan – not like the plan

Lisa Hagen | June 24, 2022, at 1:57 p.m. https://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2022-06-24/congress-takes-final-step-in-passing-gun-safety-package-sends-bill-to-bidens-desk

The bipartisan bill, the “Bipartisan Safer Communities Act,” cleared the House in a 234-193 vote. Fourteen Republicans – including some who are retiring at the end of the term and others who face tougher reelection races – supported the legislation despite GOP leadership actively urging their members to oppose the bill. Congress was able to rally around the momentum to address gun violence after recent mass shootings in Buffalo, New York, and Uvalde, Texas.

#### Gun reform bill was a one time shot driven by public response to mass shootings

[SARAH FERRIS](https://www.politico.com/staff/sarah-ferris) and [JORDAIN CARNEY](https://www.politico.com/staff/jordain-carney) 06/24/2022 01:33 PM EDT Updated: 06/24/2022 01:48 PM EDT https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/24/gun-safety-bill-congress-00042312

“In the aftermath of Uvalde and Buffalo people all across this country, regardless of their politics, were so horrified. They are demanding that we act. … I would have preferred that we do more, but I understand that we can only get done what we can get done in the reality in which we’re living here in the Congress,” he added. Many Democrats were hopeful that the Senate’s rare agreement on guns — in which several GOP senators bucked the NRA — would clear a path for further dealmaking. In reality, [it could be another generation](https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/23/democrats-gun-safety-00041550) before Congress acts again on gun safety, particularly with Democrats on the verge of losing at least one chamber.

#### The real action on gun reform is making little progress in Congress. They bills all stuck or stalled.

Paul LeBlanc May 25, 2022 “Gun legislation is stalled in Congress. Here's why that won't change anytime soon” <https://www.cnn.com/2022/05/25/politics/gun-laws-us-congress/index.html>

**A House-passed bill**, HR 1446, backed by Democratic Rep. Jim Clyburn of South Carolina, **would close what's known as the "Charleston loophole,"** which allows some licensed gun sales to go through before a required background check is done.

Specifically, the legislation would increase the amount of time, from three business days to a minimum of 10 business days, that a federal firearms licensee must wait to receive a completed background check prior to transferring a firearm to an unlicensed person.

Using that loophole, a White gunman was able to legally purchase a firearm to kill nine people at a historically Black church in Charleston, South Carolina, in 2015.

Senate Democrats took steps Tuesday night to place the bill, called the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2021, onto the legislative calendar so it can be voted on.

**It's unclear when the Senate will vote on the measure**, **but it needs 60 votes in the chamber to overcome a filibuster, and it's clear the legislation does not have that support** (at least not right now) -- **nor does it have full Democratic backing to gut the Senate rule altogether.**

It's unclear when Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer will try to force a procedural vote to break a filibuster. Unless there's an agreement from all 100 senators, the earliest he could set up the procedural vote would be Saturday, according to a Democratic aide.

But senators were expected to leave for next week's Memorial Day recess on Thursday afternoon. So they may wait until after the recess to take that procedural vote, even though leaving town amid the Texas tragedy would be bad optics.

The aide said Schumer has not indicated when he may try to force the vote yet.

Still, Democratic Sen. Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut, who has pushed for gun safety legislation since the Sandy Hook shooting in his state nearly 10 years ago, told reporters Tuesday there should be a vote even if it is doomed to fail.

"I think we need to hold every member of Congress accountable and vote so that the public knows where every one of us stand," he said. Asked about the potential for bipartisan agreement, he added, "I think there may well be areas of agreement. I have come close to agreement with a number of my colleagues on a red flag statute."

Even bills with bipartisan support can't pass the Senate

**Another bill, HR 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021, would expand background checks for all firearm sales or transfers in the country**. Currently, background checks are not required for gun sales and transfers by unlicensed and private sellers.

The legislation has bipartisan support, passing the House last year in a 227-203 vote. Eight Republicans supported the bill and one Democrat voted against it.

Asked Tuesday about this broader House-passed background checks measure, Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia referenced his own, narrower effort in the Senate, saying, "If you can't pass Manchin-Toomey, how are you going to get enough votes for anything?"

In 2013, Manchin and Republican Sen. Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania pushed a compromise bill that would have required background checks on all commercial sales of guns (including private sales at gun shows and all internet sales), but would have allowed for individuals to sell their firearms to family, friends and other acquaintances without background checks.

This failed under Senate filibuster rules, even though it had majority support. The vote was 54-46, with four Republicans joining most Democrats in support. Then-Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid cast a "no" vote to secure the ability to bring the measure up again. Four other Democrats voted against the bill.

Manchin has continued to push versions of that legislation in more recent years.

**Republicans will argue that background checks chip away at gun rights and, ultimately, will take away guns.** "You see Democrats and a lot of folks in the media whose immediate solution is to try to restrict the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens," Sen. Ted Cruz, a Texas Republican, told reporters Tuesday.

The GOP will also argue that the bills would not stop every shooting. This is true. The specifics of each shooting are different. We still don't know if any of this legislation would have stopped Tuesday's shooter, identified by Texas officials as Salvador Ramos.

For now, every state has variations on the rules. **Most action on gun regulation is happening at the state level because Washington is frozen on the issue,** as it is on so many others.

## Link Extension

### Block Link Overview

#### Link is four-fold

#### -Political influence: Biden will be able to negotiate deals to sustain his current agenda. The plan is a bolt from the blue insert that will collapse his negotiating credibility and destroys the push for China legislation.

#### -Party infighting and division - plan forces democratic infighting when key moderate dems are on the cusp of bipartisan passage of the bills.

#### -Congressional focus: Biden focus on non-agenda policy issues takes away his ability to keep Dem factions united on his key priorities in the small window of time remaining before midterm election focus starts– now is necessary for his agenda.

#### Successfully stewarding PC now is key for Biden to ensure passage AND bill integrity

Beckman 10, PhD Professor of Political Science (Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 66-67)

The theory's foremost contention is that presidents not only can get their preferred initiatives considered but also can further encourage their passage via agenda-centered and vote-centered lobbying. By tracking the logic motivating these strategies, as well as the consequences that follow, a more nuanced view of contemporary presidents' role in U.S. lawmaking has emerged. Although presidents may some- times engage in knock-down, drag-out floor fights for pivotal voters' support, such endgame interactions are the exception rather than the rule. More typical presidential-congressional relations, I have argued, entail bargaining between the White House and congressional leaders over what alternatives will make it to the floor. If a president can rally leading allies' support and strike a "deal" with opposing leaders in the legislative earlygame, he [they] not only can circumvent a costly endgame floor fight but also can actually sign into law a bill more to his liking than would have been possible by just waging an endgame offensive for aye votes.

### Links – Clayton Increase / OCO Norms Aff

**Congress opposes offensive cyber operations because they could make us a party to a war against Russia**.

[Michael N. Schmitt](https://lieber.westpoint.edu/author/michaels/) | Jun 6, 2022 UKRAINE SYMPOSIUM – U.S. OFFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF UKRAINE https://lieber.westpoint.edu/us-offensive-cyber-operations-support-ukraine/

The challenge for our purposes is that, as is clear from the JP 3-12 extract above, the term “offensive cyberspace operations” can refer to those below the level of a use of force, like one that merely disrupts Russian command and control or logistics. Indeed, a cyber operation might be “offensive” for U.S. doctrinal purposes but not “armed force” for IHL purposes. Thus, without knowing more about the operations to which General Nakasone was referring, and in light of the uncertainty as to the threshold at which cyber operations initiate an IAC, no definitive conclusion regarding whether the U.S. operations standing alone initiated an armed conflict between the United States and Russia is possible (assuming one is not already underway as a matter of law, see [here](https://lieber.westpoint.edu/are-we-at-war/)). Second, U.S. offensive cyber operations could make the United States a party to the IAC between Russia and Ukraine based on so-called “co-belligerency,” a subject I addressed in a prior [post](https://lieber.westpoint.edu/are-we-at-war/) in this series. That post was prompted by reports that the United States shared intelligence that enabled Ukrainian forces to engage in lethal and destructive targeting, including against Russian generals and the cruiser Moskva.

#### Congress opposes action like OCOs that could spark wider conflict with Russia

ALEXANDER BOLTON - 03/14/22 6:00 AM ET Lawmakers fear Ukraine could spiral into US-Russian war https://thehill.com/homenews/senate/597936-lawmakers-fear-ukraine-could-spiral-into-us-russian-war/

Democrats and Republican in Congress are deeply worried about the spiraling Russian war with Ukraine, fearing it could eventually draw the U.S. into a direct conflict with Russian troops. Lawmakers in both parties say they support [President Biden’s](https://thehill.com/people/joe-biden/) decision to draw the line at putting U.S. troops on the ground in Ukraine or enforcing a no-fly zone over the country, fearing that such moves could spark a much bigger war. “This is the most dangerous moment since the Cuban missile crisis,” warned Sen. [Chris Murphy](https://thehill.com/people/chris-murphy/) (D-Conn.), the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee. “We have never been this close to direct conflict with Russia,” added Murphy, who along with other senators wants to quash calls for U.S. fighter jets to impose a no-fly zone over Ukraine to stop the bombing of Ukrainian defense forces and civilians.

### Links – Ban Offensive Cyber Operations

#### Bipartisan support in Congress for offensive cyber operations.

Wes O’Donnell Managing Editor, [In Military](https://inmilitary.com/?utm_source=amuedge.com&utm_medium=link&utm_content=content%20-%20In%20Military&utm_campaign=Degrees%20-%20Overview%20-%20LT%20-%20IM), [InCyberDefense](https://incyberdefense.com/?utm_source=amuedge.com&utm_medium=link&utm_content=content%20-%20InCyberDefense&utm_campaign=Degrees%20-%20Overview%20-%20LT%20-%20ICD) and [In Space News](https://inspacenews.com/?utm_source=amuedge.com&utm_medium=link&utm_content=content%20-%20In%20Space%20News&utm_campaign=Degrees%20-%20Overview%20-%20LT%20-%20ISN). Veteran, U.S. Army & U.S. Air Force. The US Enters a New Era of Offensive Cyber Operations 06/26/2019 https://amuedge.com/the-us-enters-a-new-era-of-offensive-cyber-operations/

Until now, the United States’ cyber warfare policy has been one of defense, with [a few noteworthy exceptions](https://www.wired.com/2014/11/countdown-to-zero-day-stuxnet/). Indeed, President Obama’s 2012 [Presidential Policy Directive 20](https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-20.pdf) (PPD-20) required a complex and lengthy interagency legal process before approval of any offensive cyber operation. That has changed. In August 2018, President Trump rescinded PPD-20 and enacted a new policy that allows agencies to make the determination on which cyber operations to pursue and the authority to pursue them. Offensive Cyber Operations Have Bipartisan Support These days, there is very little that Democrats and Republicans can agree on. However, punishing bad actors with America’s significant arsenal of cyberweapons has received support from both sides of the aisle. The 2018 policy drew praise from both House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Michael McCaul (R-Texas) and Senate Intelligence Committee Vice Chair Mark Warner (D-VA). As a result, the U.S. has entered a new era of cyber warfare that requires neither the approval nor knowledge of Congress or the President.

#### Broad bipartisan support in Congress for offensive cyber operations.

Fixler and Montgomery 2022 [Annie Fixler CCTI Deputy Director and Research Fellow](https://www.fdd.org/team/annie-fixler/) Mark Montgomery <https://www.fdd.org/analysis/2020/12/08/congress-cyber-defense-legislation/>

The NDAA has a proven record of initiating significant cyber reforms. The NDAA for Fiscal Year 2019 contained three critical provisions that authorized the framework for existing offensive cyber operations. Section 1632 provided DoD the authority to conduct cyber surveillance and reconnaissance as a traditional military activity; Section 1636 established U.S. policy for responding to cyberattacks and or other malicious cyber activities conducted by foreign powers; and Section 1642 provided authorization to act in response to malicious Russian, Chinese, North Korean, or Iranian cyber campaigns. The Trump administration rapidly utilized these authorities in developing National Security Presidential Memorandum 13 to streamline the process for developing and approving offensive cyber operations, and has [reportedly](https://www.fifthdomain.com/dod/cybercom/2019/05/08/new-authorities-mean-lots-of-new-missions-at-cyber-command/) conducted a number of operations under these authorities. This year’s NDAA may drive equally important cybersecurity efforts: improving the government’s organization for defense, building more robust capabilities within DoD and throughout the federal agencies, establishing the ligature for public-private collaboration, and beginning to address the challenging critical technology supply chain issues facing the United States and its allies.

#### Wide and growing support for increased use of offensive cyber operations

[BRAD D. WILLIAMS](https://breakingdefense.com/author/bwilliams/) on July 23, 2021 at 9:45 AM Proposed ‘Hack-Back’ Bill Tells DHS To Study Allowing Companies To Retaliate https://breakingdefense.com/2021/07/proposed-hack-back-bill-tells-dhs-to-study-allowing-companies-to-retaliate/

WASHINGTON: Two members of the Senate Finance Committee have introduced a bipartisan bill that instructs the Department of Homeland Security to study the “potential consequences and benefits” of allowing private companies to hack back following cyberattacks. Sens. Steve Daines, R- Mont., and Sheldon Whitehouse, D-R.I., have introduced the legislation as frustration over repeated cyberattacks against US companies has led to growing calls across the national security community and the private sector for retaliatory actions. Some, [including military legal advisors](https://www.lawfareblog.com/revisiting-framework-military-takedowns-against-cybercriminals), are now calling for the US to revisit its policy on military offensive cyber operations, especially in response to increasing ransomware attacks targeting the public and private sectors.

**US Congress supports offensive cyber operations – and NATO is updating plans to integrate**.

Erica D. Lonergan and Mark Montgomery | 01.25.22 PRESSING QUESTIONS: OFFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS AND NATO STRATEGY https://mwi.usma.edu/pressing-questions-offensive-cyber-operations-and-nato-strategy/

NATO’s shift to incorporating offensive cyber operations into existing strategy and policy has focused on integrating offensive effects into conventional military plans and operations in the context of a conflict. While NATO’s updated strategy is a positive development, its limited focus on conflict scenarios for employing cyber power fails to accurately account for the cyber threat environment NATO faces—particularly the mismatch between the alliance’s clear distinction between wartime and peacetime and the approach of adversaries like Russia, who adopt a competition-conflict continuum. Additionally, the focus on employing offensive cyber during a high-end conventional fight is also not consistent with how several NATO members are already engaged in gray zone offensive cyber operations.

The primary [threat](https://ccdcoe.org/library/publications/cyber-threats-and-nato-2030-horizon-scanning-and-analysis/) to NATO allies in the cyber domain is not from high-end, decisive cyberattacks. Instead, cyber threats more frequently and effectively manifest as gray zone tactics designed to have a corrosive effect without rising to the level of warfare. There are numerous examples of this type of threat. For instance, in July 2021, NATO publicly [condemned](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_185863.htm) a range of malicious cyber behavior, including the Microsoft Exchange hack (which NATO attributed to China) and ransomware attacks targeting critical infrastructure. Russia has leveraged cyber and disinformation operations to interfere in democratic elections in the [United States](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/16/us/politics/election-interference-russia-2020-assessment.html) in 2016, 2018, and 2020; [France](https://www.politico.eu/article/france-election-2017-russia-hacked-cyberattacks/) in 2017; and Germany in [2017](https://www.brookings.edu/testimonies/the-impact-of-russian-interference-on-germanys-2017-elections/) and [2021](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/10/world/europe/germany-russia-hacking-investigation.html)—to name just a few examples. Russia also conducted distributed denial-of-service cyberattacks against government websites in [Montenegro](https://stratcomcoe.org/cuploads/pfiles/Nato-Cyber-Report_15-06-2021.pdf) during the lead-up to, and following, Montenegro’s ascension to NATO in 2017. And when NATO forces were positioned in the Baltics beginning in 2017 as part of NATO’s [enhanced forward presence](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_136388.htm), two threat actors, [GhostWriter](https://www.fireeye.com/content/dam/fireeye-www/blog/pdfs/Ghostwriter-Influence-Campaign.pdf) and [Secondary Infektion](https://secondaryinfektion.org/), conducted a [range](https://www.cyberscoop.com/russia-disinformation-ghostwriter-secondary-infektion/) of disinformation campaigns.

Additionally, the reality is that several NATO members are already speaking publicly about offensive cyber operations below the level of warfare and their statements and actions have an effect on the entire alliance. In particular, NATO member nations have not reached a political consensus about the role of offensive cyber operations. In 2018, the US Department of Defense and US Cyber Command issued new [strategy](https://media.defense.gov/2018/Sep/18/2002041658/-1/-1/1/CYBER_STRATEGY_SUMMARY_FINAL.PDF) and policy [documents](https://www.cybercom.mil/Portals/56/Documents/USCYBERCOM%20Vision%20April%202018.pdf) that articulated a role for the military in conducting offensive cyber operations below the level of armed conflict outside of US-controlled cyberspace (part of the “defend forward” strategy), and there has been some reporting about US offensive cyber operations. For instance, in [2018](https://warontherocks.com/2019/03/what-a-u-s-operation-against-russian-trolls-predicts-about-escalation-in-cyberspace/) the United States disrupted the Russian-linked Internet Research Agency from interfering in the midterm elections. And, more recently, in [December 2021](https://www.cnn.com/2021/12/05/politics/us-cyber-command-disrupt-ransomware-operations/index.htmlPolitics) General Paul Nakasone, commander of US Cyber Command, publicly acknowledged that the military played a role in disrupting ransomware groups targeting critical infrastructure. The United States has also worked with other NATO allies, such as [Estonia](https://www.cybercom.mil/Media/News/Article/2433245/hunt-forward-estonia-estonia-us-strengthen-partnership-in-cyber-domain-with-joi/) and [Montenegro](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/02/us/politics/cyber-command-hackers-russia.html), to conduct “hunt forward” cyber operations on allied and partner networks to uncover and disrupt malicious cyber activity.

#### Cybersecurity lawmakers support OCOs for deterrence

Kate **Morton**, 4-5-20**22**, (reporter for WIS politics, graduated from University of Wisconsin) "U.S. Rep. Gallagher: Cyberspace solarium co-chairs urge President Biden to maintain cyberdeterrence posture", WIS Politics, https://www.wispolitics.com/2022/u-s-rep-gallagher-cyberspace-solarium-co-chairs-urge-president-biden-to-maintain-cyberdeterrence-posture/ lilw-msdi2022

WASHINGTON, D.C. – **Rep. Mike Gallagher** (**R-WI**) **and Senator Angus King** **(I-ME),** Co-Chairs of the Cyberspace Solarium Commission (CSC), **are urging** President Joe **Biden to keep a key cyberdeterrent** **in place** after reports indicated that the administration is considering changes to the policy. **In a letter to** President **Biden**, **Gallagher and King lay out the critical importance of** **National Security Presidential Memorandum – 13 (NSPM-13), which established an agile workflow allowing the Department of Defense to plan and conduct time**-**sensitive offensive cyber operations.** The pair of lawmakers stress that changes to the policy would undermine the United States’ national security and highlight the essential deterrent NSPM-13 provides against adversaries like Russia. “As the Co-Chairmen of the Cyberspace Solarium Commission, we are very concerned by press reporting that your Administration may be considering changes to the governing policy document, National Security Presidential Memorandum – 13, with an intent to limit the Secretary of Defense’s freedom of action to plan and conduct offensive cyber operations,” said CSC Co-Chairs Rep. Gallagher and Sen. King. “**Any effort to alter** **and possibly weaken** **NSPM-13 signals** **to our adversaries** a **lack of credible willingness to use offensive cyber capabilities which undermines the credibility of our deterrent,” the CSC Co-Chairs concluded**. “It is for these reasons we urge in the strongest possible terms that you to not alter the existing processes and policies that allow for an agile, effective planning process for the conduct of offensive cyber operations – the security of our national critical infrastructure may very well depend upon it.” **As Co-Chairs of the** **Cyberspace Solarium Commission** (**CSC**), **Gallagher and King are recognized as two of Congress’s leading experts on cyberdefense** and are strong advocates for a forward-thinking cyberstrategy that emphasizes layered cyberdeterrence. Since it officially launched in April 2019, dozens of CSC recommendations have been enacted into law, including the creation of a National Cyber Director.

#### Republicans support offensive cyber operations

Chris **Bing**, 7-19-20**16**, (Christopher J. Bing is a cybersecurity reporter for FedScoop. He has written about technology and policy for DC Inno, International Policy Digest and The Daily Caller, among other outlets. While at DC Inno, Chris focused on covering innovative technology businesses that are based in the D.C.-area. In June 2014, he founded a foreign policy blog called The Grey Cut, which monitored the influence and activity of petro-dictatorships across the globe. Chris is an alumnus of St. Marys College of Maryland.) “Experts: GOP cyber platform “detrimental to global stability” Fedscoop, <https://www.fedscoop.com/gops-new-cybersecurity-plan-dangerous/> lilw-msdi2022

**The U.S. must** “**stop playing defense** **and go on offense” online in order to avoid a “cyber Pearl Harbor,” according to the** newly released **Republican Party platform.** “**Despite their promises to the contrary, Russia and China see cyber operations as a part of a warfare strategy during peacetime,” the platform states, adding,** “**We will … make clear that users have a self-defense right to deal with hackers as they see fit**.” Security and policy experts, however, have serious reservations about the platform which was authored by Republican lawmakers and party faithful alike, and released in tandem with the GOP Convention kick-off on Monday night. One scholar fretted that Republicans would end up “destroy[ing] the internet in order to save it.” “There is a distinct lack of clarity about rules of the road for peacetime, and the norms and laws that do and will govern offensive cyber operations in peacetime [are] still highly malleable,” explained Robert Morgus, a policy analyst with D.C.-based think tank New America. “This means that operations conducted by the U.S. and others are highly influential in shaping those rules, and pushing the red line too far — while useful for short-term strategic goals like disrupting the Iranian nuclear program — may prove detrimental to global stability in the long run,” he added. The platform’s ambiguous call to action, noted Morgus, offers no details about what it defines as going on cyber offense — “it’s important to draw a line between offensive cyber operations conducted for espionage or intelligence gathering purposes and offensive computer network operations,” he said. Espionage, Morgus said, is an expected reality for nation-states but offensive computer network operations — like the Stuxnet cyberweapon which crippled Iran’s nuclear program — could easily cross the threshold into “armed attack.” In international law, nations are permitted to respond militarily to an armed attack. Moreover, observed former NSA IT architect Will Ackerly, the platform would give other nations political cover for launching cyberwar operations. “The way that this section of **the Republican platform is** written sounds as though it’s **rationalizing the use of force following a cyber-attack** by way of defending the country. To that end, any offensive practice would give everyone else in the room the latitude to justify their offensive actions based on the United States’ rhetoric,” explained Ackerly, who left the NSA to become co-founder and CTO of cyber start-up Virtru. “It is tempting for the United States, with its advanced offensive cyber capabilities, to think the best defense is a good offense, but this is not true when it comes to our most likely adversaries,” said Brown University Academic Director for Law and Policy Tim Edgar. “Offensive cyber operations carry a host of risks and unintended consequences for the security and stability of the internet. The United States is uniquely vulnerable to these risks. Offensive operations should be tightly controlled,” Edgar told FedScoop. “We don’t want to destroy the internet in order to save it.” Among other cybersecurity-related topics addressed, the party platform specifically advocates for stronger energy infrastructure security, the birth of a global free market in cyber insurance and for Congress’ to lead efforts to create an encryption “solution.” **The party platform is drawn up by the RNC Arrangements Committee whose leadership is appointed by RNC Chairman Reince Priebus**. The committee is comprised by roughly 150 elected officials and prominent party allies who also helped organize other aspects of this year’s convention. The platform is not binding on the president or his appointees.

#### Republicans support offensive cyber operations for deterrence

William **Jackson**, 9-5-20**12**, (William Jackson is a Maryland-based freelance writer.)"Dem, GOP platforms expose divide over cyber defense", GCN, https://gcn.com/cybersecurity/2012/09/dem-gop-platforms-expose-divide-over-cyber-defense/280953/ lilw-msdi2022

With the failure of Congress to pass legislation aimed at bolstering the nation’s cybersecurity, the Democratic platform asserts the president’s willingness to act on his own through executive order. “President Obama has supported comprehensive cybersecurity legislation that would help business and government protect against risks of cyber attacks while also safeguarding the privacy rights of our citizens,” says the platform adopted Sept. 4 by the Democratic National Convention. “And, going forward, the president will continue to take executive action to strengthen and update our cyber defenses.” **The Republican platform**, adopted last week, also **recognizes the importance of securing cyberspace, calling for the U**nited **S**tates **to develop an offensive cyberattack capacity to deter would-be enemies.** “**We will pursue an effective cybersecurity strategy**, supported by the necessary resources, **that recognizes the importance of offensive capabilities,” against nations, terrorists and criminals,** **the platform says. The two platforms reflect the partisan differences that have divided the 112th Congress** and prevented the passage of meaningful cybersecurity legislation despite the efforts of leaders on both sides to move bills. Republicans see cybersecurity largely as a business issue and object to any regulations on industry establishing requirements for securing IT infrastructure and systems. They would place responsibility for overseeing civilian and private-sector cybersecurity in the military. The National Security Agency is often mentioned as the most likely home.

### Links – Funding Vaccine Research

#### Congress has exhausted momentum and will for funding vaccine research

[ADAM CANCRYN](file:///C:\Users\hw005\Dropbox\Greenwood%20Debate%202021-2022\Nationals\Disadvantages\ADAM%20CANCRYN) 05/13/2022 04:30 AM EDT https://www.politico.com/news/2022/05/13/white-house-vaccines-covid-funding-impasse-00032319

A painful and foreboding reality is setting in for the White House as it enters a potentially dangerous stretch of the Covid fight: It may soon need to run its sprawling pandemic response on a shoestring budget. Just two months after the administration unveiled a nearly 100-page roadmap out of the crisis, doubts are growing about Congress’ willingness to fund the nation’s fight. It has forced Biden officials to debate deep cuts to their Covid operation and game out ways to keep the federal effort afloat on a month-by-month basis.

#### Increased funding for vaccine research is controversial – lacks additional bipartisan support.

GABY GALVIN April 13, 2022 at 6:00 am ET https://morningconsult.com/2022/04/13/global-covid-vaccine-funding-priority-data/

The findings come as a bipartisan deal for an additional $10 billion for the federal pandemic response [remains stalled](https://www.politico.com/news/2022/04/07/senate-covid-aid-border-policy-00023790) in Congress through the Easter holiday. Earlier, Senate negotiators [dropped support](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/04/us/politics/senate-covid-vaccines.html) for global vaccinations from the deal, leading health officials [to warn](https://www.politico.com/news/2022/03/28/global-covid-vaccines-usaid-funding-00020627) that their work to help vaccinate the world could be hampered in the coming months. The White House has also said that [without more funding](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/03/22/funding-fourth-vaccine-doses/) from Congress, the federal government doesn’t have the money to buy enough COVID-19 shots for all Americans to get a fourth dose. Federal vaccine advisers are [scrambling to put together](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/04/06/coronavirus-booster-shots/) a framework for potential booster shots this fall.

