# \*\*\*Air Control/Congestion CP

# 1NC Shell

(net benefit – politics/spending)

**Text: The United States federal government should switch to a user fee system based on how far a plane flies.**

**cp solves air traffic congestion/control**

**Business Week 2006** (June 4, “Snarl in the Sky”, [www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/06\_23/b3987036.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/06_23/b3987036.htm))

But if private jet travel gives its participants a warm glow, it has airport managers and the Federal Aviation Administration wondering if the nation's creaky air traffic control system can handle all those extra aircraft. More than 10,000 U.S. companies now own private planes, both prop- and jet-driven -- nearly double the number a decade ago. Yes, many private jets land at small airports rather than the larger ones frequented by the majors. But not always. Private traffic at McCarran, for example, is up by about a third since 2001. And private plane travel is expected to take off even more dramatically as a new generation of so-called very light jets, also known as microjets, arrives later this year. The FAA estimates that 5,000 of these tiny planes will be flying by 2017. With the skies getting more crowded, a dogfight has broken out between commercial and private aviation. The big carriers point out that it costs the system exactly the same to land a Boeing 737 with 180 passengers as it does to land Donald Trump's plane. And yet private aviation, despite having many more jets in the sky, pays a fraction of the annual tab required to keep order in the skies. With a pricey modernization of the air traffic control system planned, the carriers are lobbying to ensure that private fliers pay their share. The battle will come to a head next year as the FAA looks to change how it funds the traffic control system. One option: ditching taxes on air fares and fuel and instead charging user fees based on how far a plane flies, be it private or commercial. "We're trying to figure out a way to make sure this scarce resource is serving the public good," says US Airways Group Inc. Chairman and CEO W. Douglas Parker. "Right now, that doesn't seem to be the case when one small plane is paying dramatically less than one large plane." It used to be that only the extremely wealthy could afford to jet around in a private plane. Doing so began to get more affordable in the 1980s, when NetJets Inc., now part of Warren E. Buffett's Berkshire Hathaway Inc., introduced fractional jet ownership. Instead of shelling out $7.1 million for a new eight-passenger, 500 mph Hawker 400XP, a 1/16th share can now be had for about $400,000. And even when they buy the whole plane, many executives figure it's still worth it. One is Ronald Duncan. The president and CEO of GCI, which provides cable TV and phone service in Alaska, figures he saves as many as 24 working days a year by piloting his own Gulfstream.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**it solves and is popular**

**Smarter Traveler 2007** (Molly Feltner, June 5th, “Commercial Flyers Paying for Corporate Jet Travel”, http://www.smartertravel.com/blogs/today-in-travel/commercial-fliers-paying-for-corporate-jet-travel-in-more-ways-than-one.html?id=2390156)

In a recent radio interview, Air Transport Association (ATA) President and CEO James May noted that every time you fly a commercial plane, about $5 to $10 of the taxes you pay goes to the FAA in the form of a "passenger facility charges." This money funds various aviation systems, including facilities used by corporate jets. May said that although commercial aircraft uses about 74 percent of these facilities, the passengers on those flights pay about 94 percent of taxes used to maintain the system. Corporate-jet traffic pays only six percent. Corporate jets may also be contributing significantly to what May calls air "gridlock." There are now 18,000 corporate jets in the U.S., or two corporate jets for every one commercial aircraft. As the demand for private jets grows, some have begun to call for limits on private jet flights. Over the 4th of July, the ATA asked the FAA to temporarily limit the activity of corporate jets in New York area airports to help relieve delays in the region, which often cause ripple affects around the country. No word yet on whether the FAA actually approved the idea. The airlines and other groups have been pushing Congress to overhaul the current system, including upgrades to air traffic control and a balanced taxes-and-fees structure. Advocates for the corporate jet industry have, of course, balked at the idea paying more taxes. It's hard to predict what will actually happen, but for once I'm glad the Hill is overrun with airline lobbyists.

**Cp is popular**

**Jenkins 2005** - is one of the best-known authorities on aviation in the world, was a member of the Executive Committee of the White House Conference on Aviation Safety and Security (Darryl, December 7th, “Turbulence Ahead: how user fees could ground the FAA” <http://www.aviationacrossamerica.org/uploadedFiles/Issues/Studies_and_Reports/Darryl_Jenkins_-_Turbulence_Ahead_-_How_User_Fees_Could_Ground_the_FAA_-_12_07_05.pdf>)

Since then, the idea has been flying under the radar. But, supported by some heavy hitters and in tune with the pro-privatization orientation of the White House, it’s coming back. “The political winds appear to be blowing in favor of user fees – with airlines, Congress, Wall Street, the Federal Aviation Administration and U.S. Chamber of Commerce exploring the benefits of this funding mechanism,” Airline Business magazine reported in the spring of 2005. “User fees will likely be challenged by general aviation and business aviation groups, depending on how the charges are structured. But the key power centers appear to be sympathetic to user fees, primarily because of a belief the FAA is facing a multibillion dollar deficit and that airport congestion will be a major problem as a result.” 4

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**Solves current inefficiencies**

**Jenkins 2005** - is one of the best-known authorities on aviation in the world, was a member of the Executive Committee of the White House Conference on Aviation Safety and Security (Darryl, December 7th, “Turbulence Ahead: how user fees could ground the FAA” <http://www.aviationacrossamerica.org/uploadedFiles/Issues/Studies_and_Reports/Darryl_Jenkins_-_Turbulence_Ahead_-_How_User_Fees_Could_Ground_the_FAA_-_12_07_05.pdf>)

The legacy airlines believe a system of user fees would benefit them in two ways: Reducing the amount they pay to the federal government. This would let them keep prices the same and increase their revenues at no increased cost. Improving their competitive prospects by having their low-fare competitors pay more to the government. That would prompt the discount carriers to raise their ticket prices – or at least to stop lowering them. Ken Button, an economics professor at George Mason University, discussed aviation taxes and user fees in a paper published earlier in 2005. He supports user fees from different perspectives, including government responsiveness and efficiency. “A genuine user fee … relates the cost of an activity to the fees that are collected, irrespective of who does the collection” (emphasis added). The existing system of taxing American aviation fails most of the criteria applying to an appropriate user fee, namely: influence the user in such a way the facility is used efficiently, providing guidance as to where capacity changes are needed, and generate revenue to finance additional capacity.

**cp key to balanced funding system**

**Institute for Policy Studies 2008** (June 24th, “How private jet travel is straining the system, warming the planet, and costing you money.” http://www.ips-dc.org/reports/high\_flyers)

Currently, users of the National Airspace System – everyone from the rumpled passenger in coach to the corporate honcho in a Gulfstream to the student pilot in a single-engine Cessna – pay to run the system via an array of 10 different excise taxes on airfares, fuel, and cargo. Due to this fragmented funding system, wildly different amounts of money are collected from airspace users, depending mostly on whether a plane is being flown as a scheduled commercial flight, or as a charter, or as a non-commercial private flight (such as a flight of a corporate-owned plane). This funding formula fails to accurately assess fees to users based on the costs they actually impose on the system. For example, corporate and private jets are exempt from the array of taxes levied on every commercial plane ticket: the 7.5 percent ticket tax, the $3.40 segment fee, the $3.00 passenger facility charge, and the $2.50 TSA security fee (users of charter and fractional jets do pay the 7.5 percent ticket tax and the segment fee). Instead, corporate and private jets pay only a 21.9-cent-per-gallon fuel tax. The result, according to the FAA, is that commercial aviation foots 95 percent of the bill, even though they use only 73 percent of the FAA’s services. Meanwhile, general aviation – the segment of the industry that includes corporate jets, charters, air taxis, and recreational pilots – uses 16 percent of the services, but pays just three percent of the cost. 35 In dollar terms, a 2007 Associated Press investigation found that while it cost $2.4 billion to provide air traffic control for private and corporate planes in 2005, those users paid only $516 million in fuel taxes that year. 36

**Fixing the funding system solves**

**Institute for Policy Studies 2008** (June 24th, “How private jet travel is straining the system, warming the planet, and costing you money.” http://www.ips-dc.org/reports/high\_flyers)

Fix the FAA’s funding structure to charge users of the National Airspace System based on costs imposed. The most straightforward way to do this is probably to revive the FAA’s original February 2007 proposal for a combination of higher general aviation fuel taxes and user fees.

# 2NC Solvency – Empirics

**No solvency deficits – empirics prove it’ll be effective**

**Aero News Network 2007** (April 24th, “FAA Rebuts User Fees Opponent Claims in “Fact Sheet”” <http://69.63.138.17/subsite.cfm?do=main.textpost&id=35cb2dd3-e3c7-4fd7-8c0b-51a482569afe>)

Myth: User fees have been ineffective and have damaged aviation around the world. Facts: There are numerous examples of successful user fee implementation throughout the rest of the developed world, and it is clear that user fees have not damaged aviation. A January 2006 report by mbs Ottawa in conjunction with three universities (“Air Traffic Control Commercialization Policy: Has It Been Effective?”) evaluated ten countries that have established user fees for air traffic control services: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. The study found that the impact on “safety was neutral or enhanced; modernization was greatly improved; and, service quality was improved.” It also found that “costs were generally reduced, significantly in some models, while financial stability was maintained, and most areas of public interest remained neutral or positive when commercialized elements were introduced.” In Canada, the fees NAV CANADA charges are more than 20 percent lower than the taxes they replaced nearly a decade ago, and rates are proposed to decrease by another 3 percent this year. In Europe, a recent discussion paper by the European Commission notes that business aviation in Europe has grown twice as quickly as the rest of air traffic since 2001, and the European fleet of business aircraft is projected to grow by 50 percent over the next ten years.

# 2NC Solvency – Congestion

**User fees limit private jet travel- solves congestion**

**Institute for Policy Studies 2008** (June 24th, “How private jet travel is straining the system, warming the planet, and costing you money.” http://www.ips-dc.org/reports/high\_flyers)

Congress and shareholders should act to restore fairness to the system and limit the burdens of private jet travel on the environment, taxpayers, shareholders, and other travelers. • Private jet users should pay their fair share of the National Airspace System with a combination of higher general aviation fuel taxes and user fees. •

# 2NC Solvency – Air Traffic

**Solves air traffic control**

**Herald-Tribune 2007** (Kathleen McLaughlin, January 29th, “FAA Causes uproar over tax” http://www.heraldtribune.com/article/20070129/BUSINESS/701290449?p=1&tc=pg)

Poole advocates a system similar to the one he worked on for Canada in the 1980s, where airlines and business jets pay fees based on a combination of the weight of the plane and the distance traveled. Poole recently studied how those fees would affect the bottom lines of business jets, based on typical planes and flying habits. A Lear 60 that pays $22,000 a year in fuel taxes would pay $47,000 in fees under the Canadian model. The change would whack the bottom lines of corporate jets, but it wouldn't mean much to jets that are in charter or fractional ownership programs. The same jet that's part of a fractional service already collects $63,000 per year in ticket taxes, Poole said. The same jet in a charter program pays $98,000 per year. The business aviation group, which represents everyone from piston-engine to Lear jet fliers, has not exactly embraced Poole and his recommendations. Poole, who said he gets no money from the airlines, said the Air Transport Association might not have realized when it began its campaign that some jets were already collecting the ticket tax. The main benefit to the airlines is to eliminate its unintended subsidy of the regional carriers while generating more money for upgrading air traffic control. "They see that as a big, big advantage," Poole said of the airlines. "And they're right. That's why all these other countries have done it." Don't think the 7.5 percent line item would disappear from airline ticket receipts: The cost of any new fees would be built into fares, Poole said.

# 2NC Solvency – Cheap/Efficient

**Its cheap and efficient**

**Aero News Network 2007** (April 24th, “FAA Rebuts User Fees Opponent Claims in “Fact Sheet”” <http://69.63.138.17/subsite.cfm?do=main.textpost&id=35cb2dd3-e3c7-4fd7-8c0b-51a482569afe>)

Myth: Administering the new user fee system will require a large new bureaucracy and billions of dollars in costs. Facts: FAA is confident that we can collect fees at minimal administrative cost to the FAA and the users of the system. Not only is this the case with service providers around the world, but the FAA has a good track record in this area; the administrative billing and collection processes for overflight fees have gone extremely smoothly. Based on best practices from the US and around the world, the administrative cost would be significantly less than 1 percent of the anticipated revenue. The fact that fewer than 500 users would account for 95 percent of the billable flights presents opportunities for significant efficiencies in the billing and collection process. GA pilots will see no air traffic user fee bills if they do not use the 30 large hub airports.

# Aff – Links to Ptx

**Cp links to politics**

**General Aviation News 3/4**/12 (“195 Members of the House tell President: no $100 fee” <http://www.generalaviationnews.com/2012/03/04/congress-sends-strong-message-to-white-house-on-user-fees/>)

WASHINGTON, D.C. — The president’s 2013 budget plan to charge $100 per flight to aircraft using controlled airspace was never expected to be adopted and it got another major setback when 195 bipartisan members of the House of Representatives sent Obama a letter opposing the fee. “The letter is another clear example that user fees are a non-starter in Congress,” said Rep. Jerry Costello (D-Ill.), ranking member of the House aviation subcommittee. “Particularly given that the FAA Reauthorization bill has been signed into law, there is no need to continue to discuss this bad idea.” Washington watchers cannot understand how the president could sign the reauthorization bill and at the same time propose a new and unpopular fee. Rep. Tom Petri (R-Wis.), chairman of the subcommittee, noted that “almost half of the House members signed the bill and there would be no difficulty getting a majority if Obama’s proposal was ever advanced to the full House, which it won’t.” Costello, Petri, and Reps. Sam Graves (R-Mo.) and John Barrow (D-Ga.), co-chairs of the House General Aviation Caucus, wrote the letter. The House has been active on budgets but no action has been taken by the Senate. Aviation groups aided in developing support for the letter by getting their members to contact members of Congress and express why the fee is an impractical and costly idea. On this subject general aviation groups and the scheduled airlines are on the same page.

**Empirics prove the cp is unpopular**

**Pacific Flyer 2/14**/12 (“User Fees are back” <http://www.pacificflyer.com/2012/02/user-fees-are-back/>)

The White House budget released Feb. 13 would impose a $100-per-flight fee on turbine and jet powered aircraft for air traffic services, the Obama administration announced in releasing its proposed budget. Specifically, page 30 of the budget states: " ... the Administration proposes to create a $100 per flight fee, payable to the Federal Aviation Administration, by aviation operators who fly in controlled airspace." The new fee-per-flight proposal would exempt all piston aircraft, military aircraft, public aircraft, air ambulances, aircraft operating outside of controlled airspace, and Canada-to-Canada flights. It only took a couple of hours for AOPA, EAA and NBAA to issue press releases denouncing the proposal and promising a coordinated battle to oppose it. Although the $100 fee came as no surprise to the aviation groups, which watched it appear in deficit-reduction negotiations in late 2011 and again in a recent statement from the White House, it was somewhat of a shock to see it in print. Between the proposal, aimed at turbine aircraft, and a plan to eliminate depreciation rules that serve as an incentive to purchase business aircraft, business aviation fared poorly in the proposed budget. "Regrettably, the Obama administration has chosen to impose fees on the use of private aircraft, which the majority of Congress on a bipartisan basis has consistently rejected," said AOPA President Craig Fuller. "Pay at the pump has worked since the dawn of powered flight and it still works. "The last thing we need right now is to create an expensive new bureaucracy to fix what isn't broken." IF IT AIN'T BROKE ... "Ideally, the president would work with general aviation to acknowledge not only this contribution, but also the industry's value in generating jobs, helping companies compete and succeed, and providing a lifeline to communities across the country," NBAA President Ed Bolen said. "Instead, he's repeatedly proposed anti-general aviation initiatives like this one." EAA said it was already in touch with GA Caucus leadership in both houses of Congress encouraging opposition to the user fee proposal. Congress has repeatedly dismissed GA user fees in a bipartisan manner and reiterated its stance recently last month with the passage of the FAA Reauthorization Bill now awaiting the president's signature. "The administration continues to paint this added tax on general aviation as an 'equal sharing' of the expense burden but, simply put, it is not that at all," said Doug Macnair, EAA vice president of government relations. "It is an additional tax onus on GA aircraft owners and pilots, who already pay their fair share of the small percentage of air traffic services they use through fuel taxes. "Even pilots who never use ATC services pay for the system through the use of aviation gasoline and jet fuel." In a response to a petition, signed by close to 9,000 people, that urged the president to take user fees off the table, the Office of Management and Budget presaged the budget release by reaffirming the White House's commitment to pursuing the fee. "While claiming to desire economic growth and more jobs, the Obama administration singles out one of the most respected industries and their highly skilled workers for punitive fees," noted AOPA President Craig Fuller. "For inexplicable reasons, the administration singles out the business use of private aircraft as the one asset for which operating fees should be required. "This is an odd approach for policy makers who elect to fly in Boeing 747s on business and personal travel." Bolen said NBAA Members can make their voices heard with their representatives in Congress through www.nbaa.org/advocacy/contact/?ISSUE=nbaa0048, NBAA's online Contact Congress resource, which has a letter that can be sent to lawmakers opposing user fees. "NBAA will continue to advocate for the industry's priorities as Congress considers the president's latest budget proposal, and our efforts will be most effective if the people in business aviation echo our message with their elected representatives," Bolen said. "I encourage everyone in general aviation to contact their elected officials today."

# \*\*\*Air Pollution CP

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should implement the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS).**

**The bill reduces air pollution**

**Peeples 11** (Lynne staff writer for the Huffington Post “EPA’s Air Pollution Rule A “Great Victory,” Say Public Health and Environmental Advocates” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/12/21/epa-air-toxics-mercury-rule-power-plants\_n\_1163770.html)

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency unveiled historic new rules on Wednesday that would limit the mercury, arsenic and other toxic pollutants in America's air, water and food. Standing with pediatricians, public health experts and industry representatives at Children's National Medical Center in Washington, D.C., EPA administrator Lisa Jackson called the first-ever Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, or MATS, for power plant emissions a "great victory for public health, especially the health of our children." In addition to preventing up to 11,000 premature deaths and 130,000 cases of aggravated asthma among children annually by 2016, as well as other health benefits estimated by the EPA, Jackson noted the rule would provide a net increase in American jobs with no risk to the country's power supply. "The lights will stay on and we will have cleaner air," said Jackson. For the more than 20 years since the EPA was first tasked with considering toxic air pollutants under the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, a battle has waged between public health advocates, who have touted the benefits of stricter standards, and industry lobbyists, who have argued that such standards would threaten jobs and raise energy prices for Americans. Meanwhile, the EPA has issued over 110 standards to cut toxic air pollution from other sources, including oil refineries and steel plants. Power plants remained a "notable and notorious exception," said John Walke, director of the clean air program for the Natural Resources Defense Council. "The electric power sector is far and away the largest emitter of toxic air pollution in America," he told The Huffington Post. "Yet it's escaped responsibility to clean up while far smaller sources like dry cleaners in your neighborhood have already cleaned up their toxic air emissions." The EPA's own analysis estimates that the newly finalized rules would put the industry out about $10 billion a year and save the country $90 billion in health care costs. In other words, for every dollar spent under the rule, said Jackson, there would be "up to $9 of health benefits." The EPA's estimates are actually a small fraction of what could be gained under the new rules, according to experts. The agency could only account for reductions in asthma attacks, heart attacks and strokes, among other health problems associated with soot (or particulates). The prevention of cognitive disorders, kidney disease and cancers caused by mercury, dioxins, arsenic, lead and other toxins was omitted due to limited data. Part of the problem, according to Jim Pew, a staff attorney for the nonprofit Earthjustice, is that industry has "done their best to stall or block" the kind of research needed to quantify these benefits. "Both mercury and particulates can be controlled if power plants put proper scrubbers on," said Dr. Philip Landrigan, chairman of the department of preventative medicine at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York City. "The scrubbers cost money. But the loss of IQ caused by mercury and respiratory disorders caused by fine particles is also very expensive." In fact, Dr. Landrigan's own research has put a price tag on at least one of the EPA's missing pieces: the loss of IQ due to mercury. Between 300,000 and 600,000 of the 4 million babies born in the U.S. each year are exposed to significant amounts of the neurotoxin while in the womb, he said. "These babies all suffer losses of IQ," Dr. Landrigan told HuffPost. "Each IQ point is worth money." Dr. Landrigan and his team calculated that every IQ point is worth $10,000 in lifetime earnings. Overall, they attributed $1.3 billion every year to mercury emissions from power plants, based just on IQ losses. "That's why any action that the EPA takes to reduce mercury emissions is so incredibly important," he said. Up to three-quarters of the mercury that goes into the atmosphere comes out of smokestacks of coal-fired power plants. Because the particles are heavier than air, the mercury eventually falls back down and is deposited in rivers, lakes and oceans, where it is converted into a more toxic form called methylmercury. This then builds up in the food chain, meaning that fish at the top, such as blue fin tuna and shark, carry the highest levels of the toxin. "The developing brain of a fetus is exquisitely sensitive to methylmercury," said Dr. Landrigan. "At the end of the day, you have a one-time expense for the power industry or a continuing erosion of the brain power of a whole generation of American children." Still, many representatives of the power industry maintain that even this one-time cost is too much, too soon. Power companies will have three years to install equipment or shut down old plants, with the possibility of an extension into a fourth year. "It takes time to get environmental permits and approval from regulators. They can't comply with regulations within three years," said Melissa McHenry, spokesperson for American Electric Power, one of the nation's largest generators of electricity. "We don't have an issue with limits they want to get to, just the time frame." "There's no way that this rule can be implemented the way it came out," added Jeff Holmstead, a former EPA official now at law firm Bracewell and Giuliani, which represents energy industry clients. "Everyone is going to be rushing at the same time to get control tech in, and they can't do that while operating. There will be localized reliability issues." Industry will have 60 days once the rule is published to file a legal challenge. Susan Tierney, managing principal at the Analysis Group in Boston and former assistant secretary for policy at the U.S. Department of Energy, refuted these arguments. About 1,100 coal-fired units are covered by the MATS rule, of which about 40 percent don't use modern pollution controls. Many of the power plants most affected, she said, were built before these technological advances. She also pointed to the 17 states that already have mercury controls, noting that the plants in those states are already compliant. "The technology is well known," Tierney told HuffPost. Constellation Energy, for example, invested $885 million to add environmental controls and a new scrubber to its Brandon Shores facility in Maryland. This resulted in a 90 percent cut to mercury emissions, 1,385 jobs during peak construction, and many more jobs manufacturing the clean air technologies. "Power plants that are old and dirty should've ended their useful life already and gone out of commission," added Michael Livermore, executive director of the Institute for Policy Integrity and adjunct professor at New York University. "We live in the 21st century. We shouldn't be using plants from 1950s." "The benefits of this rule outweigh the costs by a huge factor," he said. "In fact, given the huge ratio of benefits to costs, we could make the rule even more strict and still generate even greater net benefits."

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**The bill would reduce 91% of mercury--- solves pollution**

**Marrapodi 11** (Eric staff writer for CNN “EPA proposes new mercury standards for power plants” <http://www.cnn.com/2011/HEALTH/03/16/us.epa.mercury/index.html>)

The Environmental Protection Agency proposed new national guidelines on Wednesday for mercury and air toxics released from power plants. The move came in response to a court-ordered deadline and would require many power plants to install pollution control technologies. "Today we're taking an important step forward in EPA's efforts to safeguard the health of millions of Americans," EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said at a press conference to sign the new order. "Under the Clean Air Act these standards will require American power plants to put in place proven and widely available pollution technologies to control and cut harmful emissions like mercury, arsenic, chromium, nickel and acid gases," Jackson said. Jackson said the new standards would "prevent 91% of mercury in coal from being released in the air." The D.C. Court of Appeals ordered the EPA to make the rules final by November. Companies have three years to comply, but some could get a one-year extension if the technology cannot be installed in time. The Power Plant Mercury and Air Toxics Standards are expected to have broad health benefits, according to the EPA. The pollution control methods are expected to prevent 17,000 premature deaths and 11,000 heart attacks. The EPA said it would also help eliminate 10,000 cases of childhood asthma. The announcement was hailed by the American Lung Association and several groups of doctors who spoke at the press event. A group of second-graders from Amidon-Bowen Elementary School in Washington, D.C., joined EPA Administration Lisa Jackson as she signed the new guidelines. Dr. Marian Burton, the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, told the students, "I think you already know this rule is for you and for all the children in the America who will follow you. "Dirty air makes people sick. That's the long and short of it," Burton continued. "If you think it's expensive to put a scrubber on a smokestack you should see how much it costs to treat a preventable birth defect." Jackson said the instillation and maintenance of the pollution controls would provide jobs as well as health benefits. "These are good labor-intensive jobs that cannot be shipped overseas," she said. Jackson emphasized these new measures would come at a financial cost for utility companies but said it would level the playing field for utility companies once they are all operating from the same clean air standard. Consumers will see a bump in their bills while utility companies put the new technology in place, she said. "We estimate impact on utility bills that are pretty minor, three to four dollars a month," Jackson said. Those costs to companies and consumers she said would be far outweighed by the benefits.