#### New vaccine funding programs are controversial

Tolbert, et.al. 2022 [Jennifer Tolbert](https://www.kff.org/person/jennifer-tolbert/) , [Samantha Artiga](https://www.kff.org/person/samantha-artiga/) [Jennifer Kates](https://www.kff.org/person/jennifer-kates/), and [Robin Rudowitz](https://www.kff.org/person/robin-rudowitz/) Published: Mar 28, 2022 Implications of the Lapse in Federal COVID-19 Funding on Access to COVID-19 Testing, Treatment, and Vaccines https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/implications-of-the-lapse-in-federal-covid-19-funding-on-access-to-covid-19-testing-treatment-and-vaccines/

A current impasse in Congress threatens continued funding for COVID-19 testing, treatment, and vaccines. The White House asked Congress for an additional [$22.5 billion](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/COVID-and-Ukraine-Supplemental-Funding-Request-Pelosi.pdf) to support domestic and global COVID-19 efforts. During the recent negotiations to fund the federal government for FY 2022, Congress reduced this amount to $15.6 billion and it was subsequently stripped from the final bill. Without additional resources, the [White House has said](https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000017f-8e53-d4fc-a1ff-bef76b0b0000) that several programs will need to be discontinued, including the Health Resources and Services Administration ([HRSA) COVID-19 Uninsured Program](https://www.hrsa.gov/CovidUninsuredClaim), established to reimburse health care providers for the costs of delivering COVID-19 testing and treatment services and administering vaccines to those who are uninsured. HRSA has announced that due to lack of funding, the program stopped accepting reimbursement claims for COVID-19 testing and treatment services on March 22, 2022 and will stop accepting claims for vaccine administration on April 5, 2022. In addition, the federal government has said it does not have funding to purchase additional COVID-19 tests, treatments, and vaccines once current supplies run out, and that it does not currently have a sufficient supply for vaccines to [cover fourth doses](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/03/22/funding-fourth-vaccine-doses/) if they are eventually recommended (also the subject of a recent KFF [analysis](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/are-there-enough-covid-19-vaccines-for-america-without-more-funding/)). The lack of additional COVID-19 funding has broad implications for access to these services, particularly for people who are uninsured, and could undermine efforts to ensure equitable access to these resources.

#### Republicans are weary of wasting money on vaccines

Jonathan **Chait**, 5-12-20**22**, (Jonathan Chait is an American pundit and writer for New York magazine. He was previously a senior editor at The New Republic and an assistant editor of The American Prospect. He writes a periodic column in the Los Angeles Times.) "Why Senate Republicans Want to Save Money by Skimping on Vaccines", Intelligencer, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2022/05/republicans-want-to-save-money-by-skimping-on-vaccines.html lilw-msdi2022

An ominous sign for continued funding of COVID-19 vaccines and therapeutics came this week when the Biden administration decided to split off these funds from a bill supplying Ukraine with military aid. It was an indication that **funding COVID vaccines**, once a matter of bipartisan accord, **was losing Republican support.** But this was merely an indirect measure of the Republican position. A more direct indication comes from Caitlin Owens, who explains why **Senate Republicans are haggling over spending money on vaccines** and therapeutics. The answer is that **they’re concerned about wasting money.** Owens’s reporting gets into the Republican view in more detail than any previous report. **One Republican concern is that the current funding strategy prioritizes access over efficiency.** The vaccines are distributed in multidose vials that, once opened, must be used or thrown away, leading to some spoilage. “**Republicans say the current strategy is wasteful**,” Owens reports, “and it would be better to rein in accessibility so that more doses are likely to be used.” **A second concern is that the vaccines**, while highly effective against hospitalization and death, **are proving less effective against transmission.** Therefore, **Republicans don’t want to spend too much on them.** “**Republicans are skeptical of using federal money to buy more vaccines that are proving not to last very long and questions remain if they will work against future variants,”** a senior GOP Senate aide told Owens. “**We’re saying that the current shot and boosters are reducing in effectiveness. New vaxx isn’t ready and it’s unclear where they are in the plan,**” the aide added. “**Since there is no plan, we don’t want to give them [a] blank check.”**

#### Republicans oppose pandemic funding

Alan **Fram**, **6-1**-2022,(AP News reporter) "Congressional stalemate makes a quick compromise on COVID funding unlikely", PBS NewsHour, https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/congressional-stalemate-makes-a-quick-compromise-on-covid-funding-unlikely lilw-msdi2022

The U.S. is headed for “a lot of unnecessary loss of life,” the Biden administration says, if Congress fails to provide billions more dollars to brace for the pandemic’s next wave. Yet the quest for that money is in limbo, the latest victim of election-year gridlock that’s stalled or killed a host of Democratic priorities. President Joe **Biden’s appeal for funds for vaccines**, **testing and treatments has hit opposition from Republicans**, **who’ve fused the fight with the precarious politics of immigration**. Congress is in recess, and the next steps are uncertain, despite admonitions from White House COVID-19 coordinator Dr. Ashish Jha of damaging consequences from “every day we wait.” Administration officials say they’re running low on money to stock up on, or even begin to order, the latest vaccines, tests and treatments. Also lacking are funds to reimburse doctors treating uninsured patients and to help poor countries control the pandemic. House and Senate Democrats have been wrangling over how to resolve the stalemate and even over which chamber should vote first. It’s an open question whether they’ll ever get the GOP votes they’ll need to pull the legislation through the 50-50 Senate, and prospects in the narrowly divided House are unclear as well. “There is still an urgency to pass a COVID relief package,” Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., said last week. “It’s very, very much needed.” Optimists hope the measure could start rolling once Congress returns next week. Pessimists say without quick resolution, Democrats may not have enough leverage to push the money to passage until early fall. That’s when they could stuff it into legislation that will probably be needed to finance government — a bill that would avert a federal shutdown, a pre-election distraction Republicans will be desperate to avoid. The heap of sidelined Democratic initiatives has grown this year, a victim of GOP opposition and rebellions by centrists like Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va. Casualties include bills on voting rights, health care, environment, taxes, gun curbs, abortion rights, policing tactics and an investigation of the 2021 Capitol storming by then-President Donald Trump’s supporters. While lawmakers have approved massive packages financing federal agencies through September and helping Ukraine counter Russia’s invasion, other priorities are dead or drifting, even as Democrats’ days running Congress are likely dwindling. Republicans are favored to win House control in November’s elections and could grab the Senate as well, and Democrats’ frustration is clear. “So far it hasn’t moved,” Sen. Mazie Hirono, D-Hawaii, said of Biden’s latest $22.5 billion request for COVID-19, which he initially sent Congress three months ago. “But then neither has sensible gun legislation, neither has voting rights.” “The 50-50 Senate sucks,” she said. The COVID money is needed quickly, officials say. Their warnings have come with over 1 million U.S. deaths from the disease and a fresh variant that daily is hospitalizing over 100,000 Americans and killing more than 300. Both numbers are rising. Officials say that lacking fresh funds, the U.S. is falling behind other countries that are already lining up for supplies needed for fall and winter. That’s prompted Jha to plan for the chance that Congress provides no new money at all, threatening painful choices about what to do if there aren’t enough vaccines or therapeutics for all who need them. “It would be terrible,” Jha told reporters recently. “I think we would see a lot of unnecessary loss of life if that were to happen.” Congress has provided $370 billion for purchasing supplies, for research and other public health initiatives to combat the pandemic, according to administration tallies obtained by The Associated Press. Around $14 billion of it was unspent or not committed to contracts as of April 5, the documents show, serious money but an amount the administration says falls below the ultimate need. **Most Republicans are skeptical about added pandemic funding**. “I have a hard time believing that there’s not enough money and not enough flexibility already” to use it, said Sen. Kevin Cramer, R-N.D.

### Links – Restricting Lethal Autonomous Weapons

#### Congress supports additional development of LAWS – restrictions would be controversial

Kelley M. Sayler, Analyst in Advanced Technology and Global Security Updated November 17, 2021 Defense Primer: U.S. Policy on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11150

In addition, approximately 30 countries and 165 nongovernmental organizations have called for a preemptive ban on LAWS due to ethical concerns, including concerns about operational risk, accountability for use, and compliance with the proportionality and distinction requirements of the law of war. The U.S. government does not currently support a ban on LAWS and has addressed ethical concerns about the systems in a March 2018 white paper, “Humanitarian Benefits of Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons.” The paper notes that “automated target identification, tracking, selection, and engagement functions can allow weapons to strike military objectives more accurately and with less risk of collateral damage” or civilian casualties.

#### Congress focused on developing LAWS and emerging military technologies – plan is controversial.

Kelley M. Sayler Analyst in Advanced Technology and Global Security July 17, 2020 Emerging Military Technologies: Background and Issues for Congress July 17, 2020 https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1105857.pdf

Members of Congress and Pentagon officials are increasingly focused on developing emerging military technologies to enhance U.S. national security and keep pace with U.S. competitors. The U.S. military has long relied upon technological superiority to ensure its dominance in conflict and to underwrite U.S. national security. In recent years, however, technology has both rapidly evolved and rapidly proliferated—largely as a result of advances in the commercial sector. As former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel observed, this development has threatened to erode the United States’ traditional sources of military advantage. The Department of Defense (DOD) has undertaken a number of initiatives to arrest this trend. For example, in 2014, DOD announced the Third Offset Strategy, an effort to exploit emerging technologies for military and security purposes as well as associated strategies, tactics, and concepts of operation. In support of this strategy, DOD established a number of organizations focused on defense innovation, including the Defense Innovation Unit and the Defense Wargaming Alignment Group. More recently, the 2018 National Defense Strategy echoed the underpinnings of the Third Offset Strategy, noting that U.S. national security will likely be affected by rapid technological advancements and the changing character of war…. New technologies include advanced computing, “big data” analytics, artificial intelligence, autonomy, robotics, directed energy, hypersonics, and biotechnology—the very technologies that ensure we will be able to fight and win the wars of the future. The United States is the leader in developing many of these technologies. However, China and Russia—key strategic competitors—are making steady progress in developing advanced military technologies. As these technologies are integrated into foreign and domestic military forces and deployed, they could hold significant implications for the future of international security writ large, and will have to be a significant focus for Congress, both in terms of funding and program oversight.

#### Congress opposes restrictions on LAWS developments.

DAN ROBITZSKI Jan 28 2021 / ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE https://futurism.com/the-byte/congressional-panel-build-killer-robots

Tasked with deciding whether the United States military should be able develop autonomous killer robots capable of using deadly force, a congressional advisory panel decided that the government should keep its options open. Using similar logic to a parent convincing to get their toddler to try vegetables, members of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence concluded that Congress should at least consider giving killer robots or artificial intelligence systems a chance, [Reuters reports](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-military-ai-idUSKBN29V2M0). Otherwise, the military might never know if they actually perform so well that they kill fewer innocent people, according to the logic of the panel, which made this decision despite [growing international pressure](https://futurism.com/scientists-ban-ai-killer-robots) to [ban killer AI outright](https://futurism.com/the-byte/fighting-back-against-militarized-killer-robots). Moral Imperative The committee's decision doesn't directly shape U.S. policy, but the group, led by former Google CEO Eric Schmidt, does have Congress' ear, according to Reuters. And its decision aligns with actions the military has already taken, like [laying out ethics principles](https://futurism.com/the-byte/pentagon-ai-ethics-dod-warfare) that don't call for much more than making sure that killer AI actually works. Arguing that an effective AI might take actions that result in fewer casualties than human soldiers, committee vice chairman and former deputy secretary of defense Robert Work said that "it is a moral imperative to at least pursue this hypothesis," according to Reuters.

#### US rejects restricts on LAWS

AFP in Geneva, Dec 2 2021 US rejects calls for regulating or banning ‘killer robots’ https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/dec/02/us-rejects-calls-regulating-banning-killer-robots

The US has rejected calls for a binding agreement regulating or banning the use of “killer robots”, instead proposing a “code of conduct” at the [United Nations](https://www.theguardian.com/world/unitednations). Speaking at a meeting in Geneva focused on finding common ground on the use of such so-called lethal autonomous weapons, a US official balked at the idea of regulating their use through a “legally-binding instrument”. The meeting saw government experts preparing for high-level talks at a review conference on the Convention of Certain Conventional Weapons from 13 to 17 December. “In our view, the best way to make progress ... would be through the development of a non-binding code of conduct,” US official Josh Dorosin told the meeting. The United Nations has been hosting diplomatic talks in Geneva since 2017 aimed at reaching an agreement on how to address the use of killer robots. Activists and a number of countries have called for [an all-out ban on any weapons that could use lethal force without a human overseeing the process](https://www.theguardian.com/science/2019/oct/21/campaign-to-stop-killer-robots-takes-peace-mascot-to-un) and making the final kill order. In November 2018, the UN chief, António Guterres, joined the call for a ban, but so far countries do not even agree on whether there is a need to regulate the weapons. During Thursday’s debate, a number of countries, including India and the United States, criticised the idea of a legally binding agreement.

**Biden administration opposes restrictions on LAWS**  
Democracy Now, 2021 U.S. Shuts Down International Calls to Ban “Killer Robots” HEADLINE DEC 03, https://www.democracynow.org/2021/12/3/headlines/us\_shuts\_down\_international\_calls\_to\_ban\_killer\_robots

The Biden administration has rejected calls to ban the use of lethal autonomous weapons, also known as “killer robots.” During a United Nations meeting in Geneva Thursday, the U.S. instead proposed establishing a code of conduct for their use. Activists across the globe have long warned of the growing threat posed by robots that use artificial intelligence and lethal weapons to kill without a human overseeing the process.

#### Americans overwhelmingly support LAWs

Baobao **Zhang**, 12-10-20**19**, (Zhang is an assistant professor of Political Science at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. She is also a CIFAR Azrieli Global Scholar and a research affiliate with the Centre for the Governance of AI. She graduated with a PhD in political science (2020) and an MA in statistics (2015) from Yale University. In 2020-2021, she worked as a Klarman Postdoctoral Fellow in the Cornell Society of Fellows. In 2019-2020, she worked as a postdoctoral fellow in MIT’s Political Science Department and a fellow at the Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University.) "Public opinion lessons for AI regulation", Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/research/public-opinion-lessons-for-ai-regulation/ lilw-msdi2022

**Lethal autonomous weapon systems can identify and engage targets without human intervention**; the technology is currently being developed but has not yet been deployed on battlefields. A coalition of nongovernmental organizations, the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots, has advocated for an international ban on fully autonomous weapons. Critics of the technology argue that lethal autonomous weapons are unethical and unsafe. Some suggest that an arms race to develop the technology would exacerbate tensions between major powers; at the same time, non-state actors, including terrorists, could adopt the technology for malicious uses. **Twenty-six countries have publicly expressed support for a pre-emptive international ban** **on fully autonomous lethal weapons**; **the U.S., along with several major powers** (**e.g., Russia, the U.K., Israel**) **currently opposes such a ban.** While **only a slim majority of Americans oppose the use of fully autonomous weapons systems in wars**, according to a 2019 Ipsos/Human Rights Watch survey, opposition grew by 7 percentage points since 2018. The **U.S. public’s opposition is slightly lower than the opposition by the public in other countries of the UN Security Council**, as seen in Figure 3. Research shows that political messaging can affect American attitudes toward lethal autonomous weapons. For instance, support for autonomous weapons increases when the public is told that other states or non-state actors are developing them. On the other hand, explaining the security risks of a military AI arms race can reduce support for investment in military applications of AI. The Campaign to Stop Killer Robots has adopted some of the publicity strategies that the International Campaign to Ban Landmines used to successfully lobby for an international ban on landmines. But researchers point out that **persuading the public to oppose lethal autonomous weapons could be more challenging than convincing them to oppose landmines**; **the former has yet to cause any causalities** **while the latter has led to gruesome deaths and injuries.**

#### Congress supports lethal drones.

Lauren Fox, 4-23-2015, (Lauren Fox is a congressional reporter at U.S. News. Her work has appeared in Salon, MSNBC, and Columbia Journalism Review.) “Congress: We're Sorry Innocent People Were Killed. But Drone Strikes Are Here to Stay.” The Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/04/congress-were-sorry-innocent-people-were-killed-but-drone-strikes-are-here-to-stay/445647/> lilw-msdi2022

**The White House's drone program is not going anywhere.** The Obama administration revealed Thursday that two hostages—including one American—were killed in a counterterrorism incident earlier this year and two other Americans who were known to be working with al-Qaida were also killed, accidentally. The Wall Street Journal reported Thursday that a drone strike was responsible for the casualties. On Capitol Hill, the incident has brought into sharp focus the unintended consequences and risks associated with the president's drone program—a cornerstone of his counterterrorism strategy in the Middle East. Yet, the same **Congress** that spent years reviewing and chronicling the enhanced-interrogation techniques administered under the Bush administration **does not appear to be moved to overhaul the lethal drone program** over Thursday's revelations. Nor, do they seem to think the program is fundamentally flawed in a major way. "**The collateral damage has been extraordinarily low," says Sen. Dianne Feinstein**, the ranking member of the Senate's Intelligence Committee. "That is really a fact. I only wish I could tell you what it was. That is the irony here. This is all classified." Feinstein says the committee is still reviewing the incident, and other committees will also consider engaging in reviews. But the CIA's drone program has become such a consequential tool in the country's war on terrorism that even Republicans who are quick to fault Obama for anything else are extremely hesitant to lodge criticisms against it. "We made a mistake. You know I have been a big critic of President Obama's. I am not going to blame him for this. I blame al-Qaida," Republican Sen. **Lindsey Graham said** Thursday. "**We are not going to terminate this drone program.** **I am sorry** these **innocent people were killed.** I am glad these two Americans collaborating with the enemy were killed. **Please understand, we are at war. This is the way war works.** It is a nasty, terrible business, but I am in it to win it." Unlike so many other foreign policy decisions the president has made, from relaxing relations with Cuba to negotiating a nuclear deal with Iran, Republicans are not lining up to attack the president over a program they say has proved to be effective at taking out top targets. "We are in a war with individuals who are hiding with civilians," says Republican Sen. James Lankford, a member of the Intelligence Committee. "[The administration] does an extremely good job of trying to check and recheck their systems, and when they do a strike, it is not flippant. They are very, very efficient and very, very careful." Even Republican presidential contenders Ted Cruz, Rand Paul, and Marco Rubio have so far resisted the urge to blame the Obama administration for the outcomes of the mission. "It is a tragedy that these American hostages lost their lives. My prayers and thoughts are with their families," Paul said in a statement from his office. Cruz said that blame for the death of the hostages sat squarely with "the terrorists who kidnapped them and forcibly held them in their command center." Democratic Sen. Ron Wyden—a constant voice of caution when it comes to America's drone program—said in a statement that he wanted to "learn more about this operation before arriving at any final judgements about how it was carried out." As the administration has sought to end the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan and scale back troops on the ground, drones have become one of the essential tools at the president's disposal. "**We are still very much in the counterterrorism business**, and as long as there are threats around the world, we will continue to be involved in that," **Sen. Richard Burr**, the chairman of the Senate's Intelligence Committee, **said** of the role the drone program fills.

#### Republicans are staunchly committed to drone strikes

John Burgess **Everett**, 4-23-20**15**, (John Burgess Everett is the co-congressional bureau chief for POLITICO, specializing in the Senate since 2013. He’s a native Mainer, a University of Maryland graduate and one of those people who goes by his middle name. Before covering the Senate, Burgess covered transportation policy for POLITICO and served on the production team. He’s also an alum of the Gazette in suburban Maryland and the Portland Press Herald in Maine.)"GOP strongly backs drone strikes, despite accident," POLITICO, <https://www.politico.com/story/2015/04/drone-strike-hostages-killed-gop-response-117284> lilw-msdi2022

**Congressional Republicans remain staunchly committed to anti-terrorism drone strikes** despite a January drone operation that accidentally killed a U.S. civilian and an Italian in Pakistan. Hawkish Republicans said Thursday that the death of Warren Weinstein was tragic but that it was collateral damage in the global war on terror. **Asked** in interviews **whether** **the killing of an American citizen should cause** **the U**nited **S**tates **to reconsider its use of drones** against overseas combatants, **GOP lawmakers said unequivocally that it should not.** “Not at all. **Collateral damage is part of war,” said** Sen. **Lindsey Graham** (R-S.C.). “We’re at war.” “There are consequences to war, and we’re in one,” said Senate Intelligence Chairman Richard Burr (R-N.C.). “When you look at our experience with collateral damage, it’s minimal.” While Senate Judiciary Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) wondered why the White House had waited until April to announce killings that took place in January, Burr said he had already reviewed the timeline for the release of the information as well as the particulars of the drone strike in question and said he will continue to do so. But everything Burr has seen so far points to a “very appropriate” use of drones in this instance. Other **top Republicans** **on national security issues backed** Burr’s assertion, along with **a war on terror that increasingly involves** the use of **unmanned drones** to kill top terrorist targets. **“It’s not gonna cause us to quit using drones,” said Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.). “I’m so committed that we have to have drones.”**

#### Voters favor drone strikes compared to other operations

Kyle **Lynaugh**, 3-9-20**22**, (Kyle Lynaugh joined the Council in January of 2022 as a spring intern with the Public Opinion team. He is currently a graduate student at the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago, studying public policy while focusing on global conflict and policy analysis.) "Public Opinion on Civilian Casualties in the War on Terror", The Chicago Council, https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/commentary-and-analysis/blogs/public-opinion-civilian-casualties-war-terror lilw-msdi2022

**Americans tend to favor airstrikes** against terror-linked targets, **rather than** **risking US service members’ lives in** **ground operations**. For example, according to the 2015 Chicago Council Survey, 77 percent of Americans favored the use of airstrikes against terrorist training camps and other facilities, while only 60 percent favored using US ground troops against those targets. However, Americans are still concerned with the civilian casualties that are more likely to result from increased airstrikes. In a Washington Post poll conducted in conjunction with YouGov in 2019, 64 percent of Americans agreed that “The US should NOT use airstrikes if it meant killing innocent civilians.” Although, a notable portion of the population (36%) disagreed with that statement. Furthermore, a subsection of voters that identified as supporting Donald Trump in the 2016 primary election held opposite views, with nearly three-quarters disagreeing with that same statement (74%). This disparity between the general US population and early Trump voters alludes to a larger partisan disagreement amongst the American populace concerning counterterrorism and the tools to combat it. While all Americans have an aversion to civilian casualties the willingness to use lethal force differs between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans tend to favor more military interventions while Democrats are more wary of the use of force. The type of military intervention does not affect this overall trend. The 2021 Chicago Council Survey finds that **40 percent of Republicans say the U**nited **S**tates **is not using** military tools like **drone strikes** and military interventions **enough**, nearly double the **20 percent of Democrats** who **say the same**. Democrats are much more likely to say that the United States uses military tools like drone strikes too much (39%), while very few Republicans feel this way (14%). This discrepancy relates to civilian casualties as air and drone strikes are more likely to kill civilian bystanders. The above Washington Post Poll that finds a partisan subjection of the population may be more willing to accept some civilian casualties could be a potential reason as to why political party seems to affect the preferred amount of air and drone strikes.

#### Republicans support drone strikes

Emily **Bohatch** **and** Joseph **Bustos**, 1-3-20**20**, (both reporters) "SC’s Republicans in Congress applaud Trump drone strike that killed Iranian general", U.S. Representative William Timmons, https://timmons.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=35 lilw-msdi2022

**As news broke that an American drone strike killed a major Iranian general was reported** Friday, **South Carolina’s Republicans in Congress praised** President Donald **Trump**. Meeting with reporters at his West Columbia office, **U.S.** **Rep. Joe Wilson, R-Springdale**, **called** **the** commander in chief’s **order to bomb a Baghdad airport** **and kill Maj. Gen. Qassem Soleimani** “**courageous**.” Wilson called Soleimani “one of the great terrorists of our era.” The general was the head of the Quds Force of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and was instrumental in Iranian military and intelligence operations. **Wilson’s comments echoed praise offered by other Republican leaders**, **from U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham to former S.C. governor and ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley.** Meanwhile, the state’s top Democrat in Congress criticized Trump’s decision to order the airstrike. U.S. Rep. Jim Clyburn, a Columbia Democrat and House majority whip, said in a statement on Twitter on Friday the president’s action put the country at risk. “His failure to even consult Congress—entrusted by the Constitution to authorize military force—is alarming,” Clyburn said. “Congress must uphold our responsibility to protect national security.” U.S. Rep. Joe Cunningham, D-Charleston, called for transparency between the Trump administration and Congress. “Last night’s airstrike was unprecedented with incalculable consequences that will play out over the coming days, weeks, and months,” Cunningham said, according to a statement. “Given the immense gravity of this situation, Congress needs to hear from the Administration about the intelligence that led to this airstrike and how it fits into our broader strategy to counter Iran’s destabilizing presence in the region, consolidate our gains in Iraq, and combat violent extremism.” The U.S. airstrike is the latest development in a series of incidents of violence in Iraq. On New Year’s Eve, demonstrators who support the Iranian-backed group Kataib Hezbollah stormed the U.S. embassy in Baghdad, breaching the exterior walls and starting fires. The protesters, said to be angered over U.S. airstrikes that killed members of the group, later retreated as the president ordered more troops to the region. The U.S. Department of State reported that U.S. personnel were safe. The drone strike has raised concerns of further escalation in the United States’ conflict with Iran. Wilson also compared the United States’ involvement in the Middle East to the war against communism, calling it a “generational conflict” that cannot be ended until America is delivered a decisive victory. “We’re at greater risk today than ever, and that’s why the president is taking this firm action,” Wilson said, adding, “It’s quite appropriate that President Trump take the action to rid the world of this person who is a threat to America’s national security and a threat to American families. I’m just so proud of the president’s leadership to act so decisively.” After the news of the airstrike broke, U.S. **Sen. Lindsey Graham**, one of Trump’s staunchest allies, had **quickly applauded Trump** **and issued a warning to the government in Tehran.** “To the Iranian government: if you want more, you will get more,” Graham said, according to a statement. “If Iranian aggression continues and I worked at an Iranian oil refinery, I would think about a new career.” Graham said that Trump’s actions were in “direct response to Iranian aggression,” including the recent killing of an American contractor in Iraq. The rocket attack was aimed at an Iraqi military base, and believed to be orchestrated by Iran-backed groups. “To the Iranian government: if you want to stay in the oil business, leave America and our allies alone and stop being the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world,” Graham said, according to the statement. **U.S. Sen. Tim Scott called the move** “a calculated and **proportional** response to Iran’s belligerent aggression towards the United States and our allies. “Iran and Soleimani continued to attack and kill Americans, sieged our embassy in Baghdad, and carried out acts of violence to destabilize the region as a whole,” Scott said, according to a statement. “The President was absolutely within his authority to approve this operation and we will not be deterred when American lives and American interests are in jeopardy.” U.S. **Rep. Jeff Duncan also said he approved of Trump’s actions.** “This action shows Iranian attacks and aggression against Americans will not go unnoticed under President Trump’s leadership,” Duncan said, according to a statement. “Our military is the best of the best, and may God bless them for their efforts in making the world a safer place without murderous terrorists like Qassem Soleimani.” U.S. **Rep. William Timmons**, **R-Greenville**, **called the president’s actions** decisive and **appropriate**. “That said, Americans at home and abroad should remain vigilant,” Timmons said in a statement. “We know the Iranian government is eager to strike back, and if they choose to do so, they will go after our most vulnerable citizens and assets. The Iranians would be smart to proceed with extreme caution. Our military presence in the Middle East remains strong, and further aggression against us will not be tolerated.” U.S. **Rep. Ralph Norman**, **R-Rock Hill**, **called the operation a much needed step for security** **in the Middle East.** “Under Obama, we saw that accommodating Iran with a horribly flawed nuclear deal and even billion-dollar ransom payouts failed to change their hostile behavior,” Norman said. “In fact, the unwillingness to confront this terrorist regime head-on only emboldened its leaders, leading to a steady escalation which included attacks on American personnel, equipment, and most recently our embassy in Iraq.” U.S. **Rep. Tom Rice**, R**-Myrtle Beach**, **echoed the sentiment.**

### Links – Germline Genetic Engineering

#### Democrats support germline genetic engineering

Lev **Facher**, 6-18-20**19**, (Lev Facher is a Washington correspondent for STAT, reporting on the politics of health and science. Since joining STAT in 2016, he has written extensively about the federal government’s response to the Covid-19 pandemic, the opioid crisis, and the pharmaceutical industry’s influence on Capitol Hill.) "Why Democrats reopened the debate about germline gene editing", STAT, https://www.statnews.com/2019/06/18/democrats-reopened-debate-about-germline-editing/ lilw-msdi2022

WASHINGTON — A rogue Chinese scientist stunned the world last year when he announced the birth of genetically modified twin girls, prompting widespread outcry from the broader scientific community and calls for a “global moratorium” on editing human embryos that result in births. Yet months later, **Democrats on Capitol Hill surprised many science policy experts when they attempted to roll back a** related, **4-year-**old **ban on altering the DNA of embryos intended for pregnancies.** To many health policy experts here, and research advocates across the country, the timing — just months after the biggest genome editing scandal in world history — was inexplicable. Several Republicans criticized the proposal by playing up concerns of “maverick bioengineers” operating with little oversight and without ethical norms. And while some scientists supported the effort, others expressed open confusion, in particular at the breadth of the change Democrats sought. Within weeks of proposing to eliminate their plan, Democrats largely backed off. But **their sudden effort to reverse what seemed to some like a basic ethical protection** **serves as a case study in how** Washington regulates science — and **the immense influence lawmakers, regardless of their scientific expertise, often wield over federal research.** “In terms of ‘Why now,’ it does seem odd given there is so much international conversation in the scientific community about how to limit germline editing,” said Remy Brim, a scientist and former Democratic Capitol Hill aide who works at the D.C. lobbying firm BGR. The United States has banned germline editing with the aim of starting a pregnancy since 2015, the result of bipartisan opposition to the practice and preemptive scientific concern about the implications of the gene-editing technology CRISPR. Republicans in particular have supported the ban due to conscience concerns similar to those surrounding the use of fetal tissue in research and using federal funds for abortion — some argue that germline genome editing requires the creation of human embryos that will eventually be discarded. **When Democrats took control of the House** **of Representatives in last year’s midterm elections, they saw an opening to repeal a measure that many felt was overly restrictive.** As the House Appropriations Committee considered the spending package that funds the Food and Drug Administration, lawmakers excluded the brief provision that has banned the consideration of certain genome-editing trials — a change that would have essentially lifted the ban, if the law had passed. **Republicans quickly criticized the change**, calling it hasty and ill-advised — even specifically citing China’s “CRISPR babies” scandal, in which He Jiankui drew worldwide criticism for using the technique to alter the genes of twin girls.