**The counterplan reduces the amount of all pollutants**

**EPA 11** (United States Environmental Protection Agency “Benefits and Costs of Cleaning Up Toxic Air Pollution From Power Plants” <http://www.epa.gov/airquality/powerplanttoxics/pdfs/20111221MATSimpactsfs.pdf>)

On December 16, 2011, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) finalized the first national Clean Air Act standards to reduce mercury and other toxic air pollution from coal and oil‐fired power plants. The science shows that mercury and toxic air pollution is a threat to public health and has real impacts on people’s lives. This fact sheet provides an overview of the benefits and highlights key impacts. • Protect public health—The Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) will save thousands of lives and prevent more than 100,000 heart and asthma attacks each year while providing important health protections to the most vulnerable, such as children and older Americans. • Overdue reductions lead to vital health benefits—Until now there were no national limits on emissions of mercury and other air toxics from power plants. Uncontrolled releases of toxic air pollutants like mercury – a neurotoxin – can impair children’s ability to learn. • Practical, cost‐effective and protective standards—More than 20 years ago, a bipartisan Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments and required EPA to control mercury and toxic air pollution. These standards will end 20 years of industry uncertainty while leveling the playing field for power plants, ensuring that modern pollution controls are installed. • Jobs for American workers—The updated standards will create thousands of good jobs for American workers who will be hired to build, install, and operate the equipment to reduce health‐threatening emissions of mercury, acid gases, and other toxic air pollutants. • Reliable, affordable energy—The standards clean the air and keep the lights on. IMPROVE AIR QUALITY, PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH • The standards will provide significant benefits to neighborhoods near power plants as well as communities hundreds of miles away. • In addition to reducing emissions of mercury and other toxic air pollutants, the controls needed to meet the standards will result in reduced emissions of sulfur dioxide and fine particles, which will lower airborne soot levels throughout the United States. • The value of the air quality improvements for human health alone totals $37 billion to $90 billion each year. • 540,000 missed work or “sick” days will be avoided each year, enhancing productivity and lowering health care costs. The Mercury and Air Toxics Standards Will Prevent: Once Implemented (cases each year) Premature Death Up to 11,000 Chronic Bronchitis 2,800 Heart Attacks 4,700 Asthma Attacks 130,000 Hospital and Emergency Room Visits 5,700 Restricted Activity Days 3,200,000 This chart shows the health benefits of the final standards to reduce mercury and other air toxics emissions from power plants Uncontrolled releases of mercury from power plants can damage children’s developing nervous systems, reducing their ability to think and learn. Releases of other toxic air pollutants from power plants can cause a range of dangerous health problems in adults, from cancer to respiratory illnesses. • Fish consumption advisories have been issued across the United States as a result of widespread mercury contamination in rivers, lakes, and streams. • The benefits are especially important to minority, low income and other populations who are disproportionately impacted by asthma, other debilitating health conditions, or because mercury contamination prevents them from fully relying on fish as a food source. OVERDUE REDUCTIONS LEAD TO VITAL HEALTH BENEFITS • The final rule establishes power plant emission standards for mercury, acid gases, and non‐mercury metallic toxic pollutants that will: prevent 90 percent of the mercury in coal burned in power plants from being emitted to the air; reduce 88 percent of acid gas emissions from power plants; and cut 41 percent of sulfur dioxide emissions from power plants beyond the reductions expected from the Cross State Air Pollution Rule. • Together, MATS and the Cross‐State Air Pollution Rule are estimated to provide annual benefits of $150‐$380 billion and prevent 18,000 – 46,000 premature deaths, 540,000 asthma attacks, 13,000 emergency room visits and 2 million missed work or school days each year. PRACTICAL, COST‐EFFECTIVE AND PROTECTIVE STANDARDS • EPA’s MATS standards are practical, cost‐effective, and protective. After proposal, EPA received more than 900,000 comments. Based on this input and data, the agency has finalized standards that follow the law, maintain vital and significant health benefits and can be implemented for $9.6 billion, about a billion dollars less than the proposed standards. That means that for every dollar spent to reduce pollution, Americans get $3‐9 in health benefits in return. • There are also benefits to the economy. To meet the MATS standards, many power plants will upgrade their operations with modern and widely available pollution control technology, helping to modernize an aging fleet of power plants, most of which are over 30 years old and many of which are over 50 years old. JOBS FOR AMERICAN WORKERS • EPA expects most facilities will comply with MATS through a range of strategies, including the use of existing emission controls, upgrades to existing emission controls, installation of new pollution controls, and fuel switching. Many facilities will need workers to build, install, operate and maintain these pollution controls. 3 • EPA estimates that implementing this rule will provide employment for tens of thousands of Americans, by supporting 46,000 short‐term construction jobs and 8,000 long‐term utility jobs. RELIABLE, AFFORDABLE ENERGY • For 40 years, we have been able to both implement the Clean Air Act and keep the lights on. MATS will not change that. • EPA and Department of Energy analyses indicate that there will be more than enough electric generating capacity to meet the nation’s needs. EPA’s analysis projects 4.7 gigawatts will retire out of the more than 1000 gigawatts that make up the nation’s electric generating capacity. That’s less than one half of one percent. • Facilities generally have up to four years to meet the standards, providing enough time for them to install pollution controls to protect Americans’ health, while continuing to meet the nation’s needs for reliable, affordable energy. • In the event that a localized reliability issue arises, EPA has also issued an enforcement policy under its Clean Air Act authority that provides a well‐defined pathway for generating units that are shown to be necessary to maintain electric reliability and units could, on a case‐by‐case basis, obtain a schedule of up to an additional year to achieve compliance. • Electricity rates are projected to stay well within normal historical fluctuations. EPA modeling indicates that these standards will result in relatively small changes in the average retail price of electricity (approximately 3 percent), primarily due to increased demand for natural gas, keeping electricity prices below 1990 levels. BACKGROUND • There are about 1,400 coal‐ and oil‐fired electric generating units (EGUs) at 600 power plants that emit harmful pollutants including mercury, non‐mercury metallic toxics, acid gases, and organic air toxics including dioxin. • Power plants are currently the dominant emitters of mercury (50 percent), acid gases (over 75 percent) and many toxic metals (20‐60 percent) in the United States.

# 2NC Shields Elections NB

**Majority of democrats, independents, and republicans support reduction in air pollution**

**ALA, PI, and GQR 12** (American Lung Association organization, Perception Insight opinion research and consulting for campaigns, Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, public polling “New Poll Shows the Public Wants EPA to do More to Reduce Air Pollution” <http://www.lung.org/press-room/press-releases/new-poll-shows-the-public.html>)

As big polluters and their allies in Congress continue attacks on the Clean Air Act, the American Lung Association released a new bipartisan survey examining public views of the Clean Air Act and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) efforts to update and enforce lifesaving clean air standards, including carbon and mercury emissions from power plants. The bipartisan survey, conducted by Democratic polling firm Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research and Republican firm Perception Insight, finds that nearly three-quarters of likely voters (73 percent) nationwide support the view that it is possible to protect public health through stronger air quality standards while achieving a healthy economy, over the notion that we must choose between public health or a strong economy. This overwhelming support includes 78 percent of independents, 60 percent of Republicans and 62 percent of conservatives, as well as significant support in Maine, Pennsylvania and Ohio. The Obama Administration will soon release updated clean air standards for carbon pollution emitted by power plants, and a substantial majority of voters support the EPA implementing these standards, even after hearing opposing arguments that stricter standards will damage the economic recovery. Initially, 72 percent of voters nationwide support the new protections on carbon emissions from power plants, including overwhelming majorities of both Democrats and independents and a majority of Republicans. After listening to a balanced debate with messages both for and against setting new carbon standards, support still remained robust with a near 2-to-1 margin (63 percent in favor and 33 percent opposed). Support remained especially robust in Maine and Pennsylvania (64 percent in each state). The majority of Ohio voters (52 percent) also favored new carbon standards, which is notable since the poll was conducted during a period of heavy media attention concerning statewide electricity rate increases and potential power plant shutdowns. “This bipartisan poll affirms that clean air protections have broad support across the political spectrum,” said Peter Iwanowicz, Assistant Vice President, National Policy and Advocacy with the American Lung Association. “Big polluters and their allies in Congress cannot ignore the facts; more air pollution means more childhood asthma attacks, more illness and more people dying prematurely. It’s time polluters and their Congressional allies drop their attempts to weaken, block or delay clean air protections and listen to the public who overwhelmingly wants the EPA to do more to protect the air we breathe.” Voters also voiced strong support for stricter standards to control industrial and power sector mercury and toxic air pollution. When asked about setting stricter limits on the amount of mercury that power plants and other facilities emit, 78 percent of likely voters were in favor of the EPA updating these standards. Strong support was also seen for stricter standards on industrial boilers. Initially, 69 percent of voters supported the EPA implementing stricter standards on boiler emissions. After hearing messaging from both sides of the issue, voters continued to support these standards by nearly a 20-point margin (56 percent favor, 37 percent oppose). Key poll findings include: Nearly three quarters (73 percent) of voters, say that we do not have to choose between air quality and a strong economy – we can achieve both; A 2-to-1 majority (60 to 31 percent) believe that strengthening safeguards against pollution will create, rather than destroy, jobs by encouraging innovation; About two-thirds of voters (66 percent) favor EPA updating air pollution standards by setting stricter limits; 72 percent of voters support new standards for carbon pollution from power plants and support is strong (63 percent) after hearing arguments from both sides of the issue; 60 percent of voters support stricter standards for gasoline and limits on the amount of tailpipe emissions from cars and SUVs (particularly strong given all the recent attention to high gasoline prices). Despite more than a year’s worth of continued attacks on clean air protections from big corporate polluters and their allies in Congress, voters across the political spectrum view the Clean Air Act very positively; with a 2-to-1 favorable to unfavorable ratio. At the same time, feelings toward Congress continue to drop, especially among Democrats and independents. Just 18 percent of voters nationally give Congress a favorable rating, while 56 percent rate Congress unfavorable. The unfavorable rating of Congress is up 9 percent since the American Lung Association’s last survey released in June 2011. “The survey clearly indicates that voters reject the notion that we have to choose between strong safeguards against air pollution and economic growth,” said Andrew Bauman, Vice President at Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research. “In fact, voters overwhelmingly believe that stronger safeguards against air pollution will create jobs in America.” “The poll does show there is broad support across partisan lines for new carbon regulations on power plants,” said Marc DelSignore, President of Perception Insight. “However, there is a significant difference in the views regarding the impact regulations may have on the economy, with Republicans expressing higher concern for possible job loss and rising energy prices than Democrats or independents.”

**77% of voters support MATS**

**DPC 12** (Democratc policy and Communications center “Fact Sheet: EPA’s Mercury and Air Toxic Standards (MATS)” <http://dpc.senate.gov/docs/fs-112-2-121.pdf>)

The public strongly supports EPA action on clean air standards. According to a bipartisan poll sponsored by Ceres, 77% of voters support the MATS safeguard. In addition, 88% of Democrats, 85% of independents, and 58% of Republicans oppose Congress stopping the EPA from enacting new limits on air pollution from electric power plants. [Ceres, 10/12/11] Americans reject the false choice between a clean environment and a strong economy. Nearly three quarters (73%) of voters, say that we do not have to choose between air quality and a strong economy – we can achieve both. A 2-to-1 majority (60% to 31%) believe that strengthening safeguards against pollution will create, rather than destroy, jobs by encouraging innovation.