#### Democrats don’t support a full ban on genetic engineering

Andrew **Joseph**, 6-5-20**19**, (Andrew Joseph is a general assignment reporter at STAT. Prior to joining STAT at its founding in 2015, he worked for the San Antonio Express-News and the San Francisco Chronicle. He was part of the STAT team that was named a Pulitzer Prize finalist for their reporting on the early days of the Covid-19 pandemic. Andrew graduated from Dartmouth College and has covered everything from crime to health policy.) "Congress Revives Ban on Altering the DNA of Human Embryos Used for Pregnancies", Scientific American, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/congress-revives-ban-on-altering-the-dna-of-human-embryos-used-for-pregnancies/ lilw-msdi2022

**A House committee** on Tuesday **restored** to **pending** legislation a **ban on altering the genomes of human embryos** intended for pregnancies, despite calls from some scientists to lift the ban and allow the Food and Drug Administration to review applications for new technologies. Lifting the prohibition could have opened the door to clinical trials of babies being made with genetic material from three people or with genomes that had been changed in ways that would be passed on to future generations. The ban has been attached to bills that fund the Food and Drug Administration in the form of an amendment, or rider, since December 2015. But last month, a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee dropped the ban from the legislation. At a hearing Tuesday, supporters of the ban framed it as a necessary barrier to prevent experiments like the one announced last year in which a Chinese scientist created the world’s first gene-edited babies with the technology CRISPR. The work drew worldwide condemnation for skirting ethical and regulatory guidelines and for using scientific tools that were not yet ready to be used in people. “The ethics hadn’t caught up with the science, and… the science has not caught up with the science,” said Rep. Robert Aderholt (R-Ala.), who introduced the rider in 2015 and again at Tuesday’s hearing. He said that for now, genetically editing embryos had “too many unknowns, too many unintended consequences.” The rider blocks the Food and Drug Administration from considering clinical trial applications “in which a human embryo is intentionally created or modified to include a heritable genetic modification.” Scientists and ethicists who advocated for dropping it argued that doing so would simply allow the FDA to review research requests, as it does any other innovative therapy. Some **Democratic lawmakers** who had **appeared supportive of dropping the ban** earlier — **and** who had **criticized the inclusion of the ban in 2015 without debate** — said **they felt it was time for Congress to debate the underlying** ethical and **scientific issues.** But they said that should be done separately from the appropriations process. **The chairwoman of the committee,** **Democrat Nita Lowey** **of New York**, **said she “reluctantly supported” returning the ban** to the bill. **She acknowledged** that editing embryonic DNA had some **potential risks, but added that it could cure and prevent genetic disease**. “We have a moral obligation to allow advances in science so that fewer parents have to watch a child die,” she said. Some scientists had called on Congress to modify the legislation to allow so-called three-parent embryos but maintain the ban on the direct editing of embryonic DNA. The three-parent technology, more precisely called mitochondrial replacement therapy, or MRT, has the potential to prevent severe diseases that result from abnormal mitochondria, energy-producing cellular structures. It involves transferring the nucleus of an unfertilized egg with defective mitochondria into one with healthy mitochondria and then fertilizing it via IVF. Because mitochondria have a small bit of their own DNA, the resulting embryo has genes from three people. The technology is being studied in some countries, including Britain, as a way to halt the inheritance of genetic diseases that stem from the DNA in the mitochondria. Rep. Sanford Bishop Jr. (D-Ga.), who chaired the subcommittee that approved the bill without the ban last month, said he wanted Congress to discuss allowing MRT, “but today is not that time, and this appropriations committee markup is not that place.” He supported adding the ban back to the bill. **The committee approved the amendment to reinsert the ban** on a voice vote, but **one Democrat** who **voted against it** was Rep. **Debbie Wasserman** **Schultz** of Florida. She **carries a variant of the BRCA2 gene that raises her risk of** certain **cancers** **(she was diagnosed with breast cancer in 2007) and said her children would have to get tested to see if they carried the mutation. “If we ever have an opportunity when they have children or when they decide to have a family, to have research advanced to a point where you could have their genetic material, when combined with their partner, altered so that that mutation could be cut off in our family tree and that risk of death and massive health care implications could be eliminated, that’s incredibly important,” she said.**

### Links – NATO (General)

#### Congress is increasingly anti-NATO

William **Saletan**, 4-12-20**22**, (William Saletan is a writer at The Bulwark.) "Putin Wants to Break NATO. Republicans Want to Help Him.", Bulwark, https://www.thebulwark.com/putin-wants-to-break-nato-republicans-want-to-help-him/ lilw-msdi2022

The House vote, taken on April 5, is a warning sign. **Putin may be losing ground in Ukraine, but he’s gaining ground in the U.S. Congress**. **Three years ago, 22 House Republicans voted against pro-NATO legislation. That number has nearly tripled. The “Putin wing” of the House GOP**—useful idiots **such as Madison Cawthorn and Marjorie Taylor Greene,** **who openly spout Russian propaganda**—**is only a tiny fraction of the Kremlin’s target audience in Congress. They’re joined by a larger crowd of** **Ukraine bashers**, **hardcore isolationists, and right-wingers who say we shouldn’t worry about anyone else’s borders until we “secure” our own.** Together, **that coalition adds up to more than 20 lawmakers.** That’s a problem. But when you combine them with the NATO skeptics who voted against last week’s resolution—another 40 or so House Republicans who don’t trust alliances and who view Europeans as America’s rivals or adversaries—the problem gets a lot bigger. **The** GOP’s **turn against NATO is particularly worrisome because Congress has been warned,** **explicitly and repeatedly**, **about Putin’s goal of dissolving the alliance**. In March 2017, after a U.S. intelligence report confirmed that Russia had interfered in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—which was then, like the rest of Congress, under Republican control—held a hearing on this subject. The hearing was titled, “Undermining Democratic Institutions and Splintering NATO: Russian Disinformation Aims.” Analysts and former officials explained to the committee how Russia had, in the words of one witness, persistently funded propaganda in the West to “fracture allied security, stoke public distrust against democratic institutions, and discredit the alliance structures that defend Europe.”

#### NATO cooperation is controversial – Congress is afraid of provoking Russia

Aaron **Blake**, 4-12-20**22**, (Aaron Blake is senior political reporter, writing for The Fix.) " Finland and Sweden joining NATO could put Trump’s GOP in the hot seat", Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/12/nato-finland-sweden-trump/ lilw-msdi2022

Of course, joining NATO isn’t just a matter of Finland and Sweden deciding to become members; it is also about whether current members would agree to this. The conventional wisdom is that both countries would be welcomed with open arms**. In the United** **States**, that would require at least two-thirds of the Senate voting to ratify their membership. But exactly how that debate would go down could be quite interesting — especially in light of **the GOP**’s slight-but-significant Trump-era **drift into more skepticism of NATO**. And the looming unknown would be Donald Trump himself weighing in on the process — and not necessarily in favor. The last two major NATO expansions came in 1999, when Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary joined, and in 2004, when seven former communist countries and Soviet republics joined. The latter was utterly uncontroversial, with the Senate voting 96 to 0 to ratify their membership. But the former presents some important lessons about how an addition of Finland and Sweden could unfold — and who might resist it. The vote wound up being strongly in favor, 80 to 19, but there was plenty of uncertainty at the outset. Throughout the debate, senators from both parties worried that the move would be viewed as provocative by Russia. They warned about Russia perceiving the NATO expansion as an “iron ring” around its borders. “I do believe this replaces, symbolically, the Iron Curtain that was established in the late ’40s, which faced west, with now an iron ring of nations that face east to Russia,” Sen. John Warner (R-Va.) said during debate on the subject. “That causes this senator a great deal of concern.” Warner proposed an amendment that would have barred any new NATO admissions for three years, and it got 41 votes — including many proponents of the expansion being debated. In the years afterward, plenty of prominent foreign policy observers questioned the wisdom of the expansion, as we summarized last month: … You need not look far into the past to see studied minds cautioning about a situation much like the one we find ourselves in today. Former Clinton administration defense secretary Bill Perry said in 2016 that Putin bore most of the blame for Russia’s aggression in Crimea but that “I have to say that the United States deserves much of the blame” for supporting NATO’s expansion in Eastern Europe. George Kennan, a former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, called it “a tragic mistake” after the Senate in 1998 ratified NATO expansion, even as Russia was still picking up the pieces from the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) warned at the same time, “We have no idea what we’re getting into.” Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski argued relatively recently that Ukraine should not join military alliances and instead stick with a Finland-esque approach of remaining neutral while cooperating with the West in other ways. All of that plays into the looming debate over Finland and Sweden joining NATO. Expanding the alliance has been a consensus issue — and even a unanimous one in 2003-2004 — but **Russia’s invasion of Ukraine brings into stark relief the prospect of perceived provocation that critics had warned about.** Admitting Finland and Sweden would be a strong repudiation of Putin, but it would also no doubt be provocative. Russia has made clear its strong opposition, saying that NATO “remains a tool geared towards confrontation” and that Finland and Sweden would face “serious military and political consequences” if they joined. While concerns about provocation historically have been bipartisan, the question today seems to concern how Republicans might respond. Just last week, **more than 30 percent of House Republicans voted against a symbolic measure reaffirming support for NATO.** Their reasons were varied and often not totally apparent, but **it followed from years of the GOP tilting toward NATO skepticism — with some not-so-gentle nudging from Trump.**

#### Republicans want to put “America First”

Alexander **Ward**, Andrew **Desiderio** **and** Quint **Forgey**, 5-17-2022, (Alex Ward is a national security reporter and anchor of “National Security Daily.” Before joining POLITICO, Ward was the White House and national security reporter at Vox. He was also an associate director in the Atlantic Council's Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security where he worked on military issues and U.S. foreign policy. And he previously wrote the #NatSec2016 newsletter for War on the Rocks where he covered the 2016 presidential election and the candidates' views on national security. Andrew Desiderio is a congressional reporter for POLITICO, covering the Senate, national security and foreign policy. He previously covered House investigations and oversight of the Trump administration. He joined POLITICO from The Daily Beast, where he covered Congress with a focus on national security, foreign affairs and Senate campaigns. He previously worked at BBC News and RealClearPolitics. He is a graduate of The George Washington University’s School of Media and Public Affairs, where he studied journalism and Italian language and literature. He hails from Philadelphia and is a proud Philly sports fan. Quint is a breaking news reporter for POLITICO. Quint previously worked as a digital producer and editorial intern for POLITICO, a freelancer and news intern for The Wall Street Journal, an associate producer for Louisiana Public Broadcasting, a reporting intern for The News Journal in Delaware, and a national reporting fellow for the Carnegie-Knight News21 program. Quint graduated from Louisiana State University, where he served as editor in chief of the student newspaper, The Daily Reveille. "‘America First’ before ‘Ukraine First,’ say some in GOP", POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/national-security-daily/2022/05/17/america-first-before-ukraine-first-say-some-in-gop-00033085 lilw-msdi2022

**It’s “America First**,” not “Ukraine First,” some **Republicans are openly telling the establishment.** Now the establishment is fighting back. Congress’ nearly $40 billion package of humanitarian aid and critical weapons for the war-torn nation is taking heat from a growing number of conservative lawmakers, candidates, activists, and even former President DONALD TRUMP. Their case against spending on Ukraine’s battle against Russia is all about redirecting taxpayer money to domestic problems — but it’s alarming fellow Republicans who see it as not only a flawed argument, but part of a disturbing trend toward isolationism. **Sen. BILL HAGERTY** **(R-Tenn.),** who served in the Trump administration as ambassador to Japan**, told Fox News’** MARIA BARTIROMO Sunday that “**we've got crises erupting across the nation**” **like a dearth of baby formula, drug overdoses and issues at the southern border.** “**The federal government can’t keep spending money without accountability or oversight**," **Sen. TOMMY TUBERVILLE (R-Ala.) told NatSec Daily,** adding that he does “support military and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, and I continue to support their fight to defend their freedom.” It’s all putting the sprawling aid package, which is set to clear the Senate later this week, at the center of the ongoing battle to define the modern GOP. And it comes at a critical time for Ukraine’s war effort. Much of the party, from the rank-and-file all the way up to Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, is forcefully rejecting the MAGA wing’s opposition to the aid. “I don’t know what their alternative is. We’ve seen world wars started over less than what is happening in Europe,” said Sen. JOHN CORNYN (R-Texas), who just returned from a swing through Eastern Europe that included a meeting with Ukrainian President VOLODYMYR ZELENSKYY in Kyiv. “Even though it’s a lot of money, it’s a small investment relative to a world war.” **Eleven GOP senators opposed a procedural vote Monday on the Ukraine assistance bill, joining 57 House Republicans** who rejected the measure last week. **It comes as GOP lawmakers aligned with Trump**, in addition to high-profile House and Senate candidates, **are slamming the aid package as reckless and out of step with Americans’ needs**. Even the conservative Heritage Foundation, typically hawkish on foreign policy, came out against it.

#### Republicans oppose NATO and hard measures on Russia

Peter **Weber**, 4-5-20**22**, (Peter Weber is a senior editor at TheWeek.com, and has handled the editorial night shift since the website launched in 2008. A graduate of Northwestern University, Peter has worked at Facts on File and The New York Times Magazine.) "63 Republicans vote against House resolution affirming support for NATO and its 'democratic principles'", Week, https://theweek.com/nato/1012212/63-republicans-vote-against-house-resolution-affirming-support-for-nato-and-its lilw-msdi2022

**The House** on Thursday evening **passed a** **nonbinding resolution reaffirming its "unequivocal support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as an alliance founded on democratic principles**," and calling on President Biden "to use the voice and vote of the United States to establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters," to underscore the alliance's "support for shared democratic values and committed to enhancing NATO's capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries." **The resolution passed 362 to 63**, **with all 63 no votes coming from Republicans,** as Rep. Bill Pascrell Jr. (D-N.J.) noted on Twitter. Weakening or destroying NATO is believed to be one of Russian President Vladimir Putin's top goals, and Pascrell called the vote evidence the GOP "truly is Putin's Party." Retired Lt. Gen. Mark Hertling, a former U.S. Army commander in Europe, softened that allegation, suggesting that "perhaps this divisiveness in the U.S. government remains one of Putin's strategic goals that hasn't yet been defeated." William Saletan, writing at The Bulwark, argues that even if the end result of GOP efforts to block U.S. and NATO actions against Russia's Ukraine invasion are "a gift to Vladimir Putin," the stated motives are a little more complicated. **Since Russia attacked Ukraine, 21 Republicans "have opposed**, or at least sought to constrain, **aid to Ukraine** **or sanctions on Russia,**" having "swallowed a cocktail of isolationism, defeatism, partisan paranoia, and Russian disinformation," he writes, and he summarized what he sees as "the main pillars of their reasoning" on Twitter. "The other side of the equation is the near-unanimity of support among Democrats, even from very progressive members, for standing up to Russia," Saletan observes. "Leftist Democrats generally oppose armed intervention, yet nearly all of them voted for sanctions against Russia and military aid for Ukraine," even "the Squad," simply "because they recognize the war as a showdown between right and wrong." **The 21 Republicans who** evidently **disagree make up "a group three times the size of 'the Squad**,' which Republicans claim is in control of every aspect of Democratic policy," Saletan writes. "**Imagine how much power those 21 Republicans would wield in a GOP-controlled House**," **not to mention the 63 who voted against the NATO resolution.**

#### Republicans support leaving NATO – they definitely won’t like the plan

Jonathan **Bernstein**, 4-7-20**22**, (Jonathan Bernstein is a Bloomberg Opinion columnist covering politics and policy. He taught political science at the University of Texas at San Antonio.) "Are Republicans Turning Against NATO?", Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-04-07/are-republicans-turning-against-nato lilw-msdi2022

Trump didn’t care much about public policy when he was president. But he did undermine this internationalist consensus, even using the old “America First” slogan from an isolationist (and anti-Semitic) movement from the 1930s. And while he had little success actually implementing his foreign-policy preferences — as he was repeatedly rolled by Congress, the bureaucracy and allied nations — it’s quite possible he could have the last laugh. Earlier this week, **an astonishing 63 House Republicans opposed a resolution supporting NATO.** That’s still not a full third of the Republican conference, but **it’s not exactly a tiny fringe**, either. To be fair, some of those objecting claimed to oppose the non-binding, symbolic resolution because of some of its specific wording rather than because they opposed the alliance — but **quite a few seem to be wary of the whole concept of an alliance of democracies against authoritarianism. These lawmakers are** only **reflecting where their party appears to be heading**. **In two recent polls,** **strong minorities of Republicans — 40% of** **respondents in one survey** — **supported leaving the alliance altogether**.

#### Republicans view NATO as a burden

William **Saletan**, 4-12-20**22**, (William Saletan is a writer at The Bulwark.) "Putin Wants to Break NATO. Republicans Want to Help Him.", Bulwark, https://www.thebulwark.com/putin-wants-to-break-nato-republicans-want-to-help-him/ lilw-msdi2022

A few days after the Times report, **House Democrats filed** and brought to the floor **the NATO Support Act,** **which reaffirmed that the U.S. was “solemnly committed to** the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enumerated in **Article 5.**” The bill couldn’t completely bind Trump, **but it expressed the sense of Congress that “the President shall not withdraw the United States from NATO” and that American policy was “to reject any efforts to withdraw the United States from NATO.” It also prohibited the use of federal funds “to take any action to withdraw the United States” from the alliance. Every Democrat voted for the bill; 22 Republicans voted against it.** One of the 22 Republicans, **Rep. Scott Perry**, explained why he and other self-styled hawks had voted no. In a statement to constituents, he **complained that “the bill prevented the U.S. from ever leaving NATO** . . . unless Congress first voted to repeal this would-be new law.” Perry wanted Trump to be free to pull America out of NATO, on his own. **Perry** also **argued that Trump should be free “to negotiate better terms** for the United States in NATO,” **as though the alliance were a trade deal.** And he warned that “an ally of ours today may not be an ally tomorrow.” **That’s how** Perry and **many of his colleagues viewed the world.** **They saw alliances as entanglements and burdens**. They worried that even friendly countries couldn’t be trusted. They believed that America should hedge its commitments because our allies might screw us. And that was all Putin needed. He didn’t need American lawmakers to love him the way Trump did. He just needed them to constrain or withhold support from NATO. **Perry’s defection was a particularly good sign for Putin**. The congressman wasn’t just an Iraq war veteran. He had also chaired part of the 2017 hearing on Russia’s strategy to undermine NATO. So he must have known he was doing what Putin wanted. But he did it anyway, because he thought he was protecting America from Europe. **In the three years since that vote, Congress has seen even more evidence of Russia’s operations to sabotage NATO.**

#### Republicans openly reject NATO, are scared of overcommitment, and are hostile to Europe

William **Saletan**, 4-12-20**22**, (William Saletan is a writer at The Bulwark.) "Putin Wants to Break NATO. Republicans Want to Help Him.", Bulwark, https://www.thebulwark.com/putin-wants-to-break-nato-republicans-want-to-help-him/ lilw-msdi2022

**Why did so many Republicans vote against the latest pro-NATO resolution? Some openly reject the alliance.** “NATO is a relic of the Cold War,” said Rep. Thomas Massie. “Why should Americans pay for Europe’s defense?” **Others said the U.S. should be wary of overcommitment**. “**We shouldn’t say that our support for NATO is unconditional**,” said Rep. Warren Davidson. But **others**, including Perry, **complained that the resolution threatened American sovereignty.** In a video statement, Perry told his constituents that the resolution “politicizes NATO” by saying “if you’re not supporting socialism, then we’re going to use NATO against you.” This is a bizarre misrepresentation. The resolution affirmed that NATO was “founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.” Those words are literally in the alliance’s founding treaty. The resolution also called for “unwavering support to the people of Ukraine.” And it endorsed a project, jointly proposed by Democratic and Republican lawmakers, to build “NATO’s capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries.” To make sure nobody misconstrued that language as an attack on sovereignty, the resolution stipulated that any NATO monitoring of “challenges to democracy” within member states would be undertaken only “when requested.” Perry ignored that stipulation and caricatured the resolution. So did several of his colleagues. Representative Chip Roy described the resolution as “empowering international organizations to target the internal activities of sovereign nations.” Davidson described it as “using NATO to try to undermine America’s sovereignty.” **Some members who opposed the measure also expressed hostility toward Europe**. Davidson said “global commitments” to accords on climate, banking, and other issues were forcing the U.S. to adopt the “inferior system” of “the Europeans.”

### PC Key to Dem Unity

#### Biden carefully treading line to keep Dems united now, but future divides can break that

Sargent 3/18. Greg Sargent, Columnist, WaPo. “Opinion: How Biden and Democrats are destroying one of Trumpism’s biggest lies” WaPo March 18, 2021. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/03/18/biden-popularity-destroying-trumpism-lie/> Accessed 3/21/21. ARJH

A funny thing is happening in U.S. politics right now. President Biden and Democratic leaders are working closely with the left on a variety of fronts, and while complications, challenges and future divisions loom, it’s all unfolding more smoothly than you might have expected. And the political sky isn’t crashing down on Democrats’ heads. In fact, Americans appear to be concluding that things are getting better. This wasn’t supposed to happen. The GOP’s 2020 campaign narrative — made especially poisonous by a certain former president — was that Democratic rule would run the country into the ground precisely because Democrats would prove wholly captive to their crazy socialist left flank. Now Biden and Democratic leaders actually are working with the party’s left to a surprising and salutary degree. And that surely helps explain some of their early successes — and those successes’ popularity. Politico has a remarkable new report on a meeting between White House Chief of Staff Ron Klain and progressive House members. In it, the progressives pressed Klain on numerous fronts, and the conversation appeared constructive. For instance, progressives suggested Biden’s next big initiative — infrastructure — should include not just transportation projects but also ones on climate change and health care. The sticking point is that if Biden wants GOP support, he’ll have to confine it to transportation, and progressives don’t want the quest for bipartisanship to water down the outcome. So Klain said one possibility would be to pursue separate bills — passing roads-and-bridges projects with GOP support and others with just Democrats by simple Senate majority through reconciliation. That prompted Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.) to tell Politico that she thinks the White House shares the progressive “commitment to addressing climate.” Klain and progressives also discussed a package raising taxes on corporations and incomes over $400,000, as Biden is reportedly mulling. Jayapal called this a “very good discussion.” On immigration, Klain said they’re working hard to improve humanitarian conditions at the border for child migrants, a sticking point on the left. Jayapal said the White House understands they have to “more quickly work” to “speed that up.” The overwhelming takeaway here is that Biden and the White House are working hard to keep things running smoothly with the party’s left. Meanwhile, Biden and Democratic leaders have largely adopted the progressive reading of the folly of chasing bipartisanship for its own sake. In short, they are talking to the left, while largely accepting that the GOP is essentially cutting itself out of the conversation about how to address the country’s major challenges. Take the $1.9 trillion rescue package. While some outcomes disappointed the left — the loss of the minimum wage hike — the ultimate result was the most far-reaching piece of progressive legislation in a half century. Its scale and ambition, secured precisely because Democrats refused to chase GOP support, unified the party. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) called it “the most significant legislation for working people that has passed in decades.” Indeed, Sanders himself played a key role making it both ambitious and unifying. As Jeet Heer notes, this shows how the left can influence the party via a combination of advocacy and inside-game playing. But it also shows that Biden and Democratic leaders see the benefits of this for policy outcomes — and for the party. It’s hard to overstate how dramatically different all this is from the 2020 Trumpist/GOP narrative. The story was that a mentally deteriorating Biden would quickly become captive to the radical socialist left, and that this would drive the stupendous Trump economy (soaring after he vanquished covid) into a “depression.” The GOP tactic of lumping together mainstream Democrats and liberals with terrifying radical elements (such as depicting civil rights liberals as tools of communism) has a long history. But Trumpism added his own special poison to the brew. Think back to the Georgia Senate runoffs. Republicans argued that the radical left threatened to take over the Senate through the (moderate and unassuming) figures of Jon Ossoff and Raphael G. Warnock. GOP ads depicted violent, unchecked antifa mobs and non-White socialist lawmakers plotting to convert the country into a hellscape of socialist devastation. Now go watch Ossoff on MSNBC, talking soberly about the benefits the rescue package will deliver to Georgia residents, and how this passed without any GOP support in Congress but with extraordinarily broad support among voters, including many Republican ones. Meanwhile, competent governance has vaccinations on track and may soon defeat covid-19. A Democratic center-left alliance largely did that. And the country broadly approves, even as GOP lawmakers sat it out entirely. All this has important implications for what’s next. Republicans are reduced to admitting we’re likely to see an economic boom while arguing it has nothing to do with Biden or Democrats. But as Michael Grunwald points out, Trump’s prediction of a Biden depression will make that harder to pull off. That has left Republicans hoping all this spending produces inflation or that they can fearmonger about the deficits that they themselves pumped up with tax cuts for the rich and corporations. To be clear, a lot can still go wrong. Republicans are betting Biden’s efforts to solve our border problems humanely will create long-term chaos, allowing them to claim Trump had it right all along. Getting the border right is an extremely difficult task and will make for very tough politics. Meanwhile, more Democratic divisions loom — over how to revisit the minimum-wage hike and over whether to end the filibuster to protect voting rights.