# Aff – Links to Ptx

**The counterplan is extremely unpopular---It was just voted down in congress**

**Young 6/20/12** (Saundra cnn medical senior producer “Senate votes in favor of clean air protections” http://thechart.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/20/senate-votes-in-favor-of-clean-air-protections/)

Senate Joint Resolution 37, the Senate bill that would overturn the Environmental Protection Agency's controversial Mercury and Air Toxics Standards or MATS, was voted down Wednesday by a margin of 46 to 53. Introduced by Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) in February, the resolution was a challenge to the country's first national protections rule designed to limit the amount of heavy metals like mercury, arsenic, chromium, nickel and other toxic air pollutants released by power plants that burn coal and oil - toxins many suspect cause cancer and other health problems. But Inhofe said the bill was specifically designed to kill the coal industry and the good paying jobs it provides. He led the charge to repeal the protections and vowed to keep fighting what he called the Obama administration's "damaging regulatory regime." "Our momentum continues to build, as a growing chorus is rising up against the Obama-EPA's radical green agenda," Inhofe said. "Whether it's EPA regulations hurting farmers, a 'crucify them' philosophy against American energy producers, or an admission from EPA officials that their rules, designed to kill coal will be 'painful every step of the way,' this much is clear: EPA is earning a reputation for abuse. During the course of this debate, we exposed the economic pain of EPA's rules, gaining the strong bipartisan support of business groups and labor unions, of Democrats and Republicans from states that will feel the heavy hand of the federal government as it puts them out of business."

# \*\*\*BioDiversity CP

# 1NC Shell

**The United States federal government should institute and fund a Quadrennial Ecosystems Services Trends Assessment.**

**Solves biodiversity**

**PCAST ’11** ( President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT SUSTAINING ENVIRONMENTAL CA PITA L : PROTECTING SOC IETY AND THE ECONOMY , White House, July 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/pcast\_sustaining\_environmental\_capital\_report.pdf)

In the report we transmit here, PCAST’s Working Group on Biodiversity Preservation and Ecosystem Sustainability addressed the needs and opportunities in relation to both of these dimensions of the capacity of governments—and especially the U.S. Federal government—to fulfill more effectively their responsibility in relation to the protection of environmental capital and ecosystem services. The Working Group’s recommendations, which we endorse, involve a three­pronged effort encompassing ways to make better use of existing knowledge, to support the generation of essential new knowledge, and to expand the use of informatics. We here boil down those recommendations to the following six key points. 1. The U.S. government should institute and fund a Quadrennial Ecosystems Services Trends (QuEST) Assessment. QuEST should provide an integrated, comprehensive assessment of the condition of U.S. ecosystems; predictions concerning trends in ecosystem change; syntheses of research findings on how ecosystem structure and condition are linked to the ecosystem functions that contribute to societally important ecosystem services; and characterization of challenges to the sustainability of benefit flows from ecosystems, together with ways to make policy responses to these challenges more effective. The QuEST assessment should draw and build upon the wide variety of ongoing monitoring programs, previously conducted and ongo­ ing assessments of narrower scope, and the expanded monitoring and species­discovery efforts for which we also call in this Report. And, it should be closely coordinated with the quadrennial National Climate Assessment mandated by the Global Change Research Act of 1990.

# 2NC Solvency - Monitoring

**QUEST resolves data gaps – allows policy response to bio-d problems**

**PCAST ’11** ( President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT SUSTAINING ENVIRONMENTAL CA PITA L : PROTECTING SOC IETY AND THE ECONOMY , White House, July 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/pcast\_sustaining\_environmental\_capital\_report.pdf)

The U.S. government should institute and fund a Quadrennial Ecosystems Services Trends (QuEST) Assessment, that will provide: − Up­to­date syntheses of research findings on how ecosystem structure and condition are linked to the ecosystem functions that contribute to societally important ecosystem ser­ vices, as well as research findings on the characterization and valuation of those services; − Integrated Information on the condition of U.S. ecosystems, including but not limited to their biodiversity, as well as on measures of ecosystem services flowing from them and the contributions of these to human health, economies, and other aspects of well­being; − Assessment of trends in these factors and scenarios of their evolution going forward under a range of assumptions about driving forces and management strategies and policies; and − Application of the foregoing information to identify and characterize challenges to the sustainability of the benefit flows from U.S. ecosystems, together with ways to make the policy responses to these challenges more effective.

**QUEST would enhance status quo monitoring programs**

**PCAST ’11** ( President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT SUSTAINING ENVIRONMENTAL CA PITA L : PROTECTING SOC IETY AND THE ECONOMY , White House, July 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/pcast\_sustaining\_environmental\_capital\_report.pdf)

The QuEST assessment should draw and build upon the wide variety of ongoing monitoring programs, as well as on the expanded monitoring and species­discovery efforts we call for elsewhere here. It should draw as well on previously conducted and ongoing assessments of narrower scope and should be closely coordinated with the quadrennial National Climate Assessment mandated by the Global Change Research Act of 1990. Federal agencies collectively currently spend more than $10 billion annually on restoration activities, land and easement purchases, and incentive payments aimed primarily at conserving biodiversity or protecting and restoring ecosystem services within the United States. Notable examples of such con­ servation investments are annual expenditures of nearly $6 billion under the Farm Bill to improve water quality, reduce soil erosion, and protect wildlife habitat; $3.8 billion in mitigation costs under major federal regulatory programs; nearly $1 billion for endangered species recovery; and up to $900 million under the Land and Water Conservation Fund to acquire land and water and conservation easements (although this has been funded at less than $200 million annually in recent years). While additional funding for these conservation investments is warranted, more careful targeting could achieve greater environmental benefits at the same level of expenditures. The allocation of much Federal conservation funding currently is based on factors other than an expected conservation benefit. In many cases, in fact, federal legislation explicitly mandates distribution of conservation funding not to achieve maximum conservation benefits, but rather by sector or geographic distribution. In other cases, agencies have the discretion to target resources based on expected effectiveness of the investment, but lack the expertise or the mandate to do so.

**QUEST solves data integration and policy response**

**Rassam ’11** – Executive Director, American Fisheries Society: World Council of Fisheries Societies (Gus, Presidential Science Advisors Recommend Accounting of Ecosystem Services, AIBS Public Policy Report, Volume 12, Issue 16, August 2, 2011, https://groups.google.com/group/afs-fisheries/tree/browse\_frm/month/2011-08/3fa7510590ee74f6?rnum=1&\_done=%2Fgroup%2Fafs-fisheries%2Fbrowse\_frm%2Fmonth%2F2011-08%3F)

A new report by the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) urges the federal government to periodically assess the condition and value of the nation’s ecosystem services. A Quadrennial Ecosystems Services Trends Assessment could build upon existing monitoring efforts, and could be conducted in conjunction with the quadrennial National Climate Assessment. “It is common wisdom in business that economic growth depends on regular inventories of capital and assets, along with assessments of risks. Given that so much of our Nation’s economy is underpinned by our ecosystems, it is only sensible to periodically take an accounting of our environmental capital and assess the risks to it,” said Rosina Bierbaum, Dean of the School of Natural Resources and Environment at the University of Michigan, and co-chair of the working group that led the study. “Such assessments will greatly inform public policy concerning these assets.” The report recommends that the government improve online accessibility of biological diversity data that federal agencies already collect. One way to achieve this would be for the government to enforce existing requirements that federal agencies publish data related to biodiversity preservation and ecosystem services within one year of collection. The data.gov website could be an appropriate venue for hosting the data. A coordinating entity should also be established to “interact with international biodiversity and ecosystem information systems in the development of globally accepted biodiversity and ecosystem information standards, and should seek out and encourage partnerships with the private and academic sectors to develop innovative tools for data integration, analysis, visualization, and decision making,” states the report. PCAST also called for the development of more sophisticated methodologies, such as remote sensing, to value ecosystem services for better prioritization of the $10 billion spent annually by federal agencies on ecological restoration and biodiversity-preservation activities.

# 2NC Solvency – Data

**QUEST allows for greater data integration for policy response**

**Houston ’11** – writer for ESA (Terence, “ESA Policy News: August 4” Ecological Society of America, ECotone, August 4th, 2011, http://www.esa.org/esablog/ecology-in-policy/esa-policy-news-august-4/)

The President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) has released a report recommending that the federal government work to improve its efforts to assess ecosystems and the social and economic value they provide. The report, entitled “Sustaining Environmental Capital: Protecting Society and the Economy,” recommends that the federal government, in accordance with its responsibility to strengthen the economy, institute and fund a Quadrennial Ecosystems Services Trends (QuEST) Assessment, to identify trends related to ecosystem sustainability and potential policy responses. The report’s executive summary explains that “even as the government is rightly focused on the direct threats to the economic aspects of wellbeing in the form of recession, unemployment, and the stagnation of the standard of living of the middle class, it must not fail to address the threats to both the environmental and the economic aspects of wellbeing that derive from the accelerating degradation of the environmental capital—the nation’s ecosystems and the biodiversity they contain—from which flow ‘ecosystem services’ underpinning much economic activity as well as public health, safety, and environmental quality.” The report calls for the development of more sophisticated methods to evaluate ecosystem services, such as satellite-based remote sensing of natural resource changes to improve the quality of information available. The report updates a 1998 Clinton administration PCAST report, “Teaming with Life: Investing in Science to Understand and Use America’s Living Capital.” The report also expresses concern that few of the 55 federal environmental monitoring programs surveyed by PCAST make their data publicly available online. PCAST asserts that the money the federal government has spent to gather environmental data does little good if it is not readily available or shared with other agencies.

# 2NC Solvency – International Efforts

**CP spurs international cooperation in IPBES**

**ENB ’12** (Earth Negotiations Bulletin, “ IPBES-2 HIGHLIGHTS” Volume 16 Number 99 - Tuesday, 17 April 2012, IISD Reporting Services, http://www.iisd.ca/vol16/enb1699e.html)

 Republic of Korea, for ASIA-PACIFIC, reported on recommendations from the Asia-Pacific regional meeting on IPBES held in March 2012, including that IPBES have a small bureau with a separate science panel and a centralized secretariat with regional hubs. Bosnia and Herzegovina, for EASTERN EUROPE, supported an integrated paper on rules of procedure. Mexico, for GRULAC, said capacity building should be clearly defined in the work programme, and called for a related working group. Denmark, for the EU, said that IPBES should attract policy-relevant contributions from scientists on ecosystem services. South Africa, for the G-77/CHINA, said IPBES should maintain scientific independence, and collaborate with existing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). NORWAY urged delegates to prioritize elements required to establish and operationalize IPBES. The US said that they could contribute to IPBES via the Quadrennial Ecosystem Services Trends (QuEST).

**That’s key to broader biodiversity efforts**

**PCAST ’11** ( President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT SUSTAINING ENVIRONMENTAL CA PITA L : PROTECTING SOC IETY AND THE ECONOMY , White House, July 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/pcast\_sustaining\_environmental\_capital\_report.pdf)

Assessment mechanisms. Current international assessments include the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Follow­up67 and the Intergovernmental Science­Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)68 that is now in development. The latter was effectively approved by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2010 through a resolution that invites UNEP to host an intergovernmental conference to “determine modalities and institutional arrangements” of the new body. Functions of IPBES will include (a) identifying and prioritizing key scientific information needed for policymakers at appropriate scales, (b) performing regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their inter­linkages, which should include comprehensive global, regional, and, as necessary, sub­regional assessments and thematic issues at appropriate scales and new topics identified by science, (c) supporting policy formulation and implementation, and (d) prioritizing key capacity­building needs to improve the science­policy interface.69,70 Relative to other major assessments, IPBES should provide more direct support to policy makers at many levels. IPBES assessments should provide conditional predictions of the consequences of specific policy options at well defined spatial and temporal scales.71 There are a large number of other international environmental assessments that are relevant to bio­ diversity and ecosystem services. These include the Dryland Land Degradation Assessment (FAO); the Forest Resources Assessment (FAO); the State of the World’s Plant Genetic Resources (FAO); State of the World’s Animal Genetic Resources (FAO); the Global International Waters Assessment (UNEP); the Global Environment Outlook (UNEP); the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC); the World Resources Report (WRI); the World Water Assessment (UNESCO); the State of the World’s Traditional Knowledge on Biodiversity (CBD); and the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD).72 However, it is likely that IPBES will become the body pri­ marily responsible for assessing the relation between biodiversity change and the benefits that people get from ecosystems

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**Biodiversity efforts have bipartisan support**

**Gunningham & Young ’97** - Director of National Research Centre for OHS Regulation, Professor Australian Centre for Environmental Law (Neil and Mike, Toward Optimal Environmental Policy: The Case of Biodiversity Conservation, Ecology Law Quarterly 1997, Hein Online)

In assessing guidelines for mixing instruments and mechanisms for conserving biodiversity, various authors have developed lists of evaluation criteria." Our preferred list includes: Â° Dependability or Certainty-the instrument delivers the desired biodiversity target, even when knowledge about likely responses is uncertain; Â° Precaution-the instrument avoids the chance of serious or irreversible consequences, especially when there is scientific uncertainty about the outcome; 0 Equity-the instrument operates without advantage or favor with respect to all groups of people, including future generations; Â° Economic Efficiency-with regard to implied and actual values, the chosen trade-off between production and conservation is achieved at the least cost (productive efficiency), and no reassignment or reallocation of property rights will improve production or biodiversity objectives without making someone worse off (productive efficiency);52 0 Dynamic and Continuing Incentive-the mechanism continues to encourage technical innovation as well as improvement of biodiversity beyond the official policy target, and automatically adapts to changing technology, prices and climatic conditions; Administrative Feasibility and Cost-monitoring and information costs are minimal (low information cost),'3 government enforcement is cost-effective and can be financed from available revenue while self- enforcement is encouraged (low administrative cost), the instruments requirements are simply explained (communicative simplicity),5"˜ and the decisionmaking processes associated with the instrument are easily understood (transparency); and Community and Political Acceptability-the community is motivated to ensure that biodiversity conservation objectives are achieved, are perceived as being legitimately formulated and delivered, add to social harmony, are consistent with government commitments, and attract bipartisan support.