#### Biden PC key to keep Democratic divisions minor for his agenda, now key

Politi and Fedor 2021. James Politi and Lauren Fedor, Reporters, Financial Times. “Joe Biden’s challenge: big, early victories in a toxic political climate” FT January 18, 2021. <https://www.ft.com/content/fa01bc64-a80c-4c32-abad-f8eb778c4fe6> Accessed 3/26/21. ARJH

Mr Biden is no stranger to tough starts, given that he became vice-president to Barack Obama at the height of the financial crisis. But the problems now confronting the country are arguably more severe and multi-faceted than they were in 2009, requiring even more sure-handed intervention and political skill. Many Democrats believe Mr Obama spent too much of his first year trying to win bipartisan support for his plans. They are well aware that to be successful, Mr Biden will need to show rapid concrete results. “To be able to deliver tangibly in the near term in ways that all people in the country can see and feel and know is a critically important thing to do,” says Mara Rudman, vice-president for policy at the Center for American Progress, a left-leaning Washington think-tank, and a former official in the Clinton and Obama administrations. “We have had a self-perpetuating cycle in a very negative direction,” she adds. “I think we have the opportunity to get to a self-perpetuating cycle in the positive direction.” The president-elect’s transition team has already set out plans for a barrage of unilateral executive orders during the first 10 days to rejoin the Paris climate agreement and scrap the travel ban imposed on certain Muslim-majority countries, undoing some of Mr Trump’s most controversial policies. It has also made clear that Mr Biden wants to rebuild the US’s traditional alliances with other western nations that frayed during the past four years, while being more focused in confronting strategic rivals such as China and Russia. But Mr Biden has tried to focus the attention of lawmakers rattled by the assault on the Capitol — and an anxious public — primarily on his prescriptions to resolve America’s health and economic crises, as he prepares to enter the White House. Nearly 400,000 Americans have died from Covid-19, and 9.8m fewer Americans are employed compared with last February. At the Queen, the president-elect called on Congress to pass his sweeping relief plan, which includes a new round of direct payments to Americans, aid to cash-strapped states and cities, a top-up of federal jobless benefits, a beefed-up tax credit for children and more funding for vaccinations. Securing its passage will be the first big test of Mr Biden’s presidency, and no easy task given his Democratic party’s exceedingly tight edge in both the House of Representatives and the Senate — and the toxic climate on Capitol Hill that may be exacerbated by Mr Trump’s second impeachment trial. “There is going to be a compulsion to get something done and get something done quickly, but it is definitely under more difficult circumstances given the political environment, the non-cooperation of the Trump administration, the severity of the pandemic itself and the close margins in Congress,” says John Lawrence, former chief of staff to Nancy Pelosi, the House speaker. “It is going to be tough.” Seizing the agenda Mr Biden’s urgency in pushing for a large-scale coronavirus relief package — less than a month after another fiscal stimulus package, worth $900bn, was agreed by Congress — reflects the knowledge that new presidents often have a short window to make use of their political capital. Midterm elections, where the entire House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate will be up for grabs, will take place in less than two years, and Mr Biden’s Democratic predecessors, Mr Obama and Bill Clinton, each saw their agendas curbed and upended after their party lost control of the House in 2010 and 1994 respectively. “What you really have in American politics is 18 months. Every administration gets 18 months of policymaking every four years,” says Glenn Hutchins, founder of private equity group Silver Lake Partners and a former Clinton administration official. “So once you've begun the process of cleaning up the dystopian nightmare that Trump left behind, how do you then pivot to addressing the long term underlying issues of importance? What do you choose to focus on? That's going to be the main thing.” As the new administration grapples with priorities, there has been plenty of debate among Democrats in recent years about how to make progressive policies more easy to understand and more popular with the American public — which Mr Biden’s team has tried to absorb both in crafting its policies and its communication. “The ambitions are at the New Deal scale, they are about kitchen table, lunch-pail, meat-and-potatoes economic concerns that people have,” says Kenneth Baer, a former senior Obama administration official and co-founder of Crosscut Strategies, a consultancy in Washington. “And [the message is] we are going to help you.” In addition to the $1.9tn stimulus package laid out by Mr Biden last week, he is expected to move quickly in February to present a second recovery plan involving trillions of dollars in additional spending centred on infrastructure and green energy. To be at least partially funded by higher taxes on corporations and the wealthy, it is another hugely ambitious legislative endeavour. Mr Biden’s hopes of a successful first-term agenda did receive a big boost on January 5, the eve of the assault on the US Capitol, when Raphael Warnock and Jon Ossoff, two Democrats, won a pair of run-off Senate races in Georgia. The twin victories handed control of the upper chamber to Mr Biden’s party — albeit with a 50:50 split and tiebreaking votes cast by Kamala Harris, the incoming vice-president. Given that the Democrats now get to decide which proposals can be put up for a vote in the Senate, the Georgia results ensure that, at the very least, Mr Biden’s goals will not be blocked by Mitch McConnell, the Republican senate leader, at every turn. Mr Biden’s ability to enact crucial parts of his agenda will initially depend on keeping the Democratic party fully united behind any legislation, marrying the needs of conservative lawmakers with those of the progressive bloc, with very little room for defection.

#### PC Key to Dem Unity

Owermohle 2021.Sarah Owermohle is a Health care reporter, Politico. “A new, fractured Congress” January 8, 2021. <https://www.politico.com/newsletters/prescription-pulse/2021/01/08/a-new-fractured-congress-491331> Accessed 3/7/21. ARJH

A NEW, FRACTURED CONGRESS — Democrats officially have the majority in the Senate, giving them Congress and the White House for the first time in a decade. But it won’t be easy. The majority could not be more razor-thin. A few key centrists like West Virginia Democrat Joe Manchin, father of Mylan CEO Heather Bresch, could take on an outsize role in the fate of signature Democratic priorities — like legislation to rein in drug costs. And even before he takes office, Biden’s to-do list is mounting: In addition to ending the pandemic and reviving the economy, he’ll be responsible for holding together a deeply fractured America — one that includes a sizable contingent of voters (and hundreds of Republican lawmakers) who made clear this week — amid a deadly riot at the Capitol — that they see Biden as illegitimate. That will take time and political capital, and leaves the prospect of sweeping reforms on shaky ground. Not every Democrat is sold on ambitious bids to let the government negotiate directly on drug costs, a progressive-led approach. Plus, while the House passed a direct negotiation bill last year, Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s H.R. 3, Democrats there have a narrower margin to work with in this session.

### 2NC---A2: PC doesn’t spillover

#### Political capital is finite and decisive.

Cohen ’19 [Jeffrey E; June; Political Science Professor at Fordham University; the President on Capitol Hill: A Theory of Institutional Influence, “Conclusions: Presidential Influence in Congress,” Ch. 11, p. 241-243]

The present study rehabilitates the idea of presidential influence in Congress. Instead of viewing influence as derived from personal characteristics, this study conceptualizes presidential influence in institutional terms. The major finding here is that presidents have a measurable amount of influence. Although presidents do not possess enough influence to dominate Congress, to force the legislature to accede to their every demand, they do possess enough influence to win on a significant number of roll calls that the president's side would otherwise lose. By winning on more roll calls because of this influence, presidents can affect the public policies produced through the legislative process.

This study conducted several types of analyses to estimate the amount of presidential influence. Since it can be hard to isolate causal effects with observational data, this research paired regression with quasi-experimental treatment effects analyses. The treatment effects analysis for the years 1953 to 2012 suggests that when the president takes a roll call position, the president’s side will win an additional 9% of House floor votes, or about five out of the fifty-four roll call positions that presidents take, on average, annually. Although five additional victories may not sound like much, if it leads to five major policy enactments, it may be consequential for the lives of citizens.2

Moreover, five additional pieces of legislation add up over the years—in a four-year term, there might be twenty additional enactments. From another perspective, Ansolabehere, Palmer, and Schneer (2016, 2018) estimate that there are eight or nine major legislative enactments per Congress from 1789 to 2010 and about seventeen from 1953 to 2010. The estimated five additional pieces of legislation presidents receive from position taking is nearly 30% of major enactments in the late modern period, assuming all the additional presidential wins are on major legislation. Through position taking, presidents can have consequential impacts on the nation's policies.

As conceptualized here, presidential influence is rooted in the office and in the surrounding political environment, termed "institutional presidential influence." There is some similarity between this conceptualization of influence and studies that emphasize the importance of contextual and political factors for presidential success (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Edwards 1990). But presidents still must decide whether to apply those institutional and contextual levers of influence; they need to be strategic decision makers, too. Hence, presidential influence is not merely a matter of dumb luck (Rockman 1981). Some presidents may be luckier than others, in that the office and the political environment provide them with greater resources, such as party control, upon which they can draw. But presidents still decide whether, when, how, and with whom they will exert effort, and how much, when trying to influence Congress.

### 2NC – A2 PC not finite

#### Biden PC is finite and must be used wisely

Young 2020 J.T. Young former director of communications in the Office of Management and Budget under GWB. “Biden's political position is tougher than Trump's” The Hill. 11/28/20. <https://thehill.com/opinion/campaign/527809-bidens-political-position-is-tougher-than-trumps> Accessed 1/6/20. ARJH

President-elect Joe Biden faces a tougher political position than President Donald Trump did when he took office. This is because of Biden’s thin congressional margins, a fractious Democratic Party and his limited political capital to address these liabilities. Mathematics’ transitive property does not apply in politics. In math, if A is greater than B, and B is greater than C, then A must be greater than C. In 2016, Hillary Clinton won more votes than Trump; in 2020, Biden won more votes than Clinton. Yet when Biden takes office next year, he will be in a tougher political position than Trump was in 2017. When Trump took office, despite losing the popular vote by two percentage points, Republicans controlled the House with a 241 to 194 majority and the Senate with a 51 to 49 majority. When Biden takes office in 2021, at best he will have the smallest congressional majorities in 20 years. And he may well not even have that. Should Real Clear Politics’s three uncalled races all go to the Republicans (and they currently lead in all three), Democrats would hold just 222 of the House’s 435 seats — allowing them to lose four members on each vote and still pass legislation. In the Senate, Biden needs Democrats to win both of Georgia’s two runoffs to just get to a 50-50 Senate, in which Vice President Kamala Harris could cast the tie-breaking vote. If Democrats lose even one of those races, Republicans will control the chamber. Should that happen, Biden would be the first president since George H. W. Bush in 1989 to enter into office with his party being in the Senate’s minority and without full control of Congress. Without control of the Senate, Biden’s ambitious campaign agenda could be stymied. Even with control by virtue of Harris, Biden could not lose a single Democrat senator’s vote and still pass legislation. In the House, depending on the currently three undecided races’ outcomes, Biden could lose anywhere from just four to seven Democrats and still pass legislation. At best, those are extremely tight squeezes. Some argue that lack of Senate control could help Biden by giving him cover for not achieving the Democratic Party’s left wing’s demands. Still, the left — the biggest block of the party — will expect him to deliver, without reducing demands. After all, Biden promised the left a lot to win the nomination. Coupled with the Democratic Party’s losses in the House and inability to pick up Senate seats, redistricting following the 2020 Census could cost the Democrats up to six seats. The 2020 election is more about Trump’s loss than Biden’s victory. This one-sided dynamic means that many of those who voted for Biden did not support him as much as they opposed Trump. With Trump now dispatched, Biden has his work cut out for him to keep this disparate marriage of convenience together. Evidence of Biden supporters’ lack of attachment to him was clear from polling. On Election Day, Morning Consult published a poll in which 44 percent of Biden voters said their vote was against Trump, while 54 percent said it was for Biden. In contrast, 75 percent of Trump voters supported the president and just 22 percent were voting against Biden. Trump’s presidency proves that a personal base is an invaluable political commodity. Trump’s followers supported him through four years of media and opposition vilification. This year alone, it stuck with him through impeachment, pandemic, economic collapse and summer rioting, increasing his popular vote total by 11 million and leaving him just short of reelection. Personal political power influences politics. So too does its absence. A president with it can wield it for and against others. Trump was able to so quickly gain control of the party because he had it. Without his own substantial personal base, Biden is at a tremendous disadvantage to Trump as he enters office. Certainly, as Biden takes office, there will be an immediate, general good feeling, a desire for normalcy and hope for success. However it happens though, this honeymoon ends quickly and, like a couple, the marriage dependent on a honeymoon for long-term happiness, is in trouble. The question for Biden is whether he can successfully forge a personal attachment with the electorate and then use it to aid him with Congress. His difficulty lies in the fact that this is the opposite of the way the presidential dynamic usually works.

### 2NC---A2: Winners Win

#### Empirics prove that winners don’t build capital.

[Markus Siewert 2018 June 2018; Assistant Professorship of Policy Analysis Hochschule für Politik München an der Technischen Universität München and Former Chair for Policy Analysis at the Bavarian, School for Public Policy; “It’s Never Easy for the President to Get Exactly What He Wants,” https://d-nb.info/1164077325/34

Third, agenda-setting offers the White House the opportunity to highlight its priorities, how they are distributed across various policy issues, and in which way policies should be packaged (Rudalevige 2005, 437ff; Wayne 2009b, 317ff). Because the resources of any administration to lobby Congress are not infinite and the multiple political arenas are usually heavily crowded with myriad policy items and problems striving to be solved, the White House needs to prioritize its policy agenda. This involves, among other things, to select some issues over others, decide about their sequencing, how to pursue them, and how much political capital it wants or needs to spend on any given item. Therefore, the administration will focus on certain policies with more attention, on others with less, depending on the prioritization by the president but also upon other considerations, such as the overall density of the policy agenda or imminent pressures of the time. The trick is to not overwhelm Congress with the president’s initiatives. As Lyndon B. Johnson famously quipped, “Congress is like a Whiskey drinker. You can put an awful lot of whiskey into a man if you just let him sip it. But if you try to force the whole bottle down his throat at one time, he’ll throw it up.” (cited in Rudalevige 2002, 113). Thus, the failure to prioritize easily leads to overload of Pennsylvania Avenue with Congress at the one end, and to excessive demands and exhaustion for the White House at the other end. The rocky start of the Clinton administration underlines this argument: since the White House did not pursue a ‘rifle-approach’ to define clear policy priorities for its initial months and then execute them, it got lost in numerous legislative battles and mine-fields early on in its first year. Instead it followed a ‘shotgun-approach’ by addressing as many issues as possible at once leading to an overkill and chaos (Rockman 1996; `Sinclair 2000b).

#### Biden PC is finite – winners don’t win

Daniel Drezner 2021 professor of international politics at the Fletcher March 30, 2021. “Biden’s brand of bipartisanship”. Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/30/bidens-brand-bipartisanship/>

The paradox for Biden is that the more successful he is at addressing the pandemic and the economy, the more difficulty he could encounter in building bipartisan coalitions to address other problems. Political Science 101 would suggest that if Biden gets credit for ending the pandemic and restoring a strong economy, that popularity should translate into greater political capital for other problems in the queue. Political Science 301 offers a cautionary warning: Solved problems fade from view. Biden is appropriately addressing the issues voters care about. But if the pandemic and the economy evolve as expected, voters will quickly bank those successes and focus on thornier problems — like immigration.

## Impact Extension

### Impact Extension – Warming causes extinction

#### Warming causes extinction

Sprat and Dunlop 19

[David Spratt and Ian Dunlop, \*Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration and co-author of *Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action*; \*\*member of the Club of Rome AND formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading, "Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach," Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, 5-30-2019, https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_90dc2a2637f348edae45943a88da04d4.pdf]

2050: By 2050, there is broad scientific acceptance that system tipping-points for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and a sea-ice-free Arctic summer were passed well before 1.5°C of warming, for the Greenland Ice Sheet well before 2°C, and for widespread permafrost loss and large-scale Amazon drought and dieback by 2.5°C. The “hothouse Earth” scenario has been realised, and Earth is headed for another degree or more of warming, especially since human greenhouse emissions are still significant. While sea levels have risen 0.5 metres by 2050, the increase may be 2–3 metres by 2100, and it is understood from historical analogues that seas may eventually rise by more than 25 metres. Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability. The destabilisation of the Jet Stream has very significantly affected the intensity and geographical distribution of the Asian and West African monsoons and, together with the further slowing of the Gulf Stream, is impinging on life support systems in Europe. North America suffers from devastating weather extremes including wildfires, heatwaves, drought and inundation. The summer monsoons in China have failed, and water flows into the great rivers of Asia are severely reduced by the loss of more than one-third of the Himalayan ice sheet. Glacial loss reaches 70 percent in the Andes, and rainfall in Mexico and central America falls by half. Semi-permanent El Nino conditions prevail. Aridification emerges over more than 30 percent of the world’s land surface. Desertification is severe in southern Africa, the southern Mediterranean, west Asia, the Middle East, inland Australia and across the south-western United States. Impacts: A number of ecosystems collapse, including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic. Some poorer nations and regions, which lack capacity to provide artificially-cooled environments for their populations, become unviable. Deadly heat conditions persist for more than 100 days per year in West Africa, tropical South America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, which together with land degradation and rising sea levels contributes to 21 perhaps a billion people being displaced. Water availability decreases sharply in the most affected regions at lower latitudes (dry tropics and subtropics), affecting about two billion people worldwide. Agriculture becomes nonviable in the dry subtropics. Most regions in the world see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, including heat waves, floods and storms. Food production is inadequate to feed the global population and food prices skyrocket, as a consequence of a one-fifth decline in crop yields, a decline in the nutrition content of food crops, a catastrophic decline in insect populations, desertification, monsoon failure and chronic water shortages, and conditions too hot for human habitation in significant food-growing regions. The lower reaches of the agriculturally-important river deltas such as the Mekong, Ganges and Nile are inundated, and significant sectors of some of the world’s most populous cities — including Chennai, Mumbai, Jakarta, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh City, Shanghai, Lagos, Bangkok and Manila — are abandoned. Some small islands become uninhabitable. Ten percent of Bangladesh is inundated, displacing 15 million people. According to the Global Challenges Foundation’s Global Catastrophic Risks 2018 report, even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated due to sea-level rise, and In high-end scenarios “the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilization coming to an end”. 22

#### climate change causes extinction

Weston 2021. Phoebe Weston, biodiversity writer for the Guardian. “Top scientists warn of 'ghastly future of mass extinction' and climate disruption” The Guardian January 13, 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jan/13/top-scientists-warn-of-ghastly-future-of-mass-extinction-and-climate-disruption-aoe> Accessed 2/25/21. ARJH

The planet is facing a “ghastly future of mass extinction, declining health and climate-disruption upheavals” that threaten human survival because of ignorance and inaction, according to an international group of scientists, who warn people still haven’t grasped the urgency of the biodiversity and climate crises. The 17 experts, including Prof Paul Ehrlich from Stanford University, author of The Population Bomb, and scientists from Mexico, Australia and the US, say the planet is in a much worse state than most people – even scientists – understood. “The scale of the threats to the biosphere and all its lifeforms – including humanity – is in fact so great that it is difficult to grasp for even well-informed experts,” they write in a report in Frontiers in Conservation Science which references more than 150 studies detailing the world’s major environmental challenges. The delay between destruction of the natural world and the impacts of these actions means people do not recognise how vast the problem is, the paper argues. “[The] mainstream is having difficulty grasping the magnitude of this loss, despite the steady erosion of the fabric of human civilisation.” The report warns that climate-induced mass migrations, more pandemics and conflicts over resources will be inevitable unless urgent action is taken. “Ours is not a call to surrender – we aim to provide leaders with a realistic ‘cold shower’ of the state of the planet that is essential for planning to avoid a ghastly future,” it adds.

### 2NC A2 Warming inevitable

#### Every bit of mitigation matters.

Nuccitelli 12 (Dana Nuccitelli is an environmental scientist at a private environmental consulting firm in the Sacramento, California area. This piece was originally published at Skeptical Science and was reprinted with permission. “Realistically What Might The Future Climate Look Like?” ThinkProgress http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/09/01/784931/realistically-what-might-the-future-climate-look-like/)

This is Why Reducing Emissions is Critical

We’re not yet committed to surpassing 2°C global warming, but as Watson noted, we are quickly running out of time to realistically give ourselves a chance to stay below that ‘danger limit’. However, 2°C is not a do-or-die threshold. Every bit of CO2 emissions we can reduce means that much avoided future warming, which means that much avoided climate change impacts. As Lonnie Thompson noted, the more global warming we manage to mitigate, the less adaption and suffering we will be forced to cope with in the future.

Realistically, based on the current political climate (which we will explore in another post next week), limiting global warming to 2°C is probably the best we can do. However, there is a big difference between 2°C and 3°C, between 3°C and 4°C, and anything greater than 4°C can probably accurately be described as catastrophic, since various tipping points are expected to be triggered at this level. Right now, we are on track for the catastrophic consequences (widespread coral mortality, mass extinctions, hundreds of millions of people adversely impacted by droughts, floods, heat waves, etc.). But we’re not stuck on that track just yet, and we need to move ourselves as far off of it as possible by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions as soon and as much as possible.

There are of course many people who believe that the planet will not warm as much, or that the impacts of the associated climate change will be as bad as the body of scientific evidence suggests. That is certainly a possiblity, and we very much hope that their optimistic view is correct. However, what we have presented here is the best summary of scientific evidence available, and it paints a very bleak picture if we fail to rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

If we continue forward on our current path, catastrophe is not just a possible outcome, it is the most probable outcome. And an intelligent risk management approach would involve taking steps to prevent a catastrophic scenario if it were a mere possibility, let alone the most probable outcome. This is especially true since the most important component of the solution – carbon pricing – can be implemented at a relatively low cost, and a far lower cost than trying to adapt to the climate change consequences we have discussed here (Figure 4).

#### Not inevitable – cuts now have an IMMEDIATE effect

Desjardins 13 (Cléa, member of Concordia university Media Relations Department, academic writer, citing Damon Matthews; associate professor of the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment at Concordia University, PhD, Member of the Global Environmental and Climate Change Center, “Global Warming: Irreversible but Not Inevitable,” http://www.concordia.ca/now/what-we-do/research/20130402/global-warming-irreversible-but-not-inevitable.php)

Carbon dioxide emission cuts will **immediately affect** the rate of future global warming Concordia and MIT researchers show Montreal, April 2, 2013 – There is a persistent misconception among both scientists and the public that there is a delay between emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) and the climate’s response to those emissions. This misconception has led policy makers to argue that CO2 emission cuts implemented now will not affect the climate system for many decades. This **erroneous line of argument** makes the climate problem **seem more intractable** than it actually is, say Concordia University’s Damon Matthews and MIT’s Susan Solomon in a recent Science article. The researchers show that **immediate decreases** in CO2 emissions would in fact result in an **immediate decrease** in the rate of climate warming. Explains Matthews, professor in the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, “If we can successfully decrease CO2 emissions in the near future, this change will be felt by the climate system when the emissions reductions are implemented **– not in several decades**." “The potential for a **quick climate response** to prompt cuts in CO2 emissions opens up the possibility that the climate benefits of emissions reductions would occur on the same timescale as the political decisions themselves.” In their paper, Matthews and Solomon, Ellen Swallow Richards professor of Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Science, show that the onus for slowing the rate of global warming falls squarely on current efforts at reducing CO2 emissions, and the resulting future emissions that we produce. This means that there are critical implications for the equity of carbon emission choices currently being discussed internationally. Total emissions from developing countries may soon exceed those from developed nations. But developed countries are expected to maintain a far higher per-capita contribution to present and possible future warming. “This disparity clarifies the urgency for low-carbon technology investment and diffusion to enable developing countries to continue to develop,” says Matthews. “Emission **cuts made now** will have an **immediate effect** on the rate of global warming,” he asserts. “I see more hope for averting difficult-to-avoid negative impacts by accelerating advances in technology development and diffusion, than for averting climate system changes that are already inevitable. Given the enormous scope and complexity of the climate mitigation challenge, clarifying these points of hope is critical to motivate change.”

### A2 We Can Adapt to Warming

#### Adaptation fails

JRC 16 **(**Joint Research Centre is the European Commission's science and knowledge service which employs scientists to carry out research in order to provide independent scientific advice and support to EU policy. August 11, 2016 https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/08/160811101332.htm)

Global change will strike the oldest and most complex ecosystems of the world hardest, regardless of their past stability. This alarming finding is reported in a JRC-led article published in *Nature Communications*. The authors hypothesized that invasive species, the warming climate and environmental degradation have altered natural habitats so deeply that species adaptation to historical conditions may not be helpful under these new circumstances. Interestingly, the authors found independent support for this hypothesis from both computer simulations and real-world data. Starting from a single ancestor digital organism, the authors let artificial life communities evolve for hundreds of thousands of generations under different, stable environmental settings. These simulated communities included both free-living and 'parasite' digital organisms that helped researchers investigate how biodiversity and ecological networks develop over time, under different environmental conditions. Over several generations, both hosts and parasites diversified, and their interactions became more complex. The authors then investigated how these communities would respond to different scenarios of biodiversity loss. They found that when species become extinct in a sequence consistent with their degree of adaptation to the 'natural' environmental conditions within which they had evolved, their extinction has only a limited effect on the overall diversity of the community. Any deviation from this pattern however, may trigger extinction cascades, eventually leading to the collapse of the entire network. The tendency of consuming species to rely and specialise (develop in a way most suited to the environment) on dependable resources has enabled the evolution of complex systems. This basic mechanism may have doomed many species to extinction -- the authors demonstrate it by comparing the results of their artificial life simulations with several empirical host-parasite networks of different animal groups. Resources that had been largely available in the past are now becoming increasingly scarce, putting at risk the species that rely on them.

### IL Extension

#### USICA is key to retaining U.S. tech leadership over China – key to solve US-China war and climate change

Jared Cohon, July 7 2021, The Hill, US Innovation and Competition Act will ensure continued US leadership https://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/571078-us-innovation-and-competition-act-will-ensure-continued-us

While those paying attention to Capitol Hill recently have been focused on the massive infrastructure and budget packages, Congress has also been making progress on another bill of equal significance. If Congress can put that measure over the finish line, the U.S. will be in a much better position to compete with China and to assure our prosperity and security for decades to come. The measure — known in the Senate as the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act — would significantly increase the federal investment in research, would target more research dollars toward solving specific technological and societal problems, and would help speed the transition of ideas from the lab to the marketplace. The House and Senate have passed different versions of the legislation — both by wide, bipartisan margins — and negotiations that are about to begin will determine whether the U.S. will have the scientific wherewithal it needs for the years ahead. Flexible, thoughtful talks ought to be able to produce an agreement that can be signed into law. The House and Senate approaches are much more alike than they are different, and too much is at stake to let this opportunity pass. Both bills would create a new directorate at the National Science Foundation — an agency that has been funding research at universities since 1950. There are two sets of issues that must be resolved — both of which relate to longstanding debates about the role of the federal government in research. The first concerns the purpose and nature of the research the federal government should fund. The Senate legislation makes maintaining U.S. competitiveness the overriding goal for the new directorate; the House allows work on a wider set of problems. The final bill should make competitiveness at least one focus for the new directorate. Competitiveness is, in part, a technological problem that can be addressed through targeted research investments in basic science. Moreover, the U.S. will be hard-pressed to solve any other issues, like inequity and climate change, if we are in relative economic decline. How could a new research program best deal with competitiveness? By pursuing a kind of research federal programs have often neglected called use-inspired basic research. This means building research around solving specific problems — but problems that require breakthroughs in basic understanding of natural phenomena. A classic example is the research that led to the creation of semiconductors — the circuits that are the basis of our phones and computers. That research was designed to replace vacuum tubes, which were fragile and ungainly, but it required such fundamental new knowledge that the work earned a Nobel Prize. This kind of research is different from basic, curiosity-driven research — research driven just by the desire to understand the world better. That kind of work is essential, but it should not be the sole purpose of federal funding or university lab work. Use-inspired research is also different from applied or translational research — the work to turn the knowledge we have already at hand into useful processes and products. That work is also critical, but much of it should be left to industry to fund and to carry out. The second set of issues relates to where federally funded research should occur. Since at least the end of World War II, concerns have been raised that research is concentrated in too few locations, mostly on the coasts. The concern has intensified as economic growth has become more closely tied to being near leading science and technology centers. Both bills take aim at this issue. The Senate approach is to require fully one-fifth of the National Science Foundation’s money to be distributed through a program that funds work only in states that have not been the top winners of competitive federal research grants. The House approach is to try to build expertise at particular schools that have research programs but are not research leaders, including schools with large minority enrollments. Mixing these paths in a balanced way could help create centers of excellence in specific fields throughout the country and do so without losing the boost the U.S. as a whole gets by having a few dozen universities that are world leaders in research. The metric needs to be whether the distribution will strengthen U.S. research and prosperity around the country, not just whether everyone is getting some money. Congress has worked through these issues before when it created the federal agencies, like the National Science Foundation, that have underwritten so much of the research that has kept the U.S. prosperous and secure since 1945. But today we face urgent new challenges, including a rising China. Congress needs to rise to the occasion — as it did after World War II and after the launch of Sputnik — and make an investment in new institutions that can ensure continued U.S. leadership.

### Turns Cyber

#### China bills reduce cyber threats and protect critical infrastructure

Sam Sabin 2022 "The cyber items left in Congress’ China bills". POLITICO. 3-21-2022. https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-cybersecurity/2022/03/21/the-cyber-items-left-in-congress-china-bills-00018760

DEJA VU — If all goes according to plan for Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer this week, we could see some movement on his closely watched China competition package, which includes cyber provisions focused on cybersecurity worker training and battling disinformation. Schumer has promised to bring his bill to the floor this week. To do that, he’s likely to just drop the text of the Senate’s U.S. Innovation and Competition Act into the House’s America COMPETES Act and leave it up to a conference committee to negotiate the difference between the two. While most of the headlines have focused on the legislation’s big-ticket $52 billion in funding for domestic semiconductor production, cyber-minded lawmakers, lobbyists and industry leaders will be watching closely to make sure that the following cyber items remain in the package: — Laying a foundation for funding: USICA includes a provision establishing a program at the Department of Homeland Security to allow the agency to study the physical and cyber threats facing the different U.S. critical infrastructure sectors. The process, which plays off of a recommendation from the Cyberspace Solarium Commission, would give the federal government a good base point for determining which critical infrastructure risks to prioritize each year. — State Department disinformation funding: Both bills provide the State Department’s Global Engagement Center, which is designed to counter foreign disinformation and propaganda, with $150 million in funding to increase its ability to fight these campaigns ahead of the midterm elections. — CyberCorps investments: The House bill expands the budget for an ROTC-like program for the federal cyber workforce, known as CyberCorps, from $60 million to $90 million. The program awards scholarships to enrollees in cyber degree programs, and in return, participating students promise to work for the U.S. government for up to four years in a cyber-related position. The new funds would allow the CyberCorps to increase the number of students it accepts as well as the number of universities and community colleges it can partner with.

#### Bill solves cybersecurity deficiencies.

Johnson 3-25 (Lamar Johnson, 3-25-2022, “Congress Nearing Finish Line on USICA/COMPETES Chips, Cyber, Innovation Bill“, No Publication, https://www.meritalk.com/articles/congress-nearing-finish-line-on-usica-competes-chips-cyber-innovation-bill/\

Lawmakers Call for Cyber Provisions to Make the Cut As Congress moves closer to beginning the conferencing process, Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wis., called for the final bill to include **cybersecurity measures that both USICA and America COMPETES share**, as well as others contained in one bill or the other. Sen. King and Rep. Gallagher, who co-chaired the Cyberspace Solarium Commission, sent a letter to Sen. Schumer and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., voicing their support for the $52 billion in CHIPS funding included in the bills, but said that the final bill should reflect the need for **enhanced investment in the cyber workforce** and the nation’s **cyber posture as a whole**. “Congress has a critical opportunity to advance and secure U.S. global technological leadership for the 21st century,” King and Gallagher wrote. “In doing so, it must also invest in America’s cybersecurity and critical infrastructure resilience.” Among that highlighted legislation is the Cybersecurity Opportunity Act, which would create a grant program to increase investment in cyber education at HBCUs and minority-serving institutions, as well as language that would create rotational learning opportunities for Federal cyber employees. Additionally, the lawmakers called for the final inclusion of a measure to expand the ROTC-like CyberCorps program that is included in the America COMPETES bill. Other COMPETES provisions the pair argued for include designating **Critical Technology Security Centers**, and creating programs designed to **build international cyber capacity for the U.S. and its allies**. As far as USICA cyber components the pair called to make the cut, they pointed to investments in regional technology hubs, as well as the creation of a National Risk Management Cycle. The latter represents a solution to a problem the Cyberspace Solarium Commission identified in its March 2020 report. The commission was then government-chartered but has since transitioned to a non-profit organization. “In our March 2020 report, the Cyberspace Solarium Commission noted that the U.S. government ‘lacks a rigorous, codified, and routinely exercised process’ for identifying risk. By creating a National Risk Management Cycle, Congress would codify an essential capability for properly **resourcing U.S. government efforts to deter threats and mitigate risks to critical infrastructure**,” the letter says. “The cyber threats facing our country have never been greater, and American technological leadership will depend significantly on our ability to defend against those threats and recover quickly from disruptions to critical infrastructure,” they wrote. “As such, we strongly urge that the provisions we have highlighted here be included in the final conferenced legislation that crosses President Biden’s desk later this year.”

#### Causes tit-for-tat escalation to nuke war.

Klare 19 [Michael T. Klare, professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation,” Arms Control Association, November 2019, armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation]

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13

The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14

These are by no means the only pathways to escalation resulting from the offensive use of cyberweapons. Others include efforts by third parties, such as proxy states or terrorist organizations, to provoke a global nuclear crisis by causing early-warning systems to generate false readings (“spoofing”) of missile launches. Yet, they do provide a clear indication of the severity of the threat. As states’ reliance on cyberspace grows and cyberweapons become more powerful, the dangers of unintended or accidental escalation can only grow more severe.

### Link Alone Turns Case

#### Domestic pushback to plan guts US leadership – turns case

T.J. Pempel 6-15-2022, Professor of Political Science in the Department of Political Science at UC Berkeley https://ucigcc.org/news/what-ukraine-is-teaching-us-about-geoeconomics/, "What Ukraine Is Teaching Us About Geoeconomics," No Publication (ermo/sms, Acc:7-1-2022)

I want to turn back to the question of how this Ukraine-Russia interaction plays out in terms of state strategies vis-a-vis economics. We’ve seen a lot of economic cooperation, but at the heart of some of the questions you’ve been asking is this notion that nation-states are going to be predisposed to look for national economic security, which will mean developing a capacity for relative strength—independent strength—vis a vis global changes. The difficulty is that most states can’t do this, and there’s a strong impulse toward economic cooperation along the technological gradient that will allow states to make up for their potential deficiencies. We’ve talked at this conference about semiconductors and it seems pretty clear that no state, even if it does make major moves in that direction, is going to be capable of complete autarky in a whole host of these high-tech areas.

The second piece of this relates to domestic politics in the U.S. What we’re seeing in the United States is a growing resistance on the part of segments of the Republican Party to the development of international support for Ukraine. We’re seeing resistance to U.S. aid for the military, and we’re seeing much broader isolationism that goes back to the MAGA mentality. This has a ripple effect in terms of how other states will perceive their capacity to rely on the United States economically. The idea of the U.S. as a reliable economic and security partner is very much at risk.

## Climate Turns X Impact

### Conflict

#### Climate Turns it- newest studies prove.

Stanford University, 6-12-2019, "Does climate change cause armed conflict?," Stanford News, <https://news.stanford.edu/2019/06/12/climate-change-cause-armed-conflict/>, Xoxo 7/14/2020

Intensifying climate change will increase the future risk of violent armed conflict within countries, according to a study published today in the journal Nature. Synthesizing views across experts, the study estimates climate has influenced between 3% and 20% of armed conflict risk over the last century and that the influence will likely increase dramatically. A new study synthesizing views from experts across several fields indicates climate change will have an increasing impact on the risk of armed conflict. In a scenario with 4 degrees Celsius of warming (approximately the path we’re on if societies do not substantially reduce emissions of heat-trapping gases), the influence of climate on conflicts would increase more than five times, leaping to a 26% chance of a substantial increase in conflict risk, according to the study. Even in a scenario of 2 degrees Celsius of warming beyond preindustrial levels – the stated goal of the Paris Climate Agreement­ – the influence of climate on conflicts would more than double, rising to a 13% chance. “Appreciating the role of climate change and its security impacts is important not only for understanding the social costs of our continuing heat-trapping emissions, but for prioritizing responses, which could include aid and cooperation,” said Katharine Mach, director of the Stanford Environment Assessment Facility and the study’s lead author. Climate change-driven extreme weather and related disasters can damage economies, lower farming and livestock production and intensify inequality among social groups. These factors, when combined with other drivers of conflict, may increase risks of violence. “Knowing whether environmental or climatic changes are important for explaining conflict has implications for what we can do to reduce the likelihood of future conflict, as well as for how to make well-informed decisions about how aggressively we should mitigate future climate change,” said Marshall Burke, assistant professor of Earth system science and a co-author on the study.

### Disease

#### Global warming turns disease—Increases range and transmission rates

Boyles and Chang 2009— (Salynn. Louise. MD. “Report: Climate Change Threatens Health: Scientists Say Global Warming Will Increase Malaria and Other Diseases.” May 13, 2009. WebMD Health News. <http://www.webmd.com/news/20090513/report-climate-change-threatens-health> Accessed: 6/3/09)

According to the report: Rising temperatures will affect the spread and transmission rates of vector-borne and rodent-borne diseases like malaria, dengue fever, Lyme disease, hantavirus, tick-borne encephalitis, and a host of other diseases. According to one model, there will be as many as 320 million additional cases of malaria in 2080. And 6 billion people will be at risk for dengue fever, compared to 3.5 billion today. As ocean temperatures rise and more intense seasonal weather events occur as a result, cholera outbreaks may increase.

### Econ

#### But Warming wrecks the economy

Kimberly Amadeo, 6-30-2020, [Kimberly Amadeo has 20 years of experience in economic analysis and business strategy. She writes about the U.S. Economy for The Balance.], "What Has Climate Change Cost Us? What's Being Done?," Balance, <https://www.thebalance.com/economic-impact-of-climate-change-3305682>, Xoxo 7/13/2020

The U.S. is one of the world’s richest countries. A recent study found that the planet's wealthiest 1 billion people emit 60% of greenhouse gases. The poorest 3 billion produce only 5%.25﻿﻿ That’s why you may hear people say income inequality can cause climate change. What's the Economic Impact of Climate Change? Insurance From 1980 to 2019, extreme weather cost $1.775 trillion.26﻿﻿ Munich Re, one of the world's largest reinsurance firms, blamed climate change for $24 billion of losses in the California wildfires.27﻿﻿ It warned that insurance firms would have to raise premiums to cover rising costs from extreme weather.﻿ That could make insurance too expensive for most people. GDP Scientists estimated that, if temperatures only rose 2 degrees Celsius, the global gross domestic product would fall 15%. If temperatures rose to 3 degrees Celsius, the global GDP would fall 25%. If nothing is done, temperatures will rise by 4 degrees Celsius by 2100.28﻿﻿ 29﻿﻿ Global GDP would decline by more than 30% from 2010 levels.30﻿﻿ That's comparable to the Great Depression, where GDP fell to -26.7%.31﻿﻿ The only difference is that it would be permanent. Employment The World Employment and Social Outlook 2018 estimated that climate change threatens 1.2 billion jobs.32﻿﻿ The industries most at risk are agriculture, fisheries, and forestry.﻿ Maine has already seen a decline in its lobster catches.33﻿﻿ Natural disasters caused or compounded by humans cost 23 million working-life years annually from 2000 to 2015.34﻿﻿ On the other hand, efforts to stop climate change would create 24 million new jobs by 2030.35﻿﻿36﻿﻿ Immigration Climate change creates mass migration around the world. People are leaving flooded coastlines, drought-stricken farmlands, and areas of extreme natural disasters. Since 2008, events related to climate or weather have displaced 22.5 million people annually, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.37﻿﻿38﻿﻿ Some forecasts predict that by 2050, climate change could cause as many as 1 billion people to emigrate.39﻿﻿40﻿﻿ Immigration at the U.S. border can be expected to increase as climate change worsens conditions in Latin America. The World Bank estimates that as many as 3.9 million people in Mexico and Central America will migrate internally by 2050 due to climate impact, and that subsequent deterioration will further exacerbate the movements of these migrants.41﻿﻿ Drought, shifting rain patterns, and extreme weather destroys crops and leads to food insecurity. The World Food Program found that almost half of Central Americans left because there wasn't enough food.42﻿﻿ National Security In 2017, Congress proclaimed that “climate change is a direct threat to the national security of the United States.”﻿ Climate change endangers 128 military bases.43﻿﻿ A 2018 Pentagon survey revealed that U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland has experienced storm surge flooding and hurricane damage. The Cape Lisburne Long Range Radar Station in Alaska has lost a seawall from extreme weather.44﻿﻿ In response, Congress asked the Department of Defense to identify the 10 most vulnerable sites and recommend solution strategies.45﻿﻿ Food Prices As America experiences more extremely hot days, food prices are rising. Corn and soybean yields in the U.S. precipitously plummet when temperatures rise above 84 degrees Fahrenheit.46﻿﻿ Those crops feed cattle and other meat sources and create spikes in beef, milk, and poultry prices. Worker productivity declines sharply, particularly for outdoor jobs.47﻿﻿ That further increases the cost of food. A 2019 study found that a warming ocean has pushed global sustainable fish yields down 4% since 1930. That's 1.4 million metric tons. In the North Sea and Sea of Japan, that decline is 35%. That affects Atlantic cod, haddock, and herring.48﻿﻿ Many species are threatened with extinction. That affects the 3 billion people who rely on fish for their primary source of protein.49﻿﻿ It also affects the $150 billion fishing industry and the 59 million people employed.50﻿﻿ It especially affects the U.S., which imports more than 80% of its seafood

### US-China War

#### Warming Turns US-China War

Hal Brands, 08/19/2019, [Hal Brands is a Bloomberg columnist and a professor at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies.], "To meet China challenge, the U.S. has to fight climate change," Japan Times, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2019/08/19/commentary/world-commentary/meet-china-challenge-u-s-fight-climate-change/>, Xoxo 8/10/2020

WASHINGTON – The two greatest challenges for American statecraft in the 21st century are becoming more severe — and seemingly pulling the United States in opposing directions. Relations with China are deteriorating by the day, presaging a prolonged competition over the shape of global order. Meanwhile, the worsening effects of climate change — demonstrated by the shocking melting of ice in Greenland this summer — are invoking the specter of ecological catastrophe. And while dealing with the changing climate will undoubtedly require cooperation between Beijing and Washington — the world’s two largest emitters of greenhouse gases — winning the geopolitical struggle with China will require the U.S. to take a harder-edged, more competitive approach. Statecraft is the art of reconciling the apparently irreconcilable, and the U.S. need not abandon either its environmental or its geopolitical objectives. But Washington must navigate between two bad strategies to execute the right one. The need to balance climate-change diplomacy with sharpening geopolitical rivalry is relatively new. After the end of the Cold War, climate-change diplomacy was conducted on the assumption that the geopolitical conflicts of previous eras had receded, easing the inevitable tradeoffs created by a process that required asymmetric economic sacrifices. “Most nations worry about the same global threats,” U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said a few months before the United Nations climate-change summit in Copenhagen in 2009; the U.S. could lead by “uniting diverse partners around common concerns.” Today, by contrast, the zero-sum aspects of the U.S.-China relationship are prominent, forcing thoughtful policymakers to consider how to approach climate-change diplomacy in a more competitive world. The Trump administration, of course, has largely dodged this challenge, by amping up confrontation with China while essentially abandoning the Paris accords and international climate-change diplomacy. But denying that a problem exists will not make it go away, and so Trump’s abdication is deferring the challenge to his successor. At a strategic level, there are three basic options for managing the simultaneous intensification of climate change and U.S.-China rivalry. The first (bad) idea, which flows naturally from the “America First” mentality that brought Trump to power, is that the U.S. should simply de-emphasize multilateral diplomacy on climate change. China, the thinking goes, is the world’s largest emitter of carbon dioxide. So it should not be allowed to transfer the global costs of adaptation to the U.S. by forcing Washington to make bigger, earlier cuts than China in its own greenhouse gas emissions, as stipulated in the U.S.-China bilateral agreement of 2014. More important, the long-term effects of climate change will supposedly hurt a badly polluted China more than a comparatively clean America. As climate change imposes mounting social and economic costs on China, the U.S. will reap a competitive advantage. This approach, however, is short-sighted and wrong-headed. According to one recent study, the U.S. will actually pay a significantly higher economic price than China as climate change progresses. In fact, Beijing’s authoritarian system might prove better than America’s messy democracy at undertaking the vast engineering projects — constructing seawalls, for instance — that are needed to mitigate the effects. This approach would also be diplomatically disastrous: Key allies, especially in Europe, will not sign up for a counter-China coalition if they perceive that Washington, rather than Beijing, is thwarting effective climate-change diplomacy. And even if the U.S. did out-compete China in a dramatically warming world, the victory would prove Pyrrhic indeed. A second bad strategy would move to the other extreme, making geopolitical concessions in hopes of getting Beijing to cooperate on a more aggressive global program to slow climate change. The Obama administration was sometimes accused of taking this approach in the run-up to Copenhagen in 2009 and Paris in 2015, although former officials have rejected this allegation. But the basic temptation will be there, particularly for progressives who are inclined to prioritize environment over geopolitics. In this scenario, a post-Trump president might mute U.S.-Chinese disputes over Taiwan or the South China Sea as a way of getting an agreement that would commit Beijing to more aggressively curb its emissions. Yet this strategy ignores that the Chinese government is a ruthlessly self-interested, Leninist party-state. It will address climate change — or not — based primarily on its assessment of whether doing so will bring benefits to China and the Chinese Communist Party. This calculus probably will lead — and already has led — to greater Chinese concern with climate issues, given China’s enormous environmental problems and the high economic and social costs that a warming globe will impose on Beijing. But if the U.S. makes unrelated concessions in hopes of moving Beijing farther and faster on climate, it will simply give China’s rulers incentive to pocket those concessions while never quite delivering on climate — so that they can keep extracting more concessions. A climate-first strategy may or may not benefit the environment, but it will cost the U.S. dearly in geopolitical terms. The question, then, is whether the U.S. can take a third route: Competing fiercely while preserving cooperation where interests align. This idea may seem counterintuitive. Yet history suggests that, while hard, is not impossible. During the Cold War, Washington and Moscow clashed far more dangerously than Washington and Beijing are jousting today. Yet they worked together on certain shared interests. They pursued smallpox eradication programs that saved millions of lives. They joined forces to build a remarkably effective nuclear nonproliferation regime. They concluded agreements, such as the Helsinki Accords, to reduce tensions in key regions, and inked arms control treaties to limit the danger of another sort of ecological catastrophe — nuclear war. Achieving something similar in the U.S.-China relationship would require careful balancing. U.S. officials would have to show that they will not allow China to establish linkage between climate and other issues — and to demonstrate that they will not go easy on key geopolitical disputes as the price of “improving the atmosphere” for future negotiations. Yet they would also need to keep open lines of communication on climate change even in periods of high tension, and reinforce the point — publicly and privately — that competition is some areas does not preclude collaboration in others. This sounds obvious, but is critically important; the momentum toward rivalry can otherwise color all aspects of the relationship. It may also be helpful to preserve scientific exchanges and international forums where technical experts can meet in relatively politics-free zones, just as exchanges of arms control and disarmament experts helped lay the intellectual groundwork for certain U.S.-Soviet agreements. Most basically, this approach requires reviving climate diplomacy as an American priority. There are legitimate critiques of the Paris agreement and other Obama-era climate initiatives. There are legitimate disagreements about how to proceed. But simply absenting the U.S. from international efforts to address climate change, as Trump has done, leaves Washington diplomatically isolated and dangerously behind the curve in dealing with a worsening problem. To its credit, the Trump administration has shown that it is possible to reorient the American geopolitical debate on China. It will be up to Trump’s successors to show that doing so doesn’t require ignoring the other profound global threat to American well-being in the 21st century and beyond.

### Heg Good

#### Warming turns hegemony—Climate change military overstretch

AP 2009—Fox News, August 9, 2009, “Report: Climate Change Could Warrant U.S. Military Action.,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/elections/2009/08/09/report-climate-change-warrant-military-action

Climate change will pose profound challenges to the United States in the coming decades, raising the prospect of military intervention to deal with its effects, The New York Times reported, citing military and intelligence analysts. Crises such as drought, violent storms, mass migration and pandemics could topple governments, feed terrorist movements or destabilize entire regions. The Times reported that for the first time, intelligence agencies and the Pentagon are taking a hard look at the possible security implications resulting from climate change. In particular, sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and South and Southeast Asia, will face the prospect of food shortages, water crises and catastrophic flooding driven by climate change that could call for U.S. military response. The U.S. military also faces a direct challenge with climate change, the Times reported, because many of its installations are vulnerable to storm surges and rising seas and plans to protect naval stations in Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif., are already underway. "The sense that climate change poses security and geopolitical challenges is central to the thinking of the State Department and the climate office," said Peter Ogden, chief of staff to Todd Stern, the State Department's top climate negotiator. A U.S. government study of glaciers released Thursday said climate change is melting America's glaciers at the fastest rate in recorded history, exposing the country to higher risks of drought and rising sea levels. "The observations show that the melt rate has definitely increased over the past 10 or 15 years," Ed Josberger, a USGS scientist, said. "This certainly is a very strong indicator that climate change is occurring and its effects on glaciers are virtually worldwide."

### Prolif

#### Climate turns prolif---creates the motive---and turns the economy

Nader Elhefnawy 8, Professor of English at the University of Miami, writer on IR published in journals including International Security, Astropolitics, and Survival, Autumn 2008, “The Next Wave of Nuclear Proliferation,” Parameters: The US Army War College Quarterly

The rationale driving the shift to nuclear energy in the first place (energy and climate stress) will increasingly translate into greater motivation on the part of some actors to pursue a nuclear capability. Broad economic disruption is nearly certain as the result of the tightening of oil supplies and the climate changes this scenario anticipates. Politically, this may translate into changes in the distribution of international power depending on individual states’ ability to cope (as with wealthier nations, or ones with energy-efficient economies), or even profit from these conditions (for instance, oil exporters); while the most vulnerable states may collapse, creating even greater problems for the international community (havens for crime, terrorism, or refugee flows). 27 Intensified conflict over territory and waters rich in energy and other resources will become increasingly likely.¶ Alliances, trading relationships, and other arrangements will be in flux, and when combined with the associated anxiety and vulnerability may exacerbate a desire on the part of certain states to minimize their vulnerability. A goal which nuclear weapons have long been viewed as a cheap way of achieving. The “nuclearization” of a single state can induce a chain reaction across a region. The nuclearization of China spurred India and in turn Pakistan to follow suit, and the Argentinean and Brazilian nuclear programs fed off one another. Today the possibility that a nuclear North Korea may lead South Korea or Japan to acquire nuclear weapons is often discussed. 28 In the Middle East there are signs that Saudi Arabia is reviewing its nuclear options, and a nuclear-armed Iran may encourage the Saudis and others in the region to continue down this path. 29¶ With nuclear technology more widely available these actions can be taken much more rapidly and at less cost. Those pursuing this course of action will find it a simple matter to amass large stockpiles of nuclear weapons. It is also worth noting that even were the development of actual nuclear weapons to remain a rarity, “virtual arsenals” could be more common, leaving the nuclear weapons status of a longer list of countries uncertain, in many cases deliberately so, with a detrimental impact on the security environment.30

### Resource Wars

#### Climate change causes huge resource wars [and nuclear prolif]

Klare 2006 (Michael Klare, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, March 10, 2006, “The Coming Resource Wars,” http://goo.gl/sPH9D)

It's official: the era of resource wars is upon us. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer" -- and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely." Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects -- rather than political orientation and ideology -- as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy. Prior to Reid's address, the most significant expression of this outlook was a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by a California-based consulting firm in October 2003. Entitled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security," the report warned that global climate change is more likely to result in sudden, cataclysmic environmental events than a gradual (and therefore manageable) rise in average temperatures. Such events could include a substantial increase in global sea levels, intense storms and hurricanes and continent-wide "dust bowl" effects. This would trigger pitched battles between the survivors of these effects for access to food, water, habitable land and energy supplies. "Violence and disruption stemming from the stresses created by abrupt changes in the climate pose a different type of threat to national security than we are accustomed to today," the 2003 report noted. "Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion or national honor." Until now, this mode of analysis has failed to command the attention of top American and British policymakers. For the most part, they insist that ideological and religious differences -- notably, the clash between values of tolerance and democracy on one hand and extremist forms of Islam on the other -- remain the main drivers of international conflict. But Reid's speech at Chatham House suggests that a major shift in strategic thinking may be under way. Environmental perils may soon dominate the world security agenda. This shift is due in part to the growing weight of evidence pointing to a significant human role in altering the planet's basic climate systems. Recent studies showing the rapid shrinkage of the polar ice caps, the accelerated melting of North American glaciers, the increased frequency of severe hurricanes and a number of other such effects all suggest that dramatic and potentially harmful changes to the global climate have begun to occur. More importantly, they conclude that human behavior -- most importantly, the burning of fossil fuels in factories, power plants, and motor vehicles -- is the most likely cause of these changes. This assessment may not have yet penetrated the White House and other bastions of head-in-the-sand thinking, but it is clearly gaining ground among scientists and thoughtful analysts around the world. For the most part, public discussion of global climate change has tended to describe its effects as an environmental problem -- as a threat to safe water, arable soil, temperate forests, certain species and so on. And, of course, climate change is a potent threat to the environment; in fact, the greatest threat imaginable. But viewing climate change as an environmental problem fails to do justice to the magnitude of the peril it poses. As Reid's speech and the 2003 Pentagon study make clear, the greatest danger posed by global climate change is not the degradation of ecosystems per se, but rather the disintegration of entire human societies, producing wholesale starvation, mass migrations and recurring conflict over resources. "As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict.