**CP is bipartisan – GCA proves**

**Oliva ’10** - Chief, Compliance and Enforcement at District Department of the Environment (Manuel, U.S. Policy: Bipartisan Leaders Make Bold Proposal for Conservation, Conservation International, March 26th, 2010, http://blog.conservation.org/2010/03/us-policy-bold-proposal-conservation/)

Here in the U.S., a lot of news has focused lately on how partisan politics have taken over Washington, DC. However, today a bipartisan effort highlights the ability of both parties to come together in agreement on a critical issue and the proper plan to solve it: the introduction of the Global Conservation Act of 2010. Forests, fish stocks, fresh water sources, healthy soils, coral reefs and wildlife species around the world are vanishing rapidly. The protection of these natural resources has long been an important aspect of U.S. foreign policy; however, there has never been a cohesive strategy to fully address the scope of this loss. The Global Conservation Act of 2010 provides this strategy. Introduced on Capitol Hill today, the bill asks the administration to develop a national strategy for global conservation, with quantitative benchmarks to monitor progress and a national security assessment of the threats from resource scarcities. In addition, the bill proposes that a specific coordinator work to implement this strategy in collaboration with other government agencies–as well as with partner countries–to effectively deliver conservation assistance. Essentially, the bill offers a vision for U.S. conservation efforts and a roadmap to achieve this vision.

**Bipartisan support for environmental efforts – farm bill proves**

**Helgen 6/21/12** – Press Secretary for Senator Amy Klobuchar (Brigit, Klobuchar: Farm Bill Passes Senate with Bipartisan Support, Senator Amy Klobuchar: News Releases, http://www.klobuchar.senate.gov/newsreleases\_detail.cfm?id=337084&)

Washington, D.C. – U.S. Senator Amy Klobuchar announced today that the 2012 Farm Bill has passed the Senate with bipartisan support. Klobuchar is a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, which is responsible for crafting the Farm Bill, and she worked to help secure Senate passage. The bill includes Klobuchar’s provisions helping beginning farmers and ranchers access crop insurance and land for cattle grazing, addressing captive shipping issues, and helping pork and poultry producers reduce catastrophic losses. “Today’s bipartisan vote is a victory for this critical legislation that will help preserve and strengthen the farm safety net, conserve our natural resources, and boost homegrown energy,” Klobuchar said.“I worked hard to ensure the legislation supported our beginning farmers and ranchers as well as our pork and poultry producers, and I will continue to work to move this legislation forward and help strengthen Minnesota’s rural communities and ensure our farmers have the support they need to thrive and succeed.” The 2012 Farm Bill includes Klobuchar’s provisions that would help beginning farmers and ranchers access crop insurance by reducing the cost of insurance by 10 percent and eliminating administrative fees for these producers in their first five years. The provision also helps beginning farmers get more coverage from the crop insurance program by changing the formula used to determine a producer’s expected production yield when they don’t have a complete established production history for a crop. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (UDSA), only 7 percent of beginning farmers and ranchers participate in the program. Crop insurance premiums are based on a farmer or rancher’s previous production history, putting beginning producers at a disadvantage and discouraging them from participating in the program altogether, leaving them more vulnerable to disasters. Klobuchar’s second provision, which was cosponsored by Senators Mike Johanns (R-NE), John Hoeven (R-ND), and Max Baucus (D-MT), would allow beginning producers to graze cattle on Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) acres without a reduction in payments for the CRP landowner. Managed grazing can be beneficial for wildlife, encourage biodiversity, and help control invasive nonnative species and quality of vegetative cover. Waiving the penalty for allowing beginning farmers and ranchers to graze on CRP acres will help beginning producers get a start while providing valuable ecological benefits on CRP land. The nation’s farm population is aging rapidly. In the last five years the number of farmers over the age of 75 has increased by 30 percent and the number of farmers under the age of 25 has decreased by 20 percent. Providing a path for young men and women who want to start a farm or ranch is critical to the continued viability of the agricultural sector and the vitality of rural America.

# Aff - Links to Politics

**GOP opposition to biodiversity regulations**

**Guerrerio ’11** – energy examiner for the examiner (John, GOP continue fight against clean energy, biodiversity, and Science, examiner, march 8th, 2011, http://www.examiner.com/article/gop-continue-fight-against-clean-energy-biodiversity-and-science)

The Earth has gone through five major extinction events in the past, all of which were caused by natural processes. The sixth one has been underway for some time now and is beginning to pick up speed. There may be time to avert such a calamity, but with local, state, federal, regional, and global government strapped just trying to keep the lights on and paychecks being signed, there is no hope that any real action will take place to safeguard the planet's rich biodiversity. The sixth extinction is being caused by a multitude of factors that all have one common thread, namely, human actions. Deforestation, overfishing, pollution, and climate change have reached such massive levels of impact on a planetary scale that animals are falling from the sky, dying in the sea, being born with deformities, and disappearing at such an alarming rate that maintaining our current global population trajectory seems unlikely; the extinction of species is bound to affect human population figures in the near future. In light of this concern, the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services has been set up through the United Nations Environment Progam. The panel will be set up and run in a similar fashion to the IPCC, but it will focus singularly on maintaining biological diversity on the planet. Hopefully, the IPBES can learn from the IPCC's mistakes.

Forty years of progress on environmental protections and safeguards are in jeopardy of being rolled back. GOP representatives are moving to dismantle environmental and health regulations relating to fossil fuels, all in the hope of receiving larger campaign contributions in the future. Fossil fuel companies have been fighting against regulations for some time now; their plan to undermine climate science through subversive denial mechanisms using media propaganda has shifted its focus to rewriting laws through direct bribery of the American Congress. The EPA and climate science are no longer their only targets; it appears as though Republicans dislike Science in general, and are working toward setting up a government in America that based more on their religion rather than one based on rational thought and Science [it would appear as though the Taliban has usurped the GOP]. 170 organizations and universities have signed a letter to Republicans asking them to cease and disist their outright attack on Science; included signatories include AAAS and AGU, as well as numerous colleges and universities.

**Biodiversity policy is unpopular with Democrats and republicans – reluctance**

**Walsh ’11** – writer for Time Magazine (Bryan, Politics: It’s Not Just Republicans Who Anger Greens. Obama Can Do It Too, Time, February 11th, http://ecocentric.blogs.time.com/2011/02/11/politics-its-not-just-republicans-who-anger-greens-obama-can-do-it-too/)

I’ve written more than a few posts recently highlighting Republican opposition to action on climate change and the party’s efforts to dismantle environmental regulations. But while the GOP has been out front targeting the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Obama Administration hasn’t escaped blame from environmentalists for some of its policies. The White House is still fielding criticism for botching the politics of last year’s carbon cap-and-trade bill, and more recently for virtually surrendering on climate change. (See The New Yorker‘s Hendrik Hertzberg’s recent piece on Obama’s State of the Union speech, which conspicuously lacked any mention of climate change or global warming.) Climate policy is largely beyond the White House’s control now—other than defending the EPA’s regulatory powers—but that’s not the only area where Obama has irked greens. To wit: On February 8, the Obama Administration announced that it would not list the Pacific walrus under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Even though the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) determined that the species is in some danger—due in part to shrinking sea ice from climate change eroding its habitat—the agency put the walrus into the”warranted but precluded” category, a kind of waiting list allowed under the ESA if FWS believes other species deserve more protection. That wait could be indefinite, however, and the Center for Biological Diversity called it a “black hole.” The move continues the White House’s general reluctance to use the ESA as a means to address climate change—something groups like the Center have been pushing for in lawsuits for years.

# \*\*\*China Cooperation CP

# 1NC Shell

Text: The United States federal government should purpose bilateral cooperation over counter-terrorism strategies to the People’s Republic of China.

China says yes – cooperation is desired and solves better than unilateral coordination

Xinhua 2/16, Xinhua News, Chinese national news source, “Xi urges China-US cooperation in Asia-Pacific region,” February 16th, 2012, from Xinhua News, <http://www.china.org.cn/world/Xijinping_visit/2012-02/16/content_24647385.htm//MC>

Visiting Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping on Wednesday urged China and the United States to conduct positive interactions in the Asia-Pacific region. "As the interests of China and the United States converge more closely in the Asia-Pacific than in anywhere else, this region should naturally become an important area where they engage in positive interactions and pursue mutually beneficial cooperation," Xi said at a luncheon hosted by friendly organizations in the United States. Xi, who arrived here Monday for a five-day visit, called on both countries to steadily enhance coordination and cooperation in international affairs and on global issues. "Our world is undergoing complex and profound changes," Xi said. China and the United States should meet challenges together and share responsibilities in international affairs. "This is what China-U.S. cooperative partnership calls for and what the international community expects from us," he said. China and the United States should enhance coordination regarding the situation on the Korean Peninsula, the Iranian nuclear issue and other hotspot issues through bilateral and multilateral mechanisms, Xi said. Both countries should increase cooperation on global issues such as climate change, counter-terrorism, cyber security, outer space security, energy and resources, public health, food security and disaster prevention and mitigation, he added. "We should jointly promote global peace, stability and common development, and make the international system a more equitable, just, inclusive and orderly one," the vice president said. He said China welcomes a constructive role by the United States in promoting peace, stability and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region. "At the same time, we hope the United States will respect the interests and concerns of China and other countries in this region," Xi said.

Cooperation is key to security and fighting climate change

Cohen 09, William S. Cohen, chairman and CEO of The Cohen Group and former U.S. secretary of defense, from the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Smart Power in U.S.-China Relations,” 2009, pg online @ http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090309\_mcgiffert\_uschinasmartpower\_web.pdf