### Russia

#### Climate change is the biggest internal link to Russia strategic decisions.

Cyrus Newlin and Heather A. Conley, 1-13-2021, [Cyrus Newlin Associate Fellow, Europe, Russia, and Eurasia Program; Heather A. Conley Senior Vice President for Europe, Eurasia, and the Arctic; and Director, Europe, Russia, and Eurasia Program], "Climate Change Will Reshape Russia," No Publication, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/climate-change-will-reshape-russia>, Xoxo 3.25.2021

When U.S. policymakers ponder Russia’s trajectory, they tend to focus on the leadership and longevity of President Vladimir Putin and the nature of his regime, on the Kremlin’s growing authoritarian tendencies at home and the poisoning of opposition figures, on Russia’s nuclear arsenal and cyber capabilities, or on Russia’s projection of power abroad, from election interference to military interventions in Ukraine and Syria. Rarely does climate change make the shortlist. Yet it is climate change, as much as any one politician or set of policies, that will exert the strongest force on Russia’s strategic future, reshaping its politics, economy, and society for decades to come. Russia is warming 2.5 times faster than the rest of the world. In 2020, regions across Russia have experienced the hottest temperatures on record, contributing to forest fires that burned through acreage the size of Greece and emitted one-third more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere than in 2019 (Russian forests account for one-fifth of the world’s total). Flash floods in Siberia destroyed entire villages and displaced thousands of residents. Snow coverage was at a record low in 2020, and Arctic sea ice coverage shrank to its second-lowest extent in over 40 years. Permafrost, which covers nearly two-thirds of Russian territory, is rapidly thawing. More dramatic freeze-thaw cycles in the subsoil are eroding urban infrastructure in Russia’s Arctic cities, home to over 2 million people, and pose a mounting risk to Russia’s 200,000 kilometers of oil and gas pipelines, not to mention thousands of miles of roads and rail lines bridging some of Russia’s widest rivers. Permafrost thaw recently toppled a diesel storage tank near the Arctic city of Norilsk, spilling 21,000 tons of diesel into the Ambarnaya river and surrounding subsoil. It has been linked to outbreaks of anthrax and the discovery of vast methane craters. At its current rate of thaw—about 1 degree Celsius per decade—Russia’s permafrost layer will stop freezing completely in three decades. This could result in a potentially catastrophic, one-off release of carbon into the atmosphere which will no longer be Russia’s problem alone. According to one study, a 30 to 99 percent reduction in near-surface permafrost would release an additional 10 to 240 billion tons of carbon and methane into the atmosphere and potentially put the globe “over the brink” by 2100. Russia is already the fourth-largest emitter of greenhouse gases, accounting for 4.6 percent of all global emissions. Its per capita emissions are among the highest in the world—53 percent higher than China, and 79 percent higher than the European Union. Dramatic shifts in global weather patterns, accelerated by warming Arctic waters and a diminishing ice cap, are expected to increase droughts in Russia’s rich southern agricultural “bread basket” regions encompassing Stavropol and Rostov. This could pose food security risks and threaten a primary Russian export: wheat. Though climate change will expand arable land in Russia in its northern latitudes, the northern topsoil tends to be thinner and more acidic than in Russia’s most productive southern regions and would not make up for its losses. In fact, arable land shrank by more than half to just 120,000 acres in 2017. In June of this year, regional officials in Stravopol, one of Russia’s major wheat regions, projected a remarkable 40 percent decline in wheat crop in 2020 as a result of droughts. This too has global implications: Russia is a core part of global food chains, accounting for 20 percent of global wheat exports, so climate disruption to Russian agricultural output will have strong effects well beyond Russia’s borders and budget coffers. As agriculture shifts north, scientists are concerned that the cultivation of carbon-rich soils will create a separate carbon feedback loop and expedite global warming. The Economics of Climate Change in Russia The threat to the Russian economy from climate change is twofold. An increase in droughts, floods, wildfires, permafrost damage, and disease could lower GDP by 3 percent annually in the next decade, according to Russia’s Audit Chamber. Climate damage to buildings and infrastructure alone could cost Russia up to 9 trillion rubles ($99 billion) by 2050, according to Deputy Minister for the Development of the Russian Far East and Arctic Alexander Krutikov. Meanwhile, Russia’s overreliance on hydrocarbon production is a conspicuous vulnerability as the world shifts toward low-carbon sources of energy and carbon neutrality. Natural gas and Arctic liquified natural gas may serve as bridge for Russia into a lower-carbon future, but global demand for gas is expected to be in sharp decline by mid-century. Russia’s top-down federal policy strongly favors state-led and managed industrial oil and gas giants. Though Russia has immense potential as a source of renewable energy, the share of renewables in Russia’s energy mix is negligible—under 0.1 percent for wind, solar, and geothermal—and there are no clear plans to invest significantly in their growth. Nor do current strategy documents foresee a major growth in nuclear and hydropower, which currently account for 36 percent of Russia’s electricity mix but under current plans will only climb to 43 percent by 2050. (To limit global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, renewables must account for 70-85 percent of global electricity by 2050.) How Is the Russian Government Responding? Russian climate policy at the federal and regional level is nascent and is handicapped by thinly stretched budgets. The need to respond to more environmental disasters with less money is becoming a growing friction point between regional governments and Moscow. An expected increase in extreme weather events and infrastructure degradation requires proactive planning and significant long-term investments into infrastructure modernization and resilience, forest management, and other adaptive measures, but regional governments are chronically under resourced and heavily in debt (some regions have begun to fall into bankruptcy). A reduction in international hydrocarbon demand will further constrict the federal budget just as the material costs of climate change will begin a parabolic ascent. This shrinking budget is abetted by chronic corruption and public service mismanagement—issues which, unlike climate change, are politically front and center in the minds of Russians. All of these dynamics fuel a very public blame game between regional political elite, business, and federal authorities over who bears the financial and moral responsibility for managing the consequences of climate change. Putin himself has offered mixed messaging on global warming, acknowledging for the first time only in October 2019 that global warming was a result of human activities, but just a month later he cast doubt on the prospects of a global shift to renewable energy, stating, “When these ideas of reducing energy production to zero or relying only on solar or wind power are promoted, I think humanity could once again end up in caves, simply because it won’t consume anything.” Though a growing chorus of officials are voicing concern about the economic consequences of a changing climate for Russia, the prevailing view remains one of passive resignation or misguided optimism. Some officials recognize the reality of climate change but contend that it is beyond Russia’s means to resolve and that Russia should therefore extract revenue from its abundant hydrocarbon resources while there is still global demand. Others believe Russia will benefit economically from warmer temperatures by way of an increase in arable land and greater use the Northern Sea Route for commercial shipping—a bet that makes dangerous assumptions about the ability of Russia to replace energy exports with agriculture and presumes as-yet-unproven sustained commercial interest in an Arctic shipping route. This policy ambivalence is encapsulated in Russia’s approach to the Paris climate accord. Russia signed on to the agreement in 2019 in an apparent recognition of the threat, but because it used 1990 as its benchmark, a year when the country was still part of the Soviet Union and emitted nearly 2.4 billion tons of carbon, Russia can effectively increase its emissions over the next decade and still meet its 30 percent reduction target. Russia’s emissions are set to rise through the next decade, according to a Ministry of Economic Development strategy document published in March 2020. Legislation introduced in 2019 as part of Russia’s ratification of the Paris Agreement would have instituted emissions quotas and carbon pricing, but lobbying efforts by the influential Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs significantly diluted the bill, resulting in weaker provisions on emissions reporting and the elimination of a national carbon trading system and penalties for polluters. How Is Russian Society Responding? The environment is front of mind for Russians. According to a January 2020 survey by the independent Levada Center, environmental degradation was named the biggest threat to humanity in the twenty-first century (48 percent), followed by international terrorism (42 percent) and wars (37 percent). Of Russia’s environmental challenges, respondents viewed air pollution as the most important in a year that set new records for instances of hazardous air quality in Russia, due in part to wildfires and industrial pollution. Yet the immediacy of local environmental challenges in Russia—from air pollution to waste management practice to wildfires—has not translated into broader apprehension about global warming or activism to change public policy. An April 2020 Ipsos survey found that only 13 percent of Russians ranked climate as the most important environmental issue facing their country—well below the world average of 37 percent. Russians were also comparatively less concerned about future energy sources and choices and held the lowest overall levels of support for government action to combat climate change. One contributing factor to this seeming contradiction is likely the tightening of Russia’s civic space. The imposition of “foreign agent” laws has hollowed out environmental nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in Russia and muffled voices sounding the alarm on global warming. Public support for environmental NGOs has declined in recent years even as a growing number of Russians are ready to protest over local environmental issues. Economic realities also contribute. Years of anemic economic growth, the dual shocks of Covid-19 and low oil prices, and a tight-fisted approach to fiscal stimulus has reduced the average Russian’s household wealth. The Kremlin is prioritizing jumpstarting the economy by supercharging its hydrocarbon and industrial model. For many Russians who are just getting by financially, issues such as price hikes, unemployment, and inequality supplant concern over climate change. Despite a more repressive political climate, there has been an uptick in environment-related protests in recent years. In April 2019, thousands turned out in the Arctic region of Arkhangelsk to protest the construction of a new landfill for Moscow’s ballooning waste. That summer, over 2,000 people turned out in the Ural city of Yekaterinburg to protest the construction of a church in one of the city’s few remaining green spaces. More recently, in Bashktorstan, in Russia’s southern Urals region, protests erupted over a local company’s plans to mine a rare limestone hill regarded as sacred by local residents. In general, the landscape for environmental activism in Russia is more fluid and decentralized than in the West, with informal protest groups springing up around specific, local issues and then dissipating. But though protests have been local, it is not coincidental that Russia’s Arctic, Siberian, and Far East regions—where the impacts of climate change will be concentrated—are also bearing the brunt of chronic economic underdevelopment. Importantly, these same regions are traditionally more independently political minded and less supportive of Kremlin-backed initiatives. Change Is Coming to Russia Externally Although many Russian officials will continue to emphasize the economic opportunities of climate change and downplay its consequences for Russia, they are growing concerned about the sweeping changes being made to the climate policies of major export markets, particularly the European Union, with its ambitious plans for a New Green Deal and target for carbon neutrality by 2050. An EU plan to introduce a carbon border adjustment tax, which in a baseline scenario would cost Russian exporters 33 billion euros by 2030, has forced Russian firms to confront the reality of a global shift toward low-carbon development and the rising the cost of their emissions. China, meanwhile, has pledged to be carbon neutral by 2060. A new economic reality is gaining a toehold: in December 2020, Deputy Finance Minister Vladimir Kolychev acknowledged that global peak oil demand may have passed and indicated his ministry was preparing for extended lower budget revenues (oil and gas sales account for roughly one-third of federal budget revenue). The Russian energy and industrial lobby remain influential voices against carbon emission quotas and are a primary cause of domestic climate policy stasis, but a growing number of Russian companies, including some hydrocarbon producers such as Novatek and more internationally exposed firms such as Lukoil, are moving ahead of the government to cut emissions and address sustainability issues. They have been given a push by international financial institutions and growing investor requirements for environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics. Some of Russia’s largest companies are making expensive investments into improving their sustainability ranking as low scores hit others in the pocket. Polyus, Russia’s largest gold producer, and Novatek were upgraded to an ESG ranking of “A” in 2020—ahead of many industry peers. Change Has Already Arrived Climate change will continue to compel change within Russia whether its leaders acknowledge the issue or not. The most immediate and significant thrust for change within Russia will come from the outside, as major energy export markets accelerate their environmental policies. This poses an existential threat to Russia’s economic model of hydrocarbon and mineral export, a threat heightened by years of weak domestic growth and a global economy suppressed by the pandemic. But change is also occurring from within, as climate-linked environmental disasters take their toil and as scarce state resources fail to address the growing frequency and magnitude of infrastructure decay, wildfires, local pollution, and other climate-related challenges, fueling protests and increasing tensions between regional governors and Moscow. The Russian Arctic, in particular, will be a case study in how climate change, regional political dynamics, and Russia’s economic ambitions interact, as businessmen, regional officials, and federal ministers, including key members of the Kremlin’s inner circle, jockey for state development resources but defer responsibility for funding disaster recovery and climate resilience. Our research and analysis must determine how climate change and climate policies—both internally and externally—will shape Russia’s future, and, in the near term, how the Kremlin and its fossil fuel export-based economy will—or will not—respond.

### Terror

#### Climate change causes ISIS rise and further conflict

Think Progress 15---(“The link between climate change and ISIS is real,” July 23, 2015, https://thinkprogress.org/the-link-between-climate-change-and-isis-is-real-399789412b41#.5gsutmwvp) Democratic presidential candidate Martin O’Malley linked climate change to the rise of ISIS earlier this week. [Conservatives](http://www.breitbart.com/video/2015/07/20/martin-omalley-climate-change-created-isis/) [pounced](http://dailycaller.com/2015/07/20/omalley-global-warming-created-isis/). Score this round for O’Malley.

For three years now, leading security and climate experts — and Syrians themselves — have made the connection between climate change and the Syrian civil war. Indeed, when a [major peer-reviewed study](http://www.pnas.org/content/112/11/3241.abstract) came out on in March making this very case, Retired Navy Rear Admiral David Titley [said](http://www.slate.com/blogs/future_tense/2015/03/02/study_climate_change_helped_spark_syrian_civil_war.html) it identifies “a pretty convincing climate fingerprint” for the Syrian drought. Titley, a meteorologist who led the U.S. Navy’s Task Force on Climate Change when he was at the Pentagon, also said, “you can draw a very credible climate connection to this disaster we call ISIS right now.” Compare the words of Admiral Titley — former Deputy Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Information Dominance (!) and currently Director of Penn State’s [Center for Solutions to Weather and Climate Risks](http://solutions2wxrisk.psu.edu/). — with O’Malley’s ([video here](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UKfYq24eWGg)): “One of the things that preceded the failure of the nation-state of Syria and the rise of ISIS was the effect of climate change and the mega-drought that affected that region, wiped out farmers, drove people to cities, created a humanitarian crisis that created the symptoms — or rather, the conditions — of extreme poverty that has led now to the rise of ISIL and this extreme violence.” Let’s run through the science underpinning what O’Malley, Admiral Titley, and others have said. We know that the Syrian civil war that helped drive the rise of the terrorist Islamic State of Iraq and Greater Syria (ISIS) was itself spawned in large part by what [one expert](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2012/03/03/437051/syria-climate-change-drought-and-social-unrest/) called perhaps “the worst long-term drought and most severe set of crop failures since agricultural civilizations began in the Fertile Crescent,” from 2006 to 2010. That drought destroyed the livelihood of 800,000 people according to the U.N. and sent vastly more into poverty. The poor and displaced fled to cities, “where poverty, government mismanagement and other factors created unrest that exploded in spring 2011,” as the study’s [news release](http://www.news.ucsb.edu/2015/015046/perfect-storm) explains. The [March 2015 study](http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2015/02/23/1421533112), “Climate change in the Fertile Crescent and implications of the recent Syrian drought,” found that global warming made Syria’s 2006 to 2010 drought two to three times more likely. “While we’re not saying the drought caused the war,” lead author Dr. Colin Kelley explained. “We are saying that it certainly contributed to other factors — agricultural collapse and mass migration among them — that caused the uprising.” The study identifies “a pretty convincing climate fingerprint” for the Syrian drought, Admiral Titley told [Slate](http://www.slate.com/blogs/future_tense/2015/03/02/study_climate_change_helped_spark_syrian_civil_war.html) at the time. Titley is the former COO of NOAA. In particular, the study finds that climate change is already drying the region out in two ways: “First, weakening wind patterns that bring rain-laden air from the Mediterranean reduced precipitation during the usual November-to-April wet season. In addition, higher temperatures increased moisture evaporation from soils during the usually hot summers.” This study and others make clear that for large parts of the not-terribly-stable region around Syria — including Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, and parts of Turkey and Iraq — brutal multi-year droughts are poised to become the norm in the coming decades if we don’t reverse carbon pollution trends ASAP. Climate models had long predicted that the countries surrounding the Mediterranean would start drying out. In general, climate science says dry areas will get dryer and wet areas wetter. In 2011, a major NOAA study [concluded](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2011/10/27/355639/noaa-climate-change-mediterranean-droughts/) that “human-caused climate change [is now] a major factor in more frequent Mediterranean droughts.” Reds and oranges highlight lands around the Mediterranean that experienced significantly drier winters during 1971–2010 than the comparison period of 1902–2010. Via NOAA [Click to enlarge]. “The magnitude and frequency of the drying that has occurred is too great to be explained by natural variability alone,” explained Dr. Martin Hoerling of NOAA’s Earth System Research Laboratory, the lead author of the 2011 study. The connection between the conflict in Syria and climate change is not new. In March 2012, Climate Progress [published](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/03/437051/syria-climate-change-drought-social-unrest/) a piece by Francesco Femia and Caitlin Werrell, co-founders and directors of the Center for Climate and Security, which made the case for the link between climate change and events in Syria. In 2013, Tom Friedman went to Syria to learn firsthand about the connection between the drought and the civil war. His New York Times column, “[Without Water, Revolution](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/19/opinion/sunday/friedman-without-water-revolution.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0),” explains what he discovered. Friedman also filmed his visit, where he talked to actual Syrians about the causes of the civil war. It was for the premiere episode in April 2014 of the Emmy-winning Showtime series, “[Years of Living Dangerously](http://yearsoflivingdangerously.com/),” which can be viewed on Netflix [right here](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=brvhCnYvxQQ). Many other recent studies have been done on this subject, such as “[Water, Drought, Climate Change, and Conflict in Syria](http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/WCAS-D-13-00059.1?journalCode=wcas)” by climate and water expert Peter Gleick. Perhaps the central takeaway from this area of research is that the greatest danger to humanity this century from human-caused climate change is [Dust-Bowlification](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/10/02/3572205/warming-dust-bowlify/) and the threat to our food supplies and hence global security. That’s because large parts of the most inhabited and arable parts of the planet — including the U.S. breadbasket — face the exact same heating and drying that have already affected the Mediterranean. The 2014 study, “[Global warming and 21st century drying](http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~bc9z/cook_pdsi_clidyn_REV_v01.pdf),” projected this bleak future: The bottom line: Homo sapiens is currently on track to make drought and extreme drying the normal condition for the Southwest, Central Plains, the Amazon, southern Europe, the entire region around the Mediterranean, and many other key areas post-2050. As Femia bluntly told an interviewer in 2013, the time to act is now: “if you let this problem get out of hand you’re going to have a number of situations in the future, whether they’re major disasters or conflicts, that our security forces may have to respond to. It will cost us a lot more in the long term if we do nothing now.” Returning to O’Malley’s comments, it’s pretty clear that they are quite reasonable and defensible. Personally, because the causes of war and terrorism are so complicated and interconnected, I prefer to say things like “climate change HELPED create conditions for rise of ISIS.” Not that nuanced phrasing will not spare anyone the attacks from the anti-science crowd.

### Failed States

#### Sea level rise and resource depletion foster failed states.

Sipho Kings, 4-1-2017, [Sipho Kings is the acting editor-in-chief of the Mail & Guardian], "​Climate change brings failed states and violent conflict," Mail & Guardian, <https://mg.co.za/article/2017-04-25-climate-change-brings-failed-states-and-violent-conflict/>, Xoxo 8/10/2020

With states struggling to respond to rapid changes in climate, capturing ever more scarce resources such as Tabqa is becoming a powerful weapon for their enemies. This is according to a new report, Insurgency, Terrorism and Organised Crime in a Warming Climate, by the German think-tank, Adelphi. The report looks at how “non-state armed groups” are capitalising on the rapidly shifting climate to exercise more control over parts of the world. The report comes as Islamic State and Kurdish forces fight over control of the dam, which has been central to the Islamic State’s control of northern Syria for much of this decade. It goes back to the outbreak of civil war in the country in 2011. In part, the civil war itself has been attributed to changes in Syria’s climate. Ten of the 12 driest years in the area have been in the past 20 years. By 2007, water use in Syria exceeded supply by 20%. Then came a five-year drought, the worst in recorded history. Crops failed. Herders lost 85% of their livestock. More than a million people moved to cities. The combination of social pressure and political repression led to civil war. The Adelphi report says this can be attributed to “climatic changes and the way they contributed to eroding the social contract in Syria”. Since then, water has played a key role in the way the different sides have fought the war. In 2014, many reports said both the regime and opposition forces were cutting water to Aleppo to weaken each other. Adelphi says: “In other cases, rebel groups diverted water to supply only those neighbourhoods that they controlled, causing severe harm [to] civilians and farmers dependent on irrigation.” The Islamic State, which controlled territory along Syria’s major rivers, used water to both harm and control communities. In 2015, the group closed the gates of the Ramadi Dam to dry up land for an offensive. In other cases, it has flooded areas to force people to move out. In 2014, when it was pushed out of Iraqi towns, it poisoned drinking water with crude oil. When the group does control areas, it uses water to raise income. Adelphi’s research says: “Control over and effective distribution of water can also help Islamic State gain legitimacy and work towards its goal of establishing a caliphate.” Syria and its Tabqa Dam is just one example of how armed groups are using the control of water — a resource becoming ever more scarce because of climate change — to gain power. These groups have also grown in number since the end of the Cold War. The United Nations says, since 2004, the number of non-state armed groups involved in civil conflicts has increased fourfold. Several different groups have linked this rise to the inability of states to respond to changing climate and the collapse of ecosystems that people rely on. The United States department of defence, in its 2014 climate change adaptation road map, referred to climate change as a “threat multiplier”. The department says this is because climate change “has the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today — from infectious disease to terrorism. We are already beginning to see some of these impacts.” The G7 group of countries has made similar statements, as has the UN. Its Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has said climate change will add pressure to existing problems, with dire consequences for communities who are close to breaking point. States that are already weak are most at risk but nowhere is safe. “Seemingly stable states can be overburdened by the combined pressures of climate change, population growth, urbanisation, environmental degradation and rising socioeconomic inequalities”, the Adelphi report says. And when states are overburdened, it is non-state armed groups such as the Islamic State and Boko Haram that have tended to benefit. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the five African countries, containing about 38-million people, that rely on the clean waters of Lake Chad, around which Boko Haram is active. Nigeria’s environment ministry says its northeastern provinces, which experience frequent drought and rely on the lake to act as a buffer, used to get rain for 150 days a year in the 1970s. They only now get 120 days of rain. The average temperature in those provinces has increased by 0.8˚C, and the Sahara is moving south at between one kilometre and 10km a year. The annual fish catch from the lake has also dropped from 140 000 tonnes a year in 1970 to just 80 000 tonnes. Lake Chad is now 10% of the size that it was five decades ago, which, Adelphi’s research says, has resulted in fewer resources and has made livelihoods less secure. It has “exacerbated tensions between pastoralists, farmers and fishers”. These groups have all crowded in on each other in an attempt to get to the lake’s dwindling water. Traditional authorities, which used to resolve disputes over access to land and water, have fallen apart with the creation of local government in countries such as Nigeria. But, Adelphi says, these new authorities have not stepped in to resolve the crisis. Instead, Boko Haram has moved into the vacuum, creating local governance structures to replace the failing state. When this doesn’t work, it has — like the Islamic State in Syria — resorted to a stranglehold on natural resources “as a weapon”. In Niger, this has been catastrophic. Fishing communities are going hungry because they cannot get food from Lake Chad, because Boko Haram uses the lake as a base from which to launch attacks. Farmers have also been affected, with the group cutting off their access to water and fertiliser. When the government sends forces to an area, Boko Haram has poisoned wells and streams, according to reports. Acts such as this are projected to become the new normal. Adelphi says climate change is creating “vicious cycles of increasing climate impacts, vulnerability, violence, conflict and fragility”.

### Democracy

#### Warming turns democracy

Samuel Miller, 7-30-2018, [Samuel Miller McDonald studies climate and energy politics at Oxford University.], "This May Be the Most Overlooked Threat of Climate Change," New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/article/148861/climate-change-authoritarian-leaders>, Xoxo 7/14/2020

National crises make governments vulnerable to autocracy—a rather obvious assessment, perhaps, but one rarely seen in debates about climate change. Take the Maldives, an atoll nation in the Indian Ocean. Rising seawater is projected to consume most, if not all, of the country this century. In 2008, the Maldives chose its first democratically elected president, Mohamed Nasheed. Almost immediately, he made climate change preparations central to his administration. He announced plans to move 360,000 Maldivian citizens to new homelands in Sri Lanka, India, or Australia, and he promised to make the Maldives the world’s first carbon-neutral country. Nasheed also demonstrated a flair for the dramatic, staging an underwater Cabinet meeting that turned him into a viral climate celebrity. “What we need to do is nothing short of decarbonizing the entire global economy,” he said. “If man can walk on the moon, we can unite to defeat our common carbon enemy.” In 2012, the military deposed Nasheed, forcing him to flee the country at gunpoint after mass protests over economic stagnation and spikes in commodity prices. His eventual successor, Abdulla Yameen, has since suspended parts of the constitution, giving himself sweeping powers to arrest and detain opponents, including two of the country’s five Supreme Court justices and even his own half-brother. Meanwhile, Yameen has tossed out Nasheed’s climate adaptation plans and rejected renewable energy programs, proposing instead to build new islands and economic free zones attractive to a global elite. “We do not need cabinet meetings underwater,” his environment minister told The Guardian. “We do not need to go anywhere. We need development.” If any lesson can be drawn from the power struggle in the Maldives, it is that people who feel threatened by an outside force, be it foreign invaders or rising tides, often seek reassurance. That reassurance may come in the form of a strongman leader, someone who tells them all will be well, the economy will soar, the sea walls hold. People must only surrender their elections, or their due process, until the crisis is resolved. This is perhaps the most overlooked threat of climate change: Major shifts in the global climate could give rise to a new generation of authoritarian rulers, not just in poorer countries or those with weak democratic institutions, but in wealthy industrialized nations, too. Number of the Maldives’ inhabited islands that flood annually: 37 of 185 Number that will eventually need to be abandoned: 61 The Maldives’ Freedom House Rating: Dropped 20 percentage points since Nasheed was deposed Sources: The United Nations; The Guardian; Freedom House Refugee crises, famine, drought—these are materials strongmen can use to build power. Already, strife and civil instability are spreading throughout the global South, with droughts and floods stoking conflict and refugee crises in parts of Africa and the Middle East. According to a 2016 paper in Science, climate change will increase the risk of armed conflict across Africa by 50 percent by 2030. Eastern Africa is particularly vulnerable. The genocidal strife in Darfur is one of the bloodiest examples, but even countries with robust economies and democracies are susceptible. In Kenya, for example, a crippling drought has led to rapid inflation of food prices, doubling the number of food-insecure people since 2014. That, and disputes over who owns land in the Laikipia region, north of Nairobi, has contributed to violent clashes there, threatening the political stability of the country. This has enabled Kenya’s President Uhuru Kenyatta to tighten his grip on power. In October, amid reports that he’d rigged a recent presidential election, Kenyatta declared the drought a national disaster—this, just weeks before the next round of voting. He was reelected and, amid continued chaos, has cracked down on his opponents in the media. It’s not just developing nations that are at risk of opportunistic climate-fueled authoritarianism. Wealthy countries may possess the resources to insulate themselves from the near-term physical impacts of climate change—they can afford sea walls, emergency services, and air conditioning. But when conflicts over resources break out in the developing world, they are bound to generate crises that spill into wealthier countries. Refugee crises, famine, drought—these are materials strongmen can use to build power. Civil instability is already spreading in the global South. A study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2015 drew a direct link between the 2007–2010 drought in the greater Fertile Crescent, which “exacerbated existing water and agricultural insecurity and caused massive agricultural failures and livestock mortality,” and Syria’s 2011 civil war, which has forced millions of people to seek refuge in Europe. Their arrival has helped fuel antidemocratic movements throughout the continent. “Even the specter of refugee crises and population movements can impact attitudes toward authoritarianism,” said Jonathan Weiler, co-author of Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics. These fears aren’t going away: According to a 2017 study published in The Lancet, extreme weather could displace up to a billion people around the world by the middle of the twenty-first century—an unprecedented human migration will undoubtedly influence the politics of wealthy countries, pushing them to the right. The best way to counteract this phenomenon is naturally to halt, or at least slow, the effects of climate change. So far, the Paris agreement is the only tangible result of those efforts, and its fate is far from certain, with the United States threatening to withdraw. But this might change, if the problems caused by climate change—not just stronger hurricanes, droughts, and rising seas, but political rupture—keep washing up on the disappearing shorelines of wealthy governments.

### Structural Violence

#### Climate turns structural violence.

Eric Bonds, Department of Sociology and Anthropology University of Mary Washington, Virginia, United States, 2015, Upending Climate Violence Research: Fossil Fuel Corporations and the Structural Violence of Climate Change, <http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n2023/pdf/ch01.pdf>, Xoxo 6/5/2020

There is a high-profile body of work asserting a link between anthropogenic climate change and increased rates of violence. There is also an expanding literature that is highly skeptical of this research. Critics point out that (1) this research has so far produced widely divergent findings, and that there is no consensus on a causal link between climate and the incidence of conflict. Critics also argue that much climate violence research (2) draws upon a longdiscredited environmental determinism, (3) rehashes colonial stereotypes of the global South, (4) naturalizes and depoliticizes inequalities within and between nations, and (5) potentially creates new rationales for militarism and intervention from more powerful states. In the following essay, I build on these critiques, arguing that orthodox climate conflict research also focuses unduly on the potential climate-related violence of the poor, overlooking the violence of the powerful. Drawing from a climate justice perspective, I advocate for more study on the structural violence of climate change. To make this case, I focus on the world’s largest publicly traded fossil fuel companies. Keywords: climate conflict, climate justice, fossil fuel corporations, fossil fuel divestment, structural violence Introduction Will climate change make the world a more violent place? This is one of the more important questions of our time. There are a growing number of warnings coming from influential places about the relationship between climate change and violence. The United States government, for instance, has increasingly labeled global warming a “threat multiplier” (Banusiewicz, 2014; CNA, 2007). 1 Author contact: ebonds@umw.edu. Human Ecology Review, Volume 22, Number 2, 2016 4 Additionally, prominent journalists and policy analysts at important think tanks and advocacy groups have worked to highlight potential connections between global warming and conflict (see for instance EJF, 2014; Friedman, 2013; Werrell & Fernia, 2013). And headlines at major newspapers, for example in the Washington Post, report “there’s a surprisingly strong link between climate change and violence” (Mooney, 2014). But how we answer the question—“will climate change create a more violent future?”—has much to do with the definitions we use. On one hand, the jury is very much out in terms of proving a causal relationship between climate change and increasing conflict. While some research, published in some of the world’s most prestigious journals, has found what the authors describe as a strong link between climatic changes and rates of violence (see Burke et al., 2009; Hsiang et al., 2013), other research, sometimes published in the same journals, has found no such correlation (Buhaug, 2010a, 2010b; Wischnath & Buhaug, 2014). There is, in fact, no consensus among quantitative researchers about the existence of a causal link between changes in temperature and rainfall and increasing violence (Buhaug, 2015; Selby, 2014). As the body of research on a potential climate violence relationship has grown, so too has the number of its critics. An increasing number of authors worry that quantitative climate conflict research, as the next reincarnation of a long-discredited environmental determinism, is simply old wine in a new bottle (Hartmann, 2014; Raleigh et al., 2014). Moreover, according to critics, this research draws upon colonial stereotypes of the global South, implying that its peoples are somehow more predisposed to violence than those of European ancestry (Livingstone, 2015; Raleigh et al., 2014; Selby, 2014; Verhoeven, 2014). Finally, this research implies that the violence of poor people in the most peripheral areas of the global economy is “natural,” hiding from view the ways that histories of colonialism and the contemporary global political economy have conditioned and produced violent conflict (Hartmann, 2010, 2014; Verhoeven, 2011, 2014). Why, given all these problems, has orthodox climate conflict research continued to flourish, and to enjoy such a high public profile? Critics warn that this is because the perspective so closely matches, and is so useful to, governments that are securitizing the issue of climate change and using it as a means to legitimate militarism and ongoing interventions in the global South (Hartmann, 2010, 2014; Selby, 2014; Verhoeven, 2014). Given all the problems with orthodox climate violence research, does this mean that it is safe to say that climate change will not make the world a more violent place? Hardly. I advance instead that anthropogenic climate change is itself a kind of violence (Solnit, 2014). After all, it will certainly cause early deaths and it will drive people from their homes and homelands, all of which will cause untold suffering. Drawing upon a climate justice perspective, I provide here a brief overview of orthodox climate conflict research and further describe its Upending Climate Violence Research 5 critics’ concerns. I add to their critique by arguing that this body of research, as a whole, focuses almost exclusively on the potential violence of the poor, overlooking the violence of the wealthy and powerful groups who benefit most from, and actively work to sustain, a fossil fuel–dependent neoliberal capitalism. To begin amending this bias in the climate violence literature, I draw upon work in sociology, green criminology, and geography to argue that major fossil fuel companies are disproportionately responsible for, and have disproportionately benefited from, the structural violence of climate change.

## A2 Theory

### 2NC – A2 intrinsic

#### Our politics DA is intrinsic

1. We read links that prove the plan will have political consequences that affect agenda items. Congress isn’t a single actor.

2. Their interpretation kills negative ground-they can cross apply the same argument to trade-off and spending arguments.

3. Empirical intrinsicness checks-running arguments that a congressperson would pass both is fine-but you can’t advocate that it should or could happen.

### 2NC – AT: Fiat Solves the Link

#### Fiat doesn’t solve the link

#### Our interpretation of fiat is that the plan will be put at the top of the agenda and pass the next time congress is in session, its normal means which the plan endorses. This is best for debate-

#### Education-our interpretation allows education on the political process, while preserving the benefits of other plan-specific education

#### Most real world-no policy is magically enacted overnight without any political discussion, this would make the plan the most extraordinary event in the history of parliamentary process

#### Still links-the plan would cause democratic congressional backlash and collapse focus.

## Affirmative Answers

### Won’t pass

#### Won’t pass – Dems will insist on including immigration provisions in the final reconciliation which Republicans won’t accept.

JEFFREY MERVIS JUN 22 2022 https://www.science.org/content/article/democrats-lobby-high-tech-immigration-reforms-innovation-bill-congress

The COMPETES Act passed the House with the support of only one Republican lawmaker. And there are no such immigration provisions in the Senate version, which won significant Republican support. That means Lofgren and her Democratic colleagues must convince enough Senate Republicans that these narrowly focused changes to current immigration policy belong in the final bill because they are essential to sustaining U.S. innovation. A hearing last week by a Senate judiciary subcommittee on immigration made public those deep partisan divisions. The 14 June hearing focused on the plight of so-called Dreamers—undocumented immigrants living in the United States since they were children who have been given a temporary reprieve from deportation through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. But that program, created in 2012, faces legal challenges that could soon lead to its termination. Some DACA recipients are early-career scientists, like Dalia Larios, a resident in radiation oncology at Harvard Medical School who came to the United States from Mexico at the age of 10. Larios was the first DACA recipient to enter Harvard Medical School, and she testified about how students like her are eager to remain and apply their talents to bolster U.S. economic growth. The panel’s Republicans readily acknowledged the contributions of immigrant scientists and engineers to U.S. innovation. But some suggested it was premature to make new rules for foreign-born researchers before deciding how to deal with other groups, such as the Dreamers. “Between DACA and STEM entrepreneurs, what should be Congress’s priority?” Senator John Cornyn (R–TX), a key backer of the Senate innovation bill, asked Larios, who declined to choose. Speaking to ScienceInsider after the hearing, Cornyn said he’s worried that adding the House immigration provisions to the final product would put the entire bill in jeopardy. “Immigration is not the primary purpose of [the Senate innovation bill],” Cornyn said. “And based on my experience here, I think that the more it deals with immigration, the harder it will be to get it passed.” Other Republican senators believe border security must come first, and they don’t trust U.S. universities hosting foreign-born scientists to safeguard national security. If anything, said Senator Marsha Blackburn (R–TN), the new visa category and other provisions will make it easier for enemies of the United States to pilfer emerging technologies. Bernard Burrola, a senior officer at the 230-member Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, which backs a pathway to citizenship for DACA recipients and Lofgren’s provisions, rejected Blackburn’s premise. “We take this topic incredibly seriously,” he told Blackburn when she asked whether international academic collaborations pose a threat to national security. “And we work closely with the FBI to identify, understand, and ameliorate any risks.” Senator Alex Padilla (D–CA), who chaired last week’s hearing, urged his Republican colleagues to embrace the immigration provisions in the House bill. “I hope we made it abundantly clear today that they are in the national interest, not just from an economic standpoint but also from the standpoint of national security,” Padilla said after the hearing. “Tapping the best talent from around the world has given us our competitive edge, and that needs to continue.” But Padilla also acknowledged that Democrats are a long way from closing a deal. “I do think immigration reform is central to the [final innovation] bill,” he told ScienceInsider. “But I guess we have more work to do to convince [Republicans] of that.”

#### China bill won’t pass – no agreement on loophole language and tech giants.

Cristiano Lima June 10 2022 Pelosi fears tech giants will exploit wrinkle in China competition bill, sources say https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/06/10/pelosi-fears-tech-giants-will-exploit-wrinkle-china-competition-bill-sources-say/

For weeks, consumer advocates have sounded the alarm that trade language in the massive China competition bill under negotiation on Capitol Hill could be exploited by the tech giants to target regulations overseas, including Europe’s sweeping new digital rules. It’s a concern that’s shared by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), people familiar with the matter told The Technology 202. At odds is a portion of the legislation that’s ostensibly aimed at “addressing censorship and barriers to digital trade” in countries like China, but one that groups fear contains loopholes that could be co-opted by major corporations. Under the Senate version of the bill, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) would be required to identify and report on countries “that engage in acts, policies, or practices that disrupt digital trade activities,” including censorship. It’s a process that can lead to tariffs, and that advocates say could be weaponized to exert pressure on tech regulations overseas. On Friday, a transatlantic coalition of consumer groups wrote a letter to congressional leadership warning that the language has been crafted too broadly and could be used by tech companies to claim that rules overseas seeking to promote online safety or crack down on competitive abuses qualify as “censorship” or as “barriers to digital trade.” The groups said in the letter shared exclusively with The Technology 202 that it may “undermine the European Union’s superior regulatory framework to protect consumers online.” The Coalition for App Fairness, a group of smaller app developers including Match Group and Basecamp that is pushing for new tech regulations, also voiced concern last month in a separate letter obtained by The Technology 202 that the language “could be interpreted to undermine critical efforts to restore fairness and competition to the digital app economy.” Another coalition of consumer and anti-monopoly groups took aim at the language last month. The provision is a key point of contention for consumer advocates as talks enter a pivotal stretch on Capitol Hill, where the House and Senate will need to hammer out differences between their versions of the bill, aimed at boosting competitiveness with China. The concerns are shared by key House lawmakers, including Pelosi, said the people familiar with the matter, who spoke anonymously to discuss private talks. It could emerge as a flash point in negotiations as the two chambers look to finalize the highly watched package. During a hearing last June, Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-Ill.) urged colleagues to reject what she called the “effort to entrench Big Tech’s … failed [business] models” in the bill by Sens. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) and Mike Crapo (R-Idaho), who authored part of the Senate trade title. Schakowsky confirmed the remarks were in reference to the section on censorship and barriers to digital trade, among other provisions. “This is exactly the wrong approach, and as a conferee I will fight to make sure this bad approach stays out,” Schakowsky, who is in the group negotiating the bill, said in a statement. Pelosi's staff has told House members she shares the concerns, according to two people familiar with the matter. A senior congressional aide added “there’s no daylight” between Schakowsky and Pelosi. Another senior congressional aide, who was not authorized to speak on the record, said the “House position is reflected in what is and what isn’t included in the trade-related measures which were carefully crafted to have the votes to be able to pass the House.”

#### Not unique - China bills can’t be reconciled and won’t pass

[Patricia Zengerle](https://www.reuters.com/authors/patricia-zengerle/) and [David Shepardson](https://www.reuters.com/authors/david-shepardson/) May 4 2022 U.S. Senate moves to launch formal talks on massive China competition bill https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-congress-edges-toward-massive-china-competition-bill-with-votes-iran-energy-2022-05-04/

The Senate also voted 86-12 on a motion arguing terrorism-related sanctions on Iran are necessary to limit cooperation between China and Iran. Such provisions could complicate delicate negotiations on the nuclear deal, although western officials have largely lost hope that the pact can be resurrected after then-Republican President Donald Trump abandoned it in 2018. [read more](https://www.reuters.com/world/iran-nuclear-deal-near-death-west-not-ready-pull-plug-2022-05-02/) They also could make it more difficult to pass the chips and China competition bill, which has been working its way through Congress for nearly a year. Another Republican-sponsored motion was approved on a 49-47 vote that would seek language to bar President Joe Biden from using climate change to declare an emergency to expand executive branch powers. The Senate first passed a version of the semiconductor chips and China competition bill in June, with strong bipartisan support. That $250 billion bill was hailed as potentially the most significant government intervention in manufacturing in decades, but stalled in the House. [read more](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-senate-set-pass-sweeping-bill-address-china-tech-threat-2021-06-08/) The House passed a version in February 2022 that had $52 billion in chips funding but significant differences on other provisions. [read more](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-house-set-pass-sweeping-vote-china-competition-bill-2022-02-04/)

### Thumpers

#### Congress just passed and continues to work on gun control measures

Clare Foran, Kristin Wilson and Annie Grayer, CNN House passes first major federal gun safety legislation in decades, bill will next go to Biden for signature Updated 3:07 PM ET, Fri June 24, 2022 https://www.cnn.com/2022/06/24/politics/house-vote-bipartisan-safer-communities-act/index.html

The House passed a bipartisan bill on Friday to address gun violence that amounts to the first major federal gun safety legislation in decades. The final tally was 234 to 193 [with 14 Republicans](http://www.cnn.com/2022/06/24/politics/house-republicans-gun-bill/index.html) voting with Democrats to approve the measure. Now that the House has passed the bill, it will go to President Joe Biden to be signed into law, marking a significant bipartisan breakthrough on one of the most contentious policy issues in Washington. The Senate [passed the bill](https://www.cnn.com/2022/06/23/politics/senate-bipartisan-gun-bill/index.html) in a late-night vote Thursday. [The measure includes](https://www.cnn.com/2022/06/21/politics/whats-in-senate-gun-reform-bill/index.html) millions of dollars for mental health, school safety, crisis intervention programs and incentives for states to include juvenile records in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

#### Biden calling for temporary suspension of gas tax

AMIE PARNES - 06/21/22 9:28 PM ET Biden expected to urge Congress to temporarily suspend gas tax https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/3532170-biden-expected-to-urge-congress-to-temporarily-suspend-gas-tax/

President [Biden](https://thehill.com/people/biden/) on Wednesday is expected to call on Congress to temporarily suspend the gas tax during the summer months, according to sources familiar with the plan. Biden will ask that Congress assist in lifting the 18 cent tax per gallon on regular gasoline during the busy summer months, a source said. The White House has been weighing a recommendation on a federal gas tax holiday for the past week, The Hill first reported, as gas prices topped $5 per gallon on average nationally. Already high gas prices have been exacerbated by Russian President [Vladimir Putin’s](https://thehill.com/people/vladimir-putin/) war in Ukraine.

### PC Spent Already

#### PC on China bills is already spent---the bills have been debated for over a year

Joseph Clark March 22 2022 The Washington Times, “China competition bill set to advance to final negotiations in Congress after months of delays”, https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2022/mar/22/china-competition-bill-set-advance-final-negotiati/

The [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) has forged ahead with a long-stalled bill to promote U.S. production of microprocessor chips to better compete with China, preparing to inch the legislation forward and into a tough round of negotiations with the [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/). President Biden has pressed Congress for quick passage of the sweeping legislation but key differences remain between the [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) and [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) versions. The [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) version is the $250 billion U.S. Innovation and Competition Act. The [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) counterpart is the $335 billion America COMPETES Act. After months of stalls, [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) Majority Leader Charles E. Schumer set up the votes to get the legislation into a bicameral conference committee to begin reconciling the two bills. “This legislation has been dissected and debated for well over a year now,” Mr. Schumer, New York Democrat, said on the [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) floor Tuesday. “But the need to pass this bill really boils down to two simple words: J-O-B-S, jobs and C-O-S-T-S costs.” Both the [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) and [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) versions include a $52 billion boost for semiconductor manufacturing to combat a chip shortage. “There’s nothing abstract about the shortage of chips,” Mr. Schumer said. “It impacts Americans’ abilities to buy cars, refrigerators, phones, and other household items. By passing bipartisan legislation that invests in domestic chip production, we can help alleviate this vexing chips crisis.” The [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) version first passed in June with the support of 18 Republicans and 50 Democrats. But the nearly 3,000-page [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) version also includes a hodgepodge of spending including $8 billion to help developing countries address climate change, funding to make the U.S. less reliant on Chinese solar technology and $45 billion to shore up U.S. supply chains. [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) Republicans railed against the bill, which passed 222 to 210 last month, as a “foreign policy failure” that funnels taxpayer dollars into an “unaccountable U.N. slush fund” without addressing threats to U.S. national security posed by China. [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) Republicans also voiced frustration with the process, saying they were sidelined while Democrats wrote the bill. Sen. Todd Young, an Indiana Republican who worked on the [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) version, said he is committed to making the final bill more palatable for [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) Republicans. The bill is a priority for Democrats and its passage would be a big win for Mr. Biden, who has been hobbled by a string of legislative defeats. Mr. Biden also has struggled to untangle a global supply chain hobbled by shipping delays and backlogs. And, the U.S. has been edged out of semiconductor manufacturing in recent decades by overseas producers. On Monday, Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo urged lawmakers to quickly move the legislation through Congress. “The situation as it relates to semiconductors is quite dire,” Ms. Raimondo said in a call with senators of both parties. Ms. Raimondo brought in former Trump administration officials, for the call including former national security adviser H.R. McMaster, to help sway lawmakers. During the call, Mr. Young said he welcomed the start of formal negotiations between the [House](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/house/) and [Senate](https://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/senate/) but wanted an open process “with input from all of my colleagues and consistent with what we call around here regular order.” “I know the vote will not be unanimous and that both parties and members of both parties are going to have to make principled compromises, principled concessions, in order to get an agreement done,” he said. “That’s always what happens when you approach a negotiating table. But America and the world will be better off with a bipartisan, broadly supported final product.”

### Winners win

#### Winners win

Paul Kane 2021, Senior Congressional Correspondent and Columnist at the Washington Post, “Day-to-day, Biden’s Agenda Looks Rocky. But Congressional Democrats Say Things Are Far Rosier If You Take The Long View.”, Washington Post, 7/24/2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/biden-agenda-democrats-congress/2021/07/24/83b776be-ebc0-11eb-ba5d-55d3b5ffcaf1\_story.html

There is, so far at least, little fear that Democrats are spreading themselves too thin by eschewing the traditional practice of focusing on a handful of domestic policy issues in the first two years of an administration. “Political momentum and political capital is like a muscle. The more you exercise it, the more of it you have. It is not like a finite resource that you can run out of if you spend too much of it. What happens is that if we do a lot of positive things, then we’ve got more political clout to do even more positive things,” Sen. Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii) said.

#### Winners win---legislative successes continue and build

Phil Mattingly 2021, “Biden wanted to remind Democrats what it was like to win. Now he's aiming to capitalize on that momentum.,” CNN, 11-9-2021, https://www.cnn.com/2021/11/09/politics/joe-biden-infrastructure-bill-momentum/index.html

When President Joe Biden worked the phones for hours late into Friday night to push through his massive infrastructure bill, what he really wanted was to show Democrats what it felt like to win. After months of missed deadlines, simmering distrust and political fallout, White House officials now hope success can breed success. The victory came at a critical moment for a party and a President mired in months of internecine legislative warfare that had largely overshadowed the actual policies in question. Getting the $1.2 trillion package over the line is viewed by the White House and its Democratic allies as a moment where some trust -- however fragile -- has been established between the party's different factions, giving Democrats the chance to finally turn the corner. "It helps when you succeed on something and everybody sees and figures out what it feels like to win and get something done," a senior administration official said. "It creates momentum." "Momentum" is hardly a scientific concept, and there aren't any misconceptions inside the West Wing about the complicated high-wire act required in the weeks ahead to clinch the $2 trillion economic and climate package that makes up the second piece of Biden's domestic agenda, officials say. But the hours of frenzied Friday night negotiations, in close coordination with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, led to something that has been missing throughout weeks of fits and starts, missed deadlines and delicate balancing act between moderates and progressives: An outcome. Biden is planning to capitalize on that victory by inviting scores of lawmakers to the White House for a formal signing ceremony next week, officials say. It's the type of event where eager members of Congress angle for a photo-op or signing pen -- something that has remained out of reach on Biden's central agenda items until now. In isolation, it doesn't resolve the existing policy divides facing Democrats on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue on the second piece of Biden's agenda. But it does give lawmakers, who for months have clashed over the direction of the bills, something to celebrate -- and sell back home. "Now comes the hard part," one House Democrat told CNN early Saturday morning. It was a sentiment largely echoed by more than a dozen participants in the process throughout the weekend. But if the need to reconcile a series of policy thickets remains, there is a sense that the party dynamics may have, in fact, shifted in the frenzied final late-night hours that cleared the way to pass Biden's $1.2 trillion infrastructure proposal. "You see that whatever the things that are dividing you or separating you, it helps to clarify that actually we agree on a hell of a lot more," the official said. That process, arduous and painful as it may have been -- both politically and in terms of the caucus dynamics -- finally led to a breakthrough. Now that breakthrough needs to translate into action on the broader and more transformational economic and climate package. That's exactly what White House officials are banking on. "It ain't over yet as they say the old expression goes, but I feel good," Biden told reporters on Monday after an event celebrating the defending NBA Champion Milwaukee Bucks. "I think people have realized, are beginning to realize it's important to get it done." Biden draws a line in the sand The agreement drove the players leading those clashes together to reach a deal, culminating in a massive piece of legislation passing the House. In a party driven -- in the words of one House Democrat -- "not by mistrust, but by no trust," it was an important development. It also came at a critical moment for Biden, with his poll numbers sitting at their lowest point of his first year in office and just days after Democrats emerged from an election night that saw their nominee for governor in Virginia -- a state Biden won by 10 points just one year ago -- lose. "I think the one message that came across was: Get something done," Biden told reporters of the role in the Virginia governor's race in the outcome. "It's time to get something done. " Biden, who for weeks took quiet criticism from House Democrats for not publicly drawing a harder line on what he wanted, pivoted hard to do exactly that during those final hours -- something Pelosi explicitly called for, people involved told CNN. But reaching that point was a progression, officials said, developed over months of negotiations, private conversations, blown deadlines, intraparty recriminations and -- in some cases -- what many Democrats viewed as missed opportunities. It was, for better or worse, all part of the process for a new administration and congressional Democrats adjusting to full control in Washington for the first time in decade. "It's getting to know a lot of these people, to build trust," Biden told reporters the day after the bill passed. "Because everything I say I'm going to try to do, I will try to do. And I think that's also part of the process." A Senate veteran learns more about the House Biden's point is a window into the last several months, where a 36-year veteran of the Senate -- who often makes clear in private settings his view that he has an innate sense for Capitol Hill -- faced his own learning curve, particularly in the House. The party dynamics have shifted, with progressives carrying not just a voice, but the votes to dictate what will or won't advance. Many came to office in the four years after Biden left Washington. Even more had never served in the majority with a Democratic president. Exacerbating it all were the barest of majorities in the House and Senate, making Biden's ambitious policy agenda -- which progressives overwhelmingly supported -- even more complicated to advance. Biden has sought to reintroduce himself to the dynamics by hosting scores of lawmakers in the Oval Office, crowding lawmakers onto couches and hearing them out over the course of dozens of meetings since taking office. While each meeting usually has an officially stated purpose, they have served more generally as get-to-know-you sessions, during which Biden is able to gain greater insight into each member's particular needs. For many, it is their first visit to the White House; Biden's predecessor Donald Trump did not habitually invite Democrats to meet with him. They often leave with White House-baked chocolate chip cookies or, more recently, specially commissioned ice cream bars bearing Biden's presidential seal. A lightning-fast, at least by congressional standards, win on Biden's $1.9 trillion Covid-19 relief proposal in his first few months in office was -- to a degree -- misleading. The urgency mattered, with the country still mired in the worst of the pandemic. Democrats were exceedingly careful not to undercut their new president -- or their new Senate majority. The path on his $3 trillion, dual-pronged domestic agenda has been significantly less seamless. Even for the self-professed "congenital optimist" in the Oval Office, navigating the divides has proved frustrating in recent weeks as his negotiators and Democratic leaders sought to thread the needle through compromises and self-imposed deadlines, to no avail. "We have to develop the will, and develop the will means putting aside personal agenda," Rep. Jim Clyburn, the House Democratic whip form South Carolina and a close Biden ally, said on "Fox News Sunday." "That to me has been a problem for us." It also takes a recognition that any single member can create a new problem to resolve. Those problems appeared to perpetually win the day -- until late Friday night. "This, in terms of degree of difficulty is very, very high," the official said. "Which makes succeeding all the more satisfying and fulfilling." Working the phones Still, the plans for that victory were quickly thrown off track Friday morning by a small group of House moderates who refused to move forward without a full Congressional Budget Office accounting of whether the second package would be financed. With that off the table for at least a week and maybe longer, Pelosi shifted course. The decision to move the infrastructure bill without the second proposal, pitched by members of the Congressional Black Caucus and moved on by Pelosi, initially ran into the same progressive roadblock that had sidetracked the prior two deadlines. But unlike those moments -- when Biden was regularly on the phone with members but cautious not to corner or jam any member -- the President went all in to find a path forward, according to people familiar with the calls. He and his team worked in close coordination with Pelosi on who to call and what to float as potential options to reconcile the differences. The two spoke by phone four times, with Pelosi giving Biden names of lawmakers to call and working closely with his top negotiators as they worked through the process of laying the groundwork to move forward. Biden made calls to moderate members. He made calls to progressive members. He talked to most of Pelosi's leadership team over the course of the day. It wasn't immediately effective. Biden was explicitly told "no" in a call with at least one progressive -- Rep. Pramila Jayapl, the chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus -- sources said. Jayapal initially rejected the effort publicly as well. In a conference call with dozens of progressives, there was palpable frustration on Biden's part when the reticence to move forward on infrastructure without the second proposal was made clear, according to participants. An official acknowledged that some of the conversations "were a little bumpy" and not everyone was on board at the beginning. But the decision was made to continue to press forward. The result -- after hours of calls, negotiations, an official statement from Biden -- was progressive and moderate leaders coming together to craft statements committing to move forward on the economic and climate package once the CBO score was in hand.