The evolution of Sino-U.S. relations over the next months, years, and decades has the potential to have a greater impact on global security and prosperity than any other bilateral or multilateral arrangement. In this sense, many analysts consider the US.-China diplomatic relationship to be the most influential in the world. Without question, strong and stable U.S. alliances provide the foundation for the protection and promotion of U.S. and global interests. Yet within that broad framework, the trajectory of U.S.-China relations will determine the success, or failure, of efforts to address the toughest global challenges: global financial stability, energy security and climate change, nonproliferation, and terrorism, among other pressing issues. Shepherding that trajectory in the most constructive direction possible must therefore be a priority for Washington and Beijing. Virtually no major global challenge can be met without U.S.-China cooperation. The uncertainty of that future trajectory and the "strategic mistrust" between leaders in Washington and Beijing necessarily concerns many experts and policymakers in both countries. Although some U.S. analysts see China as a strategic competitor—deliberately vying with the United States for energy resources, military superiority, and international political influence alike— analysis by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has generally found that China uses its soft power to pursue its own, largely economic, international agenda primarily to achieve its domestic objectives of economic growth and social stability.1 Although Beijing certainly has an eye on Washington, not all of its actions are undertaken as a counterpoint to the United States. In addition, CSIS research suggests that growing Chinese soft power in developing countries may have influenced recent U.S. decisions to engage more actively and reinvest in soft-power tools that have atrophied during the past decade. To the extent that there exists a competition between the United States and China, therefore, it may be mobilizing both countries to strengthen their ability to solve global problems. To be sure, U.S. and Chinese policy decisions toward the respective other power will be determined in large part by the choices that leaders make about their own nations interests at home and overseas, which in turn are shaped by their respective domestic contexts. Both parties must recognize—and accept—that the other will pursue a foreign policy approach that is in its own national interest. Yet, in a globalized world, challenges are increasingly transnational, and so too must be their solutions. As demonstrated by the rapid spread of SARS from China in 2003, pandemic flu can be spread rapidly through air and via international travel. Dust particulates from Asia settle in Lake Tahoe. An economic downturn in one country can and does trigger an economic slowdown in another. These challenges can no longer be addressed by either containment or isolation. What constitutes the national interest today necessarily encompasses a broader and more complex set of considerations than it did in the past As a general principle, the United States seeks to promote its national interest while it simultaneously pursues what the CSIS Commission on Smart Power called in its November 2007 report the "global good."3 This approach is not always practical or achievable, of course. But neither is it pure benevolence. Instead, a strategic pursuit of the global good accrues concrete benefits for the United States (and others) in the form of building confidence, legitimacy, and political influence in key countries and regions around the world in ways that enable the United States to better confront global and transnational challenges. In short, the global good comprises those things that all people and governments want but have traditionally not been able to attain in the absence of U.S. leadership. Despite historical, cultural, and political differences between the United States and China, Beijing's newfound ability, owing to its recent economic successes, to contribute to the global good is a matter for common ground between the two countries. Today there is increasing recognition that no major global challenge can be addressed effectively, much less resolved, without the active engagement of—and cooperation between—the United States and China. The United States and China—the worlds first- and third-largest economies—are inextricably linked, a fact made ever more evident in the midst of the current global financial crisis. Weak demand in both the United States and China, previously the twin engines of global growth, has contributed to the global economic downturn and threatens to ignite simmering trade tensions between the two countries. Nowhere is the interconnectedness of the United States and China more clear than in international finance. China has $2 trillion worth of largely U.S. dollar-denominated foreign exchange reserves and is the world's largest holder—by far—of U.S. government debt. Former treasury secretary Henry M. Paulson and others have suggested that the structural imbalances created by this dynamic fueled the current economic crisis. Yet. China will almost certainly be called on to purchase the lion's share of new U.S. debt instruments issued in connection with the U.S. stimulus and recovery package. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton's February 23.2009, reassurance to Beijing that U.S. markets remain safe and her call for continued Chinese investment in the U.S. bond market as a means to help both countries, and the world, emerge from global recession underscored the shared interest—and central role—that both countries have in turning around the global economy quickly. Although China's considerable holdings of U.S. debt have been seen as a troubling problem, they are now being perceived as a necessary part of a global solution. Similarly, as the world’s two largest emitters of greenhouse gases, China and the United States share not only the collateral damage of energy-inefficient economic growth, b­­ut a primary responsibility to shape any ultimate global solutions to climate change. To date, cooperation has been elusive, owing as much to Washington's reluctance as to Beijing's intransigence. Painting China as the environmental bogeyman as an excuse for foot-dragging in policymaking is no longer an option; for its part, China, as the world's top polluter, must cease playing the developing-economy card. Yet energy security and climate change remain an area of genuine opportunity for joint achievement. Indeed, U.S.-China cooperation in this field is a sine qua non of any response to the energy and climate challenges. The sheer size of the Chinese economy means that collaboration with the United States could set the de facto global standards for etficiency and emissions in key economic sectors such as industry and transportation. Climate change also provides an area for cooperation in previously uncharted policy waters, as in emerging Arctic navigational and energy exploration opportunities. Washington and Beijing also share a deep and urgent interest in international peace and stability. The resumption of U.S.-China military contacts is a positive development. As two nuclear powers with worldwide economic and strategic interests, both countries want to minimize instability and enhance maritime security, as seen by parallel antipiracy missions in the waters otT Somalia. Joint efforts in support of United Nations peacekeeping, nonproliferation, and counterterrorism offer critical areas for bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Certainly, regional and global security institutions such as the Six-Party Talks concerning North Korea or the UN Security Council require the active engagement of both Washington and Beijing. Even more broadly, crisis management in geographic regions of mutual strategic interest like the Korean peninsula, Iran, or Burma require much more Sino-U.S. communication if the two countries are to avoid miscalculation and maximize opportunities to minimize human sutfering. Increasing the number of mid-level military-to-military exchanges would help in this regard. The United States and China could do more to cooperate on law enforcement to combat drug trafficking and organized crime in Western China. Afghanistan is competing with Burma as the main provider of narcotics to China; Washington could use its influence with the International Security Assistance Force in Kabul to develop a joint antinarcotics program. This could potentially build networks and joint capabilities that might be useful for U.S.-China cooperation on the issue of Pakistan. In addition, Washington should also encourage NATO-China cooperation along the Afghan border. Collaborating under the auspices of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) might provide an additional framework for Beijing and Washington to address Central Asian security issues in a cooperative manner. 1he SCO, which includes Pakistan as an observer and will convene a multinational conference on Afghanistan in March 2009, has long made curbing narcoterrorism in Afghanistan a priority. In addition, the VS. Drug Enforcement Agency and the Chinese Anti-Narcotics Bureau should expand cooperation on interdiction and prosecution of heroin and meth traffickers. To be sure, there are a number of areas of serious divergence between Washington and Beijing. This should surprise no one. The United States has disagreements with even its allies. Two large powers with vastly dilferent histories, cultures, and political systems are bound to have challenges. History has shown, however, that the most effective way of addressing issues is for the U.S. and Chinese governments to engage in quiet diplomacy rather than public recrimination. In the U.S.-China context, there is often little to be gained—and much to be lost in terms of trust and respect—by a polarizing debate. Any differences, moreover, must not necessarily impede Sino-U.S. cooperation when both sides share strong mutual interests. I;. Scott Fitzgerald wrote that "the test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function."3 Effective policy toward China by the United States, and vice versa, will require this kind of dual-minded intelligence. Moreover, working together on areas of mutual and global interest will help promote strategic trust between China and the United States, facilitating possible cooperation in other areas. Even limited cooperation on specific areas will help construct additional mechanisms for bilateral communication on issues of irreconcilable disagreement. In fact, many of the toughest challenges in U.S.-China relations in recent years have been the result of unforeseen events, such as the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in May 1999 and the EP-3 reconnaissance plane collision in April 2001. Building trust and finding workable solutions to tough problems is the premise behind the Obama administrations foreign policy of smart power, as articulated by Secretary of State Clinton. Smart power is based on, as Secretary Clinton outlined in her confirmation hearing, the fundamental belief that 'We must use... the full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economic, military, political and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation."' As the CS1S Commission on Smart Power noted in November 2007, "Smart Power is neither hard nor soft—it is the skillful combination of bothIt is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships and institutions at all levels... .°5 As such, smart power necessarily mandates a major investment in a U.S.-China partnership on key issues. 'The concept enjoys broad support among the Chinese and American people and, by promoting the global good, it reaps concrete results around the world. There should be no expectation that Washington and Beijing will or should agree on all, or even most, questions. But the American and Chinese people should expect their leaders to come together on those vital issues that require their cooperation. U.S.-China partnership, though not inevitable, is indispensable.

Warming causes extinction

SIFY 2010 – Sydney newspaper citing Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at University of Queensland and Director of the Global Change Institute, and John Bruno, associate professor of Marine Science at UNC (Sify News, “Could unbridled climate changes lead to human extinction?”, <http://www.sify.com/news/could-unbridled-climate-changes-lead-to-human-extinction-news-international-kgtrOhdaahc.html>

The findings of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' emerged from a synthesis of recent research on the world's oceans, carried out by two of the world's leading marine scientists. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is further evidence that we are well on the way to the next great extinction event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly if the trend continues. The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added. The 'fundamental and comprehensive' changes to marine life identified in the report include rapidly warming and acidifying oceans, changes in water circulation and expansion of dead zones within the ocean depths. These are driving major changes in marine ecosystems: less abundant coral reefs, sea grasses and mangroves (important fish nurseries); fewer, smaller fish; a breakdown in food chains; changes in the distribution of marine life; and more frequent diseases and pests among marine organisms. Study co-author John F Bruno, associate professor in marine science at The University of North Carolina, says greenhouse gas emissions are modifying many physical and geochemical aspects of the planet's oceans, in ways 'unprecedented in nearly a million years'. 'This is causing fundamental and comprehensive changes to the way marine ecosystems function,' Bruno warned, according to a GCI release. These findings were published in Science

# 2NC Solvency - Cooperation

Counter terrorist coordination fosters relations

CRS 05, Congressional Research Service, “US-China Counter Terrorism Cooperation: Issues for US Policy,” May 12th, 2005, From the CRS, <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rs21995.pdf//MC>

The counter-terrorism campaign helped to stabilize U.S.-PRC relations up to the highest level, which faced tensions early in the Bush Administration in April 2001 with the EP-3 aircraft collision crisis and U.S. approvals of arms sales to Taiwan. According to the Final Report of the 9/11 Commission issued in July 2004, President Bush chaired a National Security Council meeting on the night of September 11, 2001, in which he contended that the attacks provided a “great opportunity” to engage Russia and China. President Bush traveled to Shanghai in October 2001 for his first meeting with then PRC President Jiang Zemin at the Leaders’ Meeting of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum. Bush called the PRC an important partner in the global coalition against terrorists but also warned Jiang that the “war on terrorism must never be an excuse to persecute minorities.” On February 21-22, 2002, the President visited Beijing (a trip postponed in October), after Tokyo and Seoul. The President then hosted Jiang at Bush’s ranch in Crawford, TX, on October 25, 2002, and Bush said that the two countries were “allies” in fighting terrorism.

All other agreements were a “good start” but continued cooperation is needed
Kan 10, Shirley Kan, Specialist in Asian Studies at the Congressional Research Service, “US-China Terrorism Cooperation: Issues for US Policy,” July 15th, 2010, from the CRS, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL33001.pdf>//MC

The PRC’s concerns about domestic attacks and any links to foreign terrorist groups, U.S.-PRC relations, China’s international standing in a world dominated by U.S. power (particularly after the terrorist attacks), and its image as a responsible world power helped explain China’s supportive stance. However, Beijing also worried about U.S. military action near China, U.S.-led alliances, Japan’s active role in the war on terrorism, greater U.S. influence in Central and South Asia, and U.S. support for Taiwan—all exacerbating long-standing fears of “encirclement.” China issued a Defense White Paper in December 2002, stating that major powers remained in competition but that since the September 2001 attacks against the United States, countries have increased cooperation. Although this policy paper contained veiled criticisms of the United States for its military buildup, stronger alliances in Asia, and increased arms sales to Taiwan, it did not criticize the United States by name as in the Defense White Paper of 2000. However, the Defense White Papers of 2004 and 2006 again criticized the United States by name. Since 2005, U.S. concerns about China’s extent of cooperation in counterterrorism have increased. In September 2005, Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick acknowledged that “China and the United States can do more together in the global fight against terrorism” after “a good start,” in his policy speech that called on China to be a “responsible stakeholder” in the world. The summits of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in 2005 and 2006 raised U.S. concerns. Since the summer of 2007, U.S. officials have expressed more concern about China-origin arms that have been found in the conflict involving U.S. forces in Afghanistan, as part of the broader threat posed by Iran and its arms transfers.