### Political Capital Fails

#### PC fails

Ryan Telingator B.A. in Political Science and Government from Bowdoin University, May 20 2021, “When is Change Possible? Presidential Power as Shaped by Political Context, Constitutional Tools, and Legislative Skills”, https://digitalcommons.bowdoin.edu/honorsprojects/258/

My research does not support Greenstein’s theory. Instead, my findings align more closely with those of George Edwards in At the Margins, where he argues that the “national preoccupation with the chief executive is misplaced,” and that presidential power is, in fact, limited in the Constitution’s “purposefully inefficient system in which the founding fathers’ handiwork in decentralizing power defeats even the most capable leaders.”50 Instead of focusing on legislative skills as a source of presidential influence, Edwards argues that party support and public support are more important. Legislative skills are only critical for “members of Congress who remain open to change after other influences have had their impact.”51 In a time as polarized as today, where very few members of Congress are “open to chang[ing]” their vote, these skills play a minor role in legislative negotiations. Similar assertions are made in another book by Edwards, Predicting the Presidency. He argues that exploiting existing opportunities (consolidating existing party and public support) is much more important for presidential success than creating opportunities (convincing legislators to change their vote vis a vis legislative skills).52 Both Lyndon Johnson and Ronald Reagan are remembered for their exemplary political skills. The Johnson Treatment, a legislating strategy in which Johnson used his imposing 6’4”, 240-pound figure – literally physically and verbally bullying, cajoling, lobbying, and threatening – to get what he wanted out of people,53 remains infamous in presidential political literature. Similarly, Ronald Reagan, “The Great Communicator,” is still revered for his oratorial prestige. Although these legislative skills were useful in passing the pieces of legislation outlined in the case studies – Johnson gaining support from southern Democrats on the EOA and Reagan compellingly speaking in favor of the ERTA – they proved impotent in political contexts not conducive to change. After Vietnam for Johnson and after the passage of the ERTA for Reagan (in conjunction with the recession in 1982), the presidents’ policy windows closed. Their renowned legislative skills could not overcome an inopportune political context. The case studies thus demonstrate the value of skills at the margins, but also exemplify their unsubstantial influence as the major factor driving policy. Again, the research suggests that political context is the most important factor in legislative change. 5.4 Applying Lessons to the Present: Predicting Biden’s Success With an understanding that the political context largely drives a president’s potential for change, with skills helping on the margins, it is important to assess the 2021 political climate in order make an informed prediction about Biden’s prospects. The COVID-19 pandemic opened a significant policy window for Biden. With a U.S. death toll nearing 580,000, massive unemployment, and a severe economic contraction, the pandemic was an all-encompassing problem that the entire country wanted addressed. Thus, the three streams of problem, policy, and politics converged to open the opportunity for the Biden administration to pass the American Rescue Plan. The Rescue Plan was signed into law in March and has received bipartisan support from the American public.54 President Biden claimed a mandate from his election, arguing that “millions of Americans” “voted for [his] vision,” giving “a clear victory” and tasking him to make his “vision real.”55 However, based on the extreme polarization in D.C., it is unlikely to become a quantifiable mandate that changes Congressional voting behavior.56 Polarization has made it impossible to win cross-party support, or, in Edwardsian terms, create new opportunities. There is deep political antagonism between parties, and even within parties,57 making any sort of bipartisanship near impossible.

#### Votes don’t switch

Dr. George C. Edwards 2016 III, Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Jordan Chair in Presidential Studies at Texas A&M, “The Potential of Presidential Leadership”, Study Done for the White House Transition Project https://www.whitehousetransitionproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/WHTP2021-08-Potential-of-Presidential-Leadership.pdf

The best evidence is that presidential persuasion is effective only at the margins of congressional decision making. Presidential legislative leadership operates in an environment largely beyond the president’s control and must compete with other, more stable factors that affect voting in Congress in addition to party. These include ideology, personal views and commitments on specific policies, and the interests of constituencies. By the time a president tries to exercise influence on a vote, most members of Congress have made up their minds on the basis of these other factors.

### China bills fail

#### Bills fail ---private investments solve

Tom Lee Feb 1 2022 "Industrial Policy: America COMPETES Act and USICA" https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/industrial-policy-america-competes-act-and-usica/

While CHIPS is very popular on both sides of the aisle, it may not relieve current shortages as intended. It takes many years to build a physical semiconductor production facility, so by the time CHIPS became law and it funds were spent on building production facilities in the United States, the COVID-19-induced global semiconductor shortage would be over. Moreover, the semiconductor industry, like many other capital-intensive industries, is cyclical in nature because it is logistically difficult and expensive for manufacturing facilities to rapidly increase production to meet sudden surges in demand. It is thus best for market mechanisms, not government intervention, to address these issues.

The private sector is already making its own investments (with no federal funding) that are far larger than the $52 billion funding in CHIPS. Intel has announced plans to invest $20 billion into two semiconductor factories in Ohio.[3] TSMC, a Taiwanese company and one of the largest producers of semiconductors, has announced plans to spend $12 billion on a new production facility in Arizona.[4] Micron will spend $150 billion over the next 10 years to build new production facilities in the United States.[5] Samsung has also announced plans to invest $17 billion in a new production facility in the United States. These private-sector projects alone would invest nearly $200 billion, and all were announced before CHIPS. The $52 billion in CHIPS spending is an arguably unnecessary intervention, which would benefit a largely healthy semiconductor industry.[6]

#### Bill not needed – companies have plenty of cash/incentive and any shortages ease before the bill can have an impact

Lizz Peek Feb 10 2022 "GOP: Don’t fall for the America Competes Act," <https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/593676-gop-dont-fall-for-the-america-competes-act/>

But, back to the widely publicized core of the bill, which purports to boost semiconductor manufacturing at home. Legislators are concerned that the U.S., the birthplace of advanced silicon and once the dominant supplier of the widely used electronic components, only accounted for 12 percent of global production in 2020, down from 37 percent in 1990. Advocates neglect to mention that the U.S. has enjoyed a steady rise in chip output, and in investment.

This comes at a time when chips are in short supply, the industry consequently is operating full out and reaping record profits. After decades during which technology gains made chips cheaper and prices dropped, companies have been raising prices aggressively. TSMC announced last year that it would raise prices up to 20 percent, its largest hike in a decade. Other companies have done the same, with the prices of some chips soaring as much as 40 percent.

In other words, semiconductor providers are in an excellent position to expand, and surely don’t need taxpayer help to do so.

In fact, major manufacturers are doing just that. Intel recently broke ground on a new plant in Arizona and has announced that it will build a $20 billion semiconductor manufacturing plant in Ohio, saying it wants to expand capacity and bring more production home. Interestingly, it has not set a timetable for the Ohio construction, indicating that it is waiting to see what Congress will offer in the way of incentives.

TSMC, the leading producer of high-end chips, is already building a $12 billion facility in Arizona, the first leg of an announced $100 billion investment program. Samsung, the biggest supplier, is building a $17 billion fabricating plant in Texas, its largest-ever investment in the U.S.

These companies understand the risks and rewards of manufacturing in the U.S. and are voting with their feet. Even the bill’s backers acknowledge that the shortage will likely ease before the subsidies in the America Competes Act kick in. Taxpayers should not fund what could turn into a boom-bust cycle.

### Warming defense

#### Extinction from warming requires 12 degrees, far greater than their internal link, and intervening actors will solve before then

Sebastian **Farquhar 17** leads the Global Priorities Project (GPP) at the Centre for Effective Altruism, et al., 2017, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

The most likely levels of global warming are very unlikely to cause human extinction.15 The existential risks of climate change instead stem from tail risk climate change – the low probability of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that warming of 11-12°C would render most of the planet uninhabitable,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to adapt enough to avoid extinction in even very extreme scenarios. The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, unless strong action is taken soon by major emitters, it is likely that we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway.20 If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,21 which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.22 The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures (which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around 10%,23 and of 10°C is around 3%.24 These estimates are of course highly uncertain. It is likely that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, long before there is warming of 10°C. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO2 emissions and eventual warming,25 and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO2 will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.26 Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO2 emissions. If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will therefore face strong incentives to find other ways to reduce global temperatures.

#### Climate change is inevitable – even ending emissions won’t solve

Zing Tsjeng, 19, 2-27-2019, executive editor and the author of the Forgotten Women book series, "The Climate Change Paper So Depressing It's Sending People to Therapy", [https://www.vice.com/en\_us/article/vbwpdb/the-climate-change-paper-so-depressing-its-sending-people-to-therapy], AVD

"Deep Adaptation" is quite unlike any other academic paper. There's the language ("we are about to play Russian Roulette with the entire human race with already two bullets loaded"). There's the flashes of dark humor ("I was only partly joking earlier when I questioned why I was even writing this paper"). But most of all, there's the stark conclusions that it draws about the future. Chiefly, that it's too late to stop climate change from devastating our world—and that "climate-induced societal collapse is now inevitable in the near term." How near? About a decade. Professor Jem Bendell, a sustainability academic at the University of Cumbria, wrote the paper after taking a sabbatical at the end of 2017 to review and understand the latest climate science "properly—not sitting on the fence anymore," as he puts it on the phone to me. What he found terrified him. "The evidence before us suggests that we are set for disruptive and uncontrollable levels of climate change, bringing starvation, destruction, migration, disease, and war," he writes in the paper. "Our norms of behavior—that we call our 'civilization'—may also degrade." "It is time," he adds, "we consider the implications of it being too late to avert a global environmental catastrophe in the lifetimes of people alive today." Even a schmuck like me is familiar with some of the evidence Bendell sets out to prove his point. You only needed to step outside during the record-breaking heatwave last year to acknowledge that 17 of the 18 hottest years on the planet have occurred since 2000. Scientists already believe we are soon on course for an ice-free Arctic, which will only accelerate global warming. Back in 2017, even Fox News reported scientists' warnings that the Earth's sixth mass extinction was underway. Erik Buitenhuis, a senior researcher at the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, tells me that Bendell's conclusions may sound extreme, but he agrees with the report's overall assessment. "I think societal collapse is indeed inevitable," he says, though adds that "the process is likely to take decades to centuries." The important thing, Buitenhuis says, is to realize that the negative effects of climate change have already been with us for some time: "Further gradual deterioration looks much more likely to me than a disaster within the next ten years that will be big enough that, after that, everybody will agree the status quo is doomed." "Jem's paper is in the main well-researched and supported by relatively mainstream climate science," says Professor Rupert Read, chair of the Green House think-tank and a philosophy academic at the University of East Anglia. "That's why I'm with him on the fundamentals. And more and more people are." Read's key disagreement with Bendell is his belief that we still have time to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, saying, "I think it's hubris to think that we know the future." But that doesn't mean Bendell's premise is wrong: "The way I see it, deep adaptation is insurance against the possibility—or rather, the probability—of some kind of collapse," says Read. "'Deep Adaptation' is saying, 'What do we need to do if collapse is something we need to realistically plan for?'" When I speak to Bendell, he tells me he thinks of "Deep Adaptation" as more of an ethical and philosophical framework, rather than a prophecy about the future of the planet. "The longer we refuse to talk about climate change as already here and screwing with our way of life—because we don't want to think like that because it's too frightening or will somehow demotivate people—the less time we have to reduce harm," he says with deliberation. What does he mean by harm? "Starvation is the first one," he answers, pointing to lowering harvests of grain in Europe in 2018 due to drought that saw the EU reap 6 million tons less wheat. "In the scientific community at the moment, the appropriate thing is to say that 2018 was an anomaly. However, if you look at what's been happening over the last few years, it isn't an anomaly. There's a possibility that 2018 is the new best case scenario." That means, in Bendell's view, that governments need to start planning emergency responses to climate change, including growing and stockpiling food. He minces his words even less in his paper: "When I say starvation, destruction, migration, disease, and war, I mean in your own life. With the power down, soon you won't have water coming out of your tap. You will depend on your neighbors for food and some warmth. You will become malnourished. You won't know whether to stay or go. You will fear being violently killed before starving to death." Should people start building bunkers and buying bulletproof vests? "There's no way of getting through this unless we try together," he says. "We need to help people stay fed and watered where they live already to reduce disruption and reduce civil unrest as much as we can." Of the Silicon Valley financiers prepping for the apocalypse in New Zealand, he says: "Once money doesn't matter anymore and the armed guards are trying to feed their starving children, what do you think they'll do? The billionaires doing that are just deluded." Bendell wasn't always this gloomy about the state of the world. He once worked for WWF, one of the biggest environmental charities in the world, and in 2012 founded the Institute for Leadership and Sustainability (IFLAS) at the University of Cumbria. The World Economic Forum named him a Young Global Leader for his work. So how did he end up writing a paper that determined that civilization—and environmental sustainability as we currently understand it—is doomed? "Since the age of 15, I've been an environmentalist," he tells me. "I've given my life professionally and personally. I'm a workaholic, and it was all about sustainability." Once he sat down with the data, however, he realized that his field was quickly becoming irrelevant in the face of oncoming climate catastrophe. "It would mean not getting super excited about the expansion of your recycling program in a major multinational," he says. "It's a completely different paradigm of what we should be looking at." What he didn’t expect was for the paper to take off online. "It was aimed at those people in my professional community and why we're in denial," he says. "When I put it out there, I didn’t expect 15-year-olds in schools in Indonesia to be reading it with their teachers." He says that "Deep Adaptation" has been downloaded over 110,000 times since it was released by IFLAS as an occasional paper. "Someone in the alternative economics and bitcoin crowd told me, 'Oh, everyone's talking about deep adaptation in London at all the dinner parties,'" he laughs. Researchers from the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), an established progressive think-tank, consulted Bendell's paper in the process of writing its new report, "This is a crisis: Facing up to the age of environmental breakdown." Laurie Laybourn-Langton, its lead author, told me via email: "I appreciated the frankness of the report in facing up to issues that so many in research and policy communities seem unwilling to. We don't subscribe to the view that social collapse is inevitable, however." He explains: "This is partly because it's so hard to predict the outcomes of the complex and uncertain process of environmental shocks interacting with social and economic systems. We simply don't know. That said, they shouldn’t be disregarded as a potential outcome, and so we are calling for greater levels of preparedness to these shocks." Not everyone was so taken with the paper. Bendell submitted it to a well-respected academic journal for publication, with little success. Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal (SAMPJ) told me that the paper was in need of "major revisions" before it would be ready for publication. Bendell ended up publishing it through IFLAS and his blog. "The academic process is such that I took that as an effective rejection," he explains, saying that the reviewers wanted him to fundamentally alter his conclusions. "I couldn't completely rewrite the paper to say that I don't think collapse is inevitable. It was asking for a different paper." Emerald, the scholarly publisher that owns SAMPJ, says it takes issue with how Bendell frames its reception of its paper on his blog: "the study on collapse they thought you should not read—yet." A spokesperson told me: "The decision was arrived at based on the merit of the submitted article and the double blind peer review process integral to academia and the advancement of knowledge. SAMPJ, and [editor Carol Adams] are proud members of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and adhere to the highest ethical standards in publishing. We see no evidence that the decision of Major Revision was politically motivated. "Emerald requested the author correct their blog post to reflect the facts. This request was unfortunately ignored. The post continues to imply the paper was rejected because it was deemed too controversial. The paper was not rejected, and was given a Major Revision due to the rigorous standards of the scholarly output of the journal." Bendell says he did reply to Emerald's request to amend his blog post—but only if they would consider telling him the decisions of those who reviewed his paper. (Under the double blind peer review, reviewers' decisions are anonymous.) "That title can be read in a number of ways," he says. "It is a paper that the reviewers didn't want you to read. They didn't want it published." Climate gloom and doom is nothing new—doomsday preppers have been stockpiling their freeze-dried food rations for decades now. But Bendell's paper appears to have hit a unique nerve, especially given that the average scientific paper is estimated to be read by only three or so people. Rupert Read tells me that he was sent it simultaneously by three other academics when it was published. But it hasn’t trended on Twitter. It hasn't been pushed by a celebrity. It was briefly mentioned in a Bloomberg Businessweek article, but that's it. "Deep Adaptation" is that unique social phenomenon: an academic paper that has gone viral through word of mouth. Nathan Savelli, a 31-year-old high school life coach from Hamilton, Canada, was recommended the paper by a local environmental activist. Reading it sent him spiraling into depression. "I guess in some ways it felt like I was diagnosed with a terminal illness," he tells me. "If I'm being honest, it was a mix of heartbreaking sadness and extreme anger." Savelli felt so low that he sought help from a climate grief support group organized by 350.org, the global grassroots climate movement. "I had attended counseling in the past for other issues, but never a group session, and thought it might be something helpful for me," he tells me. Did it help? "I'm not sure I'd say it alleviated my grief, but it was definitely comforting to be around people who understood what I was feeling." And therein lies the problem with "Deep Adaptation:" if you accept that the paper is entirely correct in its prediction of collapse, how do you move on with your life? How do you even get out of bed in the morning? "I'm aware of what difficult emotions it triggers," Bendell acknowledges. "I do believe that if you’ve come across this [paper], then absolutely some grief and despair is very natural. Why isn't that OK? We all die in the end. Life is about impermanence." On his blog, he lists several sources for psychological support, including several groups on Facebook and LinkedIn that discuss collapse and offer help to those struggling to come to terms with the conclusions of his paper. But, Bendell adds, reading the paper has been "transformative" for some. "People find a new boldness about living life on their own terms—actually connecting to their heart's desire. How do they wish to live, and why don't they live that way now rather than postponing it?" In one case, it even helped prompt one high-ranking academic to quit her job and the city. In December of 2017, Dr. Alison Green left her post as the pro vice-chancellor of Arden University. She had read the IPCC report warning that the world is nowhere near averting global temperature increases, as well as the 1,656-page National Climate Assessment on how climate change is now dramatically affecting our lives—and then she read Bendell's paper.

### China War defense

#### No US-China war

Charles C. Krulak & Alex Friedman 21, former President of Birmingham-Southern College, former Commandant of the US Marine Corps, M.S. from George Washington University; former Chief Financial Officer of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, J.D. from Columbia University, “The US and China Are Not Destined for War,” Project Syndicate, 08-17-2021, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/us-china-not-destined-for-war-by-charles-c-krulak-and-alex-friedman-1-2021-08

True, throughout history, when a rising power has challenged a ruling one, war has often been the result. But there are notable exceptions. A war between the US and China today is no more inevitable than was war between the rising US and the declining United Kingdom a century ago. And in today’s context, there are four compelling reasons to believe that war between the US and China can be avoided.

First and foremost, any military conflict between the two would quickly turn nuclear. The US thus finds itself in the same situation that it was in vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. Taiwan could easily become this century’s tripwire, just as the “Fulda Gap” in Germany was during the Cold War. But the same dynamic of “mutual assured destruction” that limited US-Soviet conflict applies to the US and China. And the international community would do everything in its power to ensure that a potential nuclear conflict did not materialize, given that the consequences would be fundamentally transnational and – unlike climate change – immediate.

A US-China conflict would almost certainly take the form of a proxy war, rather than a major-power confrontation. Each superpower might take a different side in a domestic conflict in a country such as Pakistan, Venezuela, Iran, or North Korea, and deploy some combination of economic, cyber, and diplomatic instruments. We have seen this type of conflict many times before: from Vietnam to Bosnia, the US faced surrogates rather than its principal foe.

Second, it is important to remember that, historically, China plays a long game. Although Chinese military power has grown dramatically, it still lags behind the US on almost every measure that matters. And while China is investing heavily in asymmetric equalizers (long-range anti-ship and hypersonic missiles, military applications of cyber, and more), it will not match the US in conventional means such as aircraft and large ships for decades, if ever.

A head-to-head conflict with the US would thus be too dangerous for China to countenance at its current stage of development. If such a conflict did occur, China would have few options but to let the nuclear genie out of the bottle. In thinking about baseline scenarios, therefore, we should give less weight to any scenario in which the Chinese consciously precipitate a military confrontation with America. The US military, however, tends to plan for worst-case scenarios and is currently focused on a potential direct conflict with China – a fixation with overtones of the US-Soviet dynamic.

This raises the risk of being blindsided by other threats. Time and again since the Korean War, asymmetric threats have proven the most problematic to national security. Building a force that can handle the worst-case scenario does not guarantee success across the spectrum of warfare.

The third reason to think that a Sino-American conflict can be avoided is that China is already chalking up victories in the global soft-power war. Notwithstanding accusations that COVID-19 escaped from a virology lab in Wuhan, China has emerged from the pandemic looking much better than the US. And with its Belt and Road Initiative to finance infrastructure development around the world, it has aggressively stepped into the void left by US retrenchment during Donald Trump’s four-year presidency. China’s leaders may very well look at the current status quo and conclude that they are on the right strategic path.

Finally, China and the US are deeply intertwined economically. Despite Trump’s trade war, Sino-American bilateral trade in 2020 was around $650 billion, and China was America’s largest trade partner. The two countries’ supply-chain linkages are vast, and China holds more than $1 trillion in US Treasuries, most of which it cannot easily unload, lest it reduce their value and incur massive losses.

To be sure, logic can be undermined by a single act and its unintended consequences. Something as simple as a miscommunication can escalate a proxy war into an interstate conflagration. And as the situations in Afghanistan and Iraq show, America’s track record in war-torn countries is not encouraging. China, meanwhile, has dramatically stepped up its foreign interventions. Between its expansionist mentality, its growing foreign-aid program, and rising nationalism at home, China could all too easily launch a foreign intervention that might threaten US interests.

Cyber mischief, in particular, could undercut conventional military command-and-control systems, forcing leaders into bad decisions if more traditional options are no longer on the table. And Sino-American economic ties may come to matter less than they used to, especially as China moves from an export-led growth model to one based on domestic consumption, and as two-way investment flows decline amid escalating bilateral tensions.

A “mistake” on the part of either country is always possible. That is why diplomacy is essential. Each country needs to determine its vital national interests vis-à-vis the other, and both need to consider the same question from the other’s perspective. For example, it may be hard to accept (and unpopular to say), but civil rights within China might not be a vital US national interest. By the same token, China should understand that the US does indeed have vital interests in Taiwan.

The US and China are destined to clash in many ways. But a direct, interstate war need not be one of them.

**No impact – Aggression’s at odds with China’s central goals**

Coco 20 – Orazio, Visiting lecturer at U of Hong Kong, where he earned an MA in International affairs, Ph.D in History of Europe (summa cum laude) from Sapienza University of Rome. “Contemporary China and the “Harmonious” World Order in the Age of Globalization”, Chinese Journal of Global Governance, <https://brill.com/view/journals/cjgg/6/1/article-p1_2.xml?language=en>, 04-06-2020

**The question is whether China would risk losing its achievements and recognition of being part of** the **international leadership for a relevant ‘domestic’ matter of geographical territory. The answer can be found in history. Waging war does not bring popularity or** more **power.** Conflicts do not bring **progress** and **prosperity and certainly not a leadership role for** the **countries leading their nations to destruction** and human losses. Europe has inexorably withdrawn from being an important geopolitical and military global leader after initiating and staging two World Wars. History has also taught us that the moral quality of leadership is the most qualified reassurance that discourages wars. **In the age of nuclear** powers such as **China and** the **U**nited **S**tates, the **consequences** of a conflict will be devastating for humanity, and they **will be worse for the** ideal process of **progress** and **advancement of the involved nation**s. **As far as China is concerned**, as Chan argues, **all the previously mentioned risks and weaknesses suggest** that **the current Chinese strat**egy does **not** seem to be **one of a rising world hegemon but** that of **a strong country searching for** a **regional** (Asian) **leadership** role **rather than being** an impatient newcomer **determined to challenge** or change **the existing** international **order.** 5 More Considerations about the Harmonious International (Socialist) Order As so far argued, **China’s political role and econ**omic **relevance are strongly linked to** the achievement of the ‘harmonious’ and **peaceful global order.** **The fact that the entire idea of a ‘Great China’ is built on the fundamental assumption that only a world at peace can bring prosperity for** the Chinese nation and give recognition to **China** as an important power in international society **should not be underestimated.** The **emergence** in the world **of any** kind of **conflict that affects international** political **instability and econ**omic **volatility** **in the international markets** **does not support the long-term consolidation of the socio-econ**omic **results achieved by China in recent years. This awareness of the need for peace** and harmony **guides Chinese leaders**hip **in pursuing consistent policies** **in domestic and international affairs. Achieving this goal requires** ‘orderliness’, **that** is, national and **international order must be maintained** **and protected.**

**No Asia war OR China mod impact**

Tim **Huxley 18**, Executive Director, International Institute for Strategic Studies (Asia) Ltd, 9-12-2018, "Why Asia's 'arms race' is not quite what it seems," World Economic Forum, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/09/asias-arms-race-and-why-it-doesnt-matter/

**Increased military spending and arms purchasing by regional countries are often identified as key indicators of a deteriorating regional security predicament**. Almost as a reflex, some commentators point to the growing dangers of a supposed Asian ‘regional arms race’; this piece from the South China Morning Post is typical. **There is a widespread impression that regional states’ escalating military spending and reckless development of offensive military capabilities are increasing the risk of conflict. Closer examination, though, reveals that the hard evidence of military developments in the region does not come close to the intense bilateral rivalry and speed of classic arms races involving major offensive capabilities**, such as the contest for naval superiority between Great Britain and Germany at the start of the twentieth century, or that between the US and the Soviet Union for strategic nuclear superiority in the 1950s and 1960s. As shown in this graphic illustrating International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) figures on defence spending in what American officials and others increasingly refer to as the ‘Indo-Pacific region’, **China is a long way from competing with the US in terms of military effort. At the same time, no other regional state comes close to competing with China. And while many Asian governments are increasing their defence spending at quite a rate, they are mainly doing this commensurately with their economic growth**, **which has been famously rapid for most of the current century.** This graphic – also using IISS figures - focuses on Southeast Asian states’ military efforts as a percentage of GDP over the last 25 years, but a similar picture of defence effort shadowing economic growth is apparent across Asia. **Many factors go into the formation of defence policy and levels of defence spending by Asian governments, but it seems clear that the sheer availability of greater resources is an important one**. **And regional states do not, apparently, generally feel compelled to increase their defence efforts more quickly than their economies are growing. Media reports often highlight expensive arms purchases by Asian governments**. **But military capability is complex, and buying new ‘kit’ does not provide countries with instant capabilities, as is often inferred**. Other important elements of capability include appropriate doctrine, suitable training, inspiring leadership, high morale, vital logistic support (including defence-industrial capacity), relevant combat experience and a high level of operational integration between military branches and services. Besides, mastery of the cyber domain may be emerging as the sine qua non of military capability, potentially providing the capacity to take down an opponent’s ability and will to fight even before a shot is fired. **Only a minority of Asian armed forces possess all these key capability elements**. **In many cases, while they might be able to hold domestic insurgents or other forms of unrest at bay, or engage in border skirmishes**, **their forces would be unable to mount sustained operations against those of other countries. Moreover, most of the military capabilities under development in the region remain essentially defensive. This applies not least to China’s People’s Liberation Army (PLA). China’s major, sustained, long-term defence effort is certainly enhancing the capabilities of the PLA, which would in any conflict now be able to complicate US operational planning and activities severely**. **But China’s long-range offensive capabilities** – its nuclear deterrent aside - remain limited. **The PLA is still a long way from matching American capabilities, and it would have little hope of winning any conflict with the US,** **whose military presence and commitments continue to ensure the security of the whole region.**