Unilateral efforts will fail and undermine cooperation – Bush era proves

Boyle and Schmid 10, Michael Boyle, PhD in international relations, and Alex Schmid, research fellow of the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence, “A Global Compact for Counter Terrorism: Towards a Robust Multilateral Counter Terrorism Regime,” November 12th, 2010, from New Ideas, <http://www.newideasfund.org/proposals/NIF_Global%20Compact.pdf//MC>

The Bush Administration’s unilateralism had another effect which undermined cooperation with other great powers, especially Russia and China, and acted as a brake on cooperation with states such as Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The Manichean language of good and evil employed by the Bush Administration, and the presumption that unilateral action could reshape the international system and make other states come along to America’s point of view, even grudgingly, contributed to global insecurity. It inadvertently increased the number of states who feared that they might be a future object of U.S. power. This translated into greater concern over relative gains in security cooperation. In a world in which U.S. power is widely trusted to be directed towards more or less benign purposes, the problem of relative gains in security cooperation would be difficult but manageable. But in a world where U.S. unilateralism has had a corrosive effect on the perception of American goodwill, and in which states fear that unchecked American power is a threat to world peace, concerns over relative gains will become more acute. The counter-balancing effects of American unilateralism would render even modest attempts at cooperation over security matters more difficult than it would have otherwise been. Unilateralism also affected the kind of coalition that the U.S. formed against terrorism and later for the operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Shortly after the September 11th attacks, the U.S. set about a forming a global coalition against al Qaeda, and found that even some former enemies were willing to consider cooperation against this common foe. Yet the unilateralism of the Bush Administration led it to conclude that an ad hoc coalition – that is, one free of formal institutional constraints and comprised solely of volunteers with minimal fixed obligations – would better suit American interests. Instead of institutionalizing the cooperation in a way which made decentralized enforcement of agreed principles possible, the U.S. preferred a loosely bound ad hoc coalition which preserved the widest latitude of action for the United States. Yet these coalitions proved less durable than those relying on pre-existing institutional arrangements. When faced with significant opposition, ad hoc coalitions tend to fray or fall apart more quickly than those in which commitments are fixed and obligations are institutionalized (and therefore more costly to escape). This can be clearly seen in the Bush Administration’s approach to the war in Afghanistan. Only after the costs of an ad hoc coalition were made apparent did the Bush Administration consent to a NATO mission in Afghanistan, which has proven to be more resilient against the serious security challenges faced in that country. The most costly unilateral move that the U.S. made in terms of counter-terrorism cooperation concerned the Iraq war. The war was overwhelmingly unpopular in the Middle East and in Europe, with majorities even in key allies like the United Kingdom opposing the war as one of choice. Moreover, the dismissal of European concerns as part of “Old Europe” inflamed anti-American sentiment and created pressures on European governments not to cooperate or appear to “give in” to American demands. As Jeffrey Record has pointed out, the linking of progress in the Iraq war to the wider battle against al Qaeda, conflated the threats and made a subtle and nuanced approach to the varying problems of terrorism and rogue states difficult if not impossible.36 But the link between counterterrorism and the Iraq war had another unexpected consequences in terms of building a functioning regime. By linking the war on terror and the Iraq war together with the common thread of unilateralism, the Bush Administration implied that dissent in one theatre meant dissent in another. By insisting that the global war on terror and the Iraq war were one of a piece, the U.S. made it hard for states to cooperate on functional counter-terrorism goals while still dissenting from an unpopular U.S. war.

# 2NC Say Yes

Of course they’ll say yes, they are demanding more of the international community now! Collaborative efforts solve the root cause of terrorism.

Xinhua 6/29, Xinhua, Chinese national news source, “China calls for balanced, comprehensive implementation of counter terrorism strategy,” June 29, 2012, from Xinhua News, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/717894.shtml>//MC

China called on international community Thursday to pay more attention to dealing with the root causes of terrorism and implement UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in a balanced and comprehensive way. The statement came as Wang Min, China's deputy permanent representative to the UN, addressed the General Assembly where the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy was reviewed. "China supports the comprehensive implementation of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy," Wang said. "It is necessary to address both the symptoms and root causes of the terrorism and adopt a comprehensive approach," Wang said. " It is of vital importance to eliminate gaps between the rich and the poor and social injustice, properly settle regional conflicts, prevent the spread of separatism, extremism, violence, hatred and intolerance in combating terrorism." "China hopes the international community to pay more attention to solving the root causes of terrorism and implement the strategy in a balanced and comprehensive manner," he said. Wang noted that combating terrorism should adhere to the UN Charter and basic norms of the international law, respect the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the member states. "The member states should renounce the double standards in combating terrorism," he said. "No country should adopt different stands because of their self-interest or protect and tolerate terrorism based on political consideration." Wang also stressed that in combating terrorism, it is important to persist in dialogue between different civilizations, promote understanding and tolerance. "The international cooperation on fighting terrorism should advocate dialogue, understanding and exchanges, mutual respect and harmony among civilizations, religions and ethnic groups." China will continue to firmly fight terrorism in any form ensuring the national security and safety of people's life and property as well as safeguarding the human rights. "China is willing to enhance communications and cooperation with relevant countries in anti-terrorist legislation and law enforcement, information sharing, interception of financing terrorist activities, extradition and repatriation of terrorist suspects," he added.

The PRC will say yes – recent security council’s prove

Xinhua 5/11, Xinhua, Chinese national news source, “China supports efforts by 3 Security Council Committees,” May 11th, 2012, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2012-05/11/content_15264255.htm>//MC

A Chinese envoy to the United Nations on Thursday expressed support for the efforts made by three Security Council subsidiary committees. Wang Min, China's deputy permanent representative to the UN, made the remarks at an open Security Council meeting, which heard regular briefings from chairmen of the Al Qaida Sanctions Committee, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the 1540 Committee. China supports the Al Qaida Sanctions Committee in carrying forward the periodic review of sanctions list as planned and enhancing communications with countries concerned, Wang said. "We hope that the member states will actively cooperate with the committee in a joint effort to safeguard the authority and effectiveness of the sanctions regime," he noted. China also supports the Counter-Terrorism Committee in taking measures such as holding regional symposium, facilitating technical assistance, in the hope that the committee will continue to maintain dialogue with the member states and help strengthen their anti-terrorism capacity building, the envoy added. As for the 1540 Committee which was established pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1540 on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Wang said China supports the committee in continuing its sound and steady work, promoting the realization of goals of the Resolution 1540 in a comprehensive, balanced and effective manner and in assisting countries in fulfilling their obligations under the resolution. The current priority is for the committee to officially establish a panel of experts, Wang said. China supports the chairman of the 1540 Committee in carrying on consultations with relevant parties and reach agreement on pending issues as soon as possible. "China will continue to work with others, takes an active part in the work of the committee in a joint efforts to continue to make progress in the international non-proliferation process," he added.

# 2NC Relations Good

Empirically proven- US China cooperation solves international terrorism and piracy

Christensen 11 Thomas J. Christensen, Professor of Politics and International Affairs and Director of the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program at Princeton University, “The Need to Pursue Mutual Interests in U.S.-PRC Relations” April 2001, from the United States Institute of Peace, <http://www.usip.org/files/resources/SR269Christensen.pdf>

As two of the world’s larger trading nations and the two largest importers of energy resources, China and the United States have a strong incentive to cooperate and coordinate their activities in fighting piracy and terrorist attacks on shipping. The Gulf of Aden operation, which China decided to join in the waning weeks of the Bush administration, is a good start. It demonstrates in concrete terms the common interests between the two sides, and it allows a level of military-to-military contact that cannot be replicated in defense ministry meeting rooms or classrooms at military academies. The existing cooperation in the Gulf of Aden mission could be enhanced further and could become a precedent for more frequent tactical-level meetings between the two nations’ militaries. Such a constructive meeting took place aboard a Chinese navy flagship in the Gulf of Aden on November 1, 2009. The U.S. commander of Combined Task Force 151, Rear Admiral Scott Sanders, met with his Chinese counterpart, Rear Admiral Wang Zhiguo. On that occasion, Admiral Sanders stated, “It is clear that China is a reliable partner and that our efforts are mutually beneficial.”11 Such concrete reminders of the two nations’ common interests provide a stronger foundation for the overall U.S.-China diplomatic relationship than abstract statements about mutual respect for allegedly fully distinct core national interests.

US China Cooperation solves warming, poverty, proliferation, disease, and the economy

Hachigian 11 Nina Hachigian, Senior Fellow at American Progress, “Conduct Befitting a Great Power Responsibility and Sovereignty in U.S.-China Relations” January 2011, from the Center for American Progress, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/01/pdf/china_policy.pdf>

It is possible that American and Chinese conceptions of global responsibility and sovereignty will converge over time to meet the needs of the 21st century as China adjusts to its global role, assuming that the consensus in the United States holds for America continuing to play the role of the responsible leader. If so, we can expect progress on rebalancing the global economy as well as tackling global warming, poverty, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation, among other global issues. But that convergence is hardly a sure thing, especially given the politically charged window of the next two years leading up to a power transition in China and a U.S. presidential election in 2012.

China relations key to the economy, disease control, and national security

Christensen 11 Thomas J. Christensen, Professor of Politics and International Affairs and Director of the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program at Princeton University, “The Need to Pursue Mutual Interests in U.S.-PRC Relations” April 2001, from the United States Institute of Peace, <http://www.usip.org/files/resources/SR269Christensen.pdf>

There are many additional areas of potential U.S.-Chinese cooperation, including global financial stability, disease control, and product safety. This is why U.S. Embassy Beijing is and should be one of the busiest buildings in the entire U.S. government system. The examples above are only illustrations of areas where cooperation has taken place and must be enhanced if the two nations’ national security interests are to be served. If we succeed in achieving real results together and along with other concerned countries, we will have done a great deal toward building confidence and trust between the two governments. If, instead, China and the United States start with issues on which they simply cannot fully agree now or for the foreseeable future, such as Taiwan and Tibet, then they are likely to hit a wall with negative repercussions for their bilateral relationship and for their mutual ability to contribute to solutions to these global problems.

# A2: High Now

Relations low now - arguments over the South China Sea prove. Both sides agree greater security cooperation is needed.

VOA News ’11, “US Official: China's Military Expansion Raises Concerns in Asia-Pacific,” June 27, 2011, from Voice of America News, <http://www.voanews.com/english/news/US-Official--Chinas-Military-Expansion-Raises-Concerns-in-Asia-Pacific-124578209.html>)

A top U.S. official for East Asian and Pacific affairs says the U.S. government has conveyed to China that its military expansion is raising concerns in the region. U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Kurt Campbell spoke to reporters in Honolulu, after a meeting with Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Cui Tiankai. The two officials held their first round of consultations on the Asia-Pacific region in a closed-door meeting Saturday. Campbell described the discussions as "open, frank and constructive" and said their goal was to obtain a better understanding of each other's intentions, policies, and actions toward the region. Campbell said the United States reiterated that it welcomes a strong, prosperous, and successful China that plays a greater role in regional and world affairs. However, he also said greater transparency and more dialogue by China about its growing military capabilities would help ease regional concerns. Campbell said the bilateral talks also included North Korea's nuclear weapons program, maritime security in the South China Sea and Burma. The two sides say that Saturday's consultations were an outcome of the third round of the China-U.S. strategic and economic dialogue held in May and that they reflect a consensus reached by U.S. President Barack Obama and his Chinese counterpart Hu Jintao to build a positive, cooperative and comprehensive relationship Campbell said that upcoming multilateral sessions should highlight areas where the United States and China -- but other countries, as well -- are able to very clearly articulate areas of cooperation on issues such as disaster preparedness. On North Korea, he reiterated that the United States is looking for concrete progress in Pyongyang's relations with South Korea. He said the U.S. has urged China again to press North Korea to deal responsibly and appropriately with South Korea, and to refrain from any further provocations. On South China Sea tensions, he said the United States told China that it wants an end to regional tensions and dialogue among all the key players. China last week warned the United States to stay out of the regional dispute over the South China Sea waters which are also claimed by the Philippines, Vietnam and Taiwan

# Aff – Relations Resilient

The relationship is going hard – Chinese Foreign Minister comments prove

Jiechi 3/9, Yang Jiechi, Foreign Minister for the People’s Republic of China, speech, “Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi’s remarks to conference on China-US Relations by video link,” March 9th, 2012, from FM Jiechi’s speech, published on Xinhuanet, <http://english.qstheory.cn/resources/speeches/201203/t20120309_144331.htm>//MC

Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi on Wednesday evening delivered a video speech to a conference held in the United States on China-US Relations. The full text of his speech is as following: Dr. Kissinger, General Scowcroft, Ambassador Solomon, Ambassador Roy, Chairman Walker, Ambassador Zhang Yesui, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends, It is so good to see you through this video link. Modern technologies have brought us close to each other despite the vast distance between Beijing and Washington. I am honored to attend this conference on China-US relations hosted by the United States Institute of Peace, the Richard Nixon Foundation and the Kissinger Institute on China and the United States to mark the 40th anniversary of President Nixon's visit to China and the issuance of the Shanghai Communique. It is so nice to be in your midst shortly after we saw each other during Vice President Xi Jinping's recent visit to the United States. I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to you for your abiding commitment and long years of hard work to build up US-China relations. Forty years ago, President Nixon paid a historic visit to China, during which our two countries issued the epoch-making Shanghai Communique. With extraordinary strategic vision and political wisdom, the Chinese and American leaders broke the ice of estrangement between China and the United States and opened a new chapter in our bilateral relations. I was in my early 20s and was about to go to Britain to study when I heard the news. And I was very excited. That historic event has changed so many things, from the overall international environment to the lives of many ordinary people. Forty years have passed since President Nixon's visit to China. Thanks to concerted efforts of both sides, China-US relations have kept moving forward despite some ups and downs over these years. With strong vitality and great potential, our relationship has grown into one of the most important bilateral ties in the world today. Frequent high-level exchanges and growing dialogue mechanisms have become a regular feature of the bilateral ties. Over the past 40 years and particularly the past few years, our leaders have maintained close contacts through mutual visits, meetings at multilateral occasions, telephone conversations, and letters. These high-level contacts have played an irreplaceable part in steering the growth of our bilateral ties. There are now over 60 bilateral dialogue and consultation mechanisms, including the Strategic and Economic Dialogues and the High-Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange. These mechanisms cover political, economic, security, cultural and many other fields. Indeed, few other two countries can claim to have so many high-level dialogue mechanisms that cover such diverse fields. Our trade and business ties are flourishing. At the time of the establishment of diplomatic relations, our two-way trade was only 2.45 billion US dollars. But it hit 446.6 billion US dollars last year, representing an increase of 182 times. Such strong business ties have brought real benefits to both sides. According to Chinese figures, the United States has invested a total of over 67 billion US dollars in China, bringing capital, technologies and expertise that serve China's needs in its economic development. The United States, too, has benefited from trade with China. Over the last decade, US exports to China have grown by 468 percent, creating over three million jobs. The quality yet inexpensive Chinese goods have saved more than 600 billion US dollars for American consumers. There are active people-to-people and local exchanges. Today, it is quite common for Chinese and Americans to visit each others' country. As a matter of fact, as many as over three million people travel across the Pacific each year. There are 38 sister provinces/states and 176 pairs of sister cities between the two countries. In 2011 alone, nearly 160,000 students from China's mainland went to study in the United States, making China the largest source of foreign students in the United States. Meanwhile, learning Chinese is becoming increasingly popular in the United States. Chinese is now the second largest foreign language in the United States, next only to Spanish. And the "100,000 Strong" Initiative announced by President Obama in 2009 is well underway. The two countries have maintained close coordination on international issues. China-US consultation and cooperation cover a wide range of fields. They include the international fight against terrorism after 9/11, response to the international financial crisis, regional hotspot issues such as the situation on the Korean Peninsula, the Iranian nuclear issue, the Middle East and South Asia, non-traditional security challenges in energy and resources security, public health and disaster prevention and mitigation. By maintaining such close consultation and cooperation, our two countries have contributed much to upholding global peace, stability and prosperity. The dynamic growth of China-US relations over the last 40 years proves that our shared interests far outweigh differences, that cooperation has always been the dominant trend of our relations, and that a sound China-US relationship is in the best interest of both countries. Attending today's conference are both Democrats and Republicans, and both government officials and non-government figures. This shows that to foster strong China-US relationship is the shared view of Democrats and Republicans and is the consensus of both the US government and the general public.

Interdependence, dialogues, social norms, and regional cooperation makes the relationship resilient

Yesui 11, Ambassador for the People’s Republic of China to the United States, “China-US Relations and the Peaceful Development of China,” October 24th, 2011, from the Chinese Embassy in America, <http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/zmgx/t870002.htm>//MC

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the reopening of relations between China and the United States. 40 years ago, the Chinese and American leaders, with great vision and political wisdom, made the decision to reach out to each other after 22 years of estrangement and hostility. It was a decision that opened a new page in China-US relations and brought about profound changes in international relations. 40 years later, despite ups and downs, with the shared commitment and joint efforts from the leadership, governments and people of all walks of life in both countries, China-US relationship has surged ahead and has come a long way. Today, China-US relationship has become one of the most important and dynamic relationships in the world. As I see it, China-US relationship has the following four distinctive features: Firstly, the economic interests of China and the United States have been closely interconnected. 40 years ago, our trade and economic activities were almost nonexistent. We are now each other's second largest trade partner. Last year, bilateral trade reached US$385 billion. China has been the US's fastest growing export market for the last 10 years, and US exports to China increased by 468% from 2000 to 2010, while its exports to other countries increased only by 55%. The US continues to be the No. 1 source of foreign direct investment for China, and China has become the biggest foreign creditor for the US. Secondly, dialogue and consultation at various levels have increased and improved. There have been frequent high level visits and exchanges. Over 60 dialogue and consultation mechanisms have been established covering a wide range of areas, including the Strategic and Economic Dialogue, the Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade, the High-Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchanges, and the recently established Strategic Security Dialogue and the Asia-Pacific Affairs Consultation. These mechanisms have provided unique and effective platforms for China and the US to build trust and expand cooperation. Thirdly, there have been extensive and growing social interactions between our two countries. Every year, more than three million visits are made between China and the US. About 9,000 people are traveling across the Pacific each and every single day. We have 38 pairs of sister province/state relationships and 169 sister city relationships. As we speak, about 130,000 Chinese are studying in the US, and over 20,000 Americans are studying in China. Currently, about three hundred million people in China are learning English, and more than two hundred thousand people in the US are learning Chinese. Finally, the two countries have kept effective communication and cooperation on many important regional and global issues. China and the US are working closely in almost every field, from traditional security and development areas to newly emerged issues such as anti-terrorism, non-proliferation, climate change, energy and environmental protection; from addressing the global financial crisis and facilitating world economic recovery to the realization of the UN Millennium Development Goals. China-US cooperation is assuming an increasing global implication. It is fair to say that China-US relationship has evolved to such a point that would surprise even the most imaginative person 40 years ago. The fundamental reason and driving force lie in the expanding common interests between the two countries and shared responsibilities in ensuring sustainable development and dealing with emerging global challenges. At the same time, China-US relationship is probably one of the most complex bilateral relationships in the world. China and the United States are different in political system, social value, historic and cultural traditions. There is a huge gap in the level of economic and social development, with China being the largest developing country and the US being the largest developed country. China is an emerging economy while the US is a strong established power. These differences have decided that we do not see eye to eye with each other on many issues. These differences can also lead to misunderstanding and mistrust in each other's strategic intentions. In the history of human civilization, there perhaps has never existed such a bilateral relationship as the China-US relationship before. Therefore there is no ready path to follow and no historical experience or model to copy. How we finally choose to manage, shape and grow this relationship will determine its course in the next 40 years. In January this year, President Hu Jintao paid a successful state visit to the United States. Among the many results that came out of the visit, the most meaningful was the shared commitment that President Hu and President Barack Obama have made in the Joint Statement, that the two sides will work together to build a cooperative partnership based on mutual respect and mutual benefit. This has laid the groundwork, and it depends on how we work together to make it happen.
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**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should increase efforts to**

* **Halve deforestation within one decade by incentivizing forest conservation investments**
* **Permit regulated U.S. companies to “offset” a substantial portion of domestic emissions through investments in tropical forests**
* **Support tropical forest nations in their efforts to develop transparent and credible procedures for making land-use decisions**
* **Establish a coordinating council and designate a lead office or agency to oversee tropical forest conservation programs**
* **Promote a comprehensive system of terrestrial carbon management that accounts for greenhouse gas emissions from forests, rangelands, agriculture and other major land-use categories.**

**Counterplan solves deforestation abroad**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

The Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests, co-chaired by John Podesta and Senator Lincoln Chafee, is a bipartisan group of leaders from business, government, advocacy, conservation, global development, science and national security that has developed recommendations on the inclusion of tropical forest conservation in broader U.S. climate change policies. Tropical deforestation accounts for 17 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions and protecting tropical forests is integral to combating climate change. The Commission’s recommendations are designed to help ensure U.S. climate policies provide the most effective response to this issue and are aligned with global solutions. Report Recommendations Halve deforestation within a decade. The United States should lead a global partnership to cut tropical deforestation in half within a decade and achieve zero net emissions from the forest sector by no later than 2030. Create the financial incentives for forest protection. With the right policy mechanisms, the U.S. could alter the financial incentives that lead to tropical deforestation. To unlock cost savings, the United States should invest at least $1 billion by 2012, and U.S. policy should mobilize $5 billion annually by 2020 in public funding and $9 billion annually from the private sector. Lead by example. The United States should adopt strong domestic climate change laws that reduce U.S. emissions 80% by 2050 and contain interim goals consistent with climate science. These domestic, timely and significant reductions are essential to galvanizing ambitious international action on tropical deforestation. Leverage permit revenue. 5% of the value of tradable emission permits in a cap-and-trade program should be allocated to new international forest conservation programs. This is vital to engage key nations that may not be able to attract private capital and engage nations where the deforestation threat is growing. Allow significant offsets. To mobilize private capital, the United States should permit regulated U.S. companies to “offset” a substantial portion of domestic emissions through investments in tropical forests. Maintain a large-enough strategic reserve of permits. The pool of emission permits set aside to help control the cost of a new cap-and-trade program should be large enough to manage the risk that the supply of forest carbon “offsets” may prove insufficient to stabilize prices and avoid price spikes. Explore U.S. “aggregator”. The United States should explore and consider establishing a financial intermediary to aggregate forest carbon offset demand and supply as a means to reduce U.S. costs and increase the climate benefits of every dollar invested in tropical forest conservation. Forge ambitious forest protection goals in international agreements. The United States should work to ensure that international agreements with tropical forest nations secure actions by those nations that support global emission reduction goals for forests. Incentivize national-scale action. As a means of encouraging nations to move swiftly to national scale actions, the U.S. should focus financial incentives to reward nations that are taking ambitious action, encourage nations to pursue large-scale policies and prevent the shifting of deforestation from one place to another. Ensure transparency and local participation. The United States should support tropical forest nations in their efforts to develop transparent and credible procedures for making land-use decisions, consulting local communities, and reporting on the impacts of forest conservation programs. Focus international forest conservation efforts on key areas. Not all forests are equally important to the United States and climate policy should reflect that reality. New forest conservation investments should be channeled to high priority areas for national security, poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation. Guarantee responsible management. The United States should establish a coordinating council and designate a lead office or agency to oversee tropical forest conservation programs. Work towards full terrestrial greenhouse gas emission accounting. The United States should promote a comprehensive system of terrestrial carbon management that accounts for greenhouse gas emissions from forests, rangelands, agriculture and other major land-use categories.

# 2NC Solvency – Warming

**Counterplan solves warming – deforestation amounts to massive levels of emissions**

**Chiono in 12** – Policy Analyst at Pacific Forest Trust <Anton. “New Federal Report Spotlights Global Deforestation, Importance of Domestic Action” January 18, 2012. http://pacificforest.org/news\_story10205.html>/CS

**Forest conversion and loss hasn’t rated very high on the U.S. political agenda** since federal climate legislation stalled in 2010. But that doesn’t mean deforestation—nor its climate damage—has stopped. We’re still losing about 90,000 acres of forestland, along with its capacity to safely absorb and store greenhouse gases, every day around the world (Source: FAO). Here at home, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates more than 57 million acres of U.S. forests will be converted to other uses by 2030 (Source: USDA). **Which is why it’s encouraging to see that the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has released a report detailing the potential of forests to combat global climate change.** Entitled Deforestation and Greenhouse Gases, the report assesses the climate role of forests and identifies the challenges facing policymakers in more fully harnessing forests in the fight against global climate change. The report was compiled at the request of Senator John Kerry, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and a co-author of the last attempt at a federal climate bill in 2010. He should be applauded for his commitment to this issue, says Pacific Forest Trust Board Secretary Andrea Tuttle, Ph.D., the former director of the California Department of Forestry. A global forest and climate consultant, Tuttle attends the negotiating sessions of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change as an observer for PFT. “It’s great to see this issue back in the Congressional spotlight,” Tuttle said. “One of the bright spots in the UN climate negotiations has been the progress in setting the standards for measuring and slowing the global rate of deforestation. **There’s a key role for the U.S. and other developed countries to play by incentivizing forest protection through well-designed markets for the climate benefits of forests.” Unlike most other sectors, forests are unique in their capacity to act as either a net source of carbon sequestration OR a net source of the carbon emissions fueling climate change. When conserved and healthy, forests are a climate defense, absorbing and storing far more carbon dioxide than they emit. When cleared or degraded, forests become net emitters of greenhouse gases. Currently, forests hold about 760 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide globally—or more than 100 times all U.S. emissions in 2009.** Despite the impressive magnitude of this carbon storage, however, deforestation and degradation continue to undermine global forest carbon sinks at an alarming rate. During the 1990s, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimated that **forest loss was responsible for 20% of global GHG emissions in terms of warming impact.** While this number fell to about 12% during 2000 to 2005, this decline was due to drastic increases in fossil fuel consumption—not any great reductions in deforestation.

# ---Incentivize Private CP

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should provide incentives for public and private sector forest conservation investments.**

**Counterplan solves**

**Lyutse in 10** – Policy Analyst for the National Resources Defense Council - <Sasha. “Securing U.S. Agricultural Competitiveness by Stopping Deforestation: New Report Shows How Protecting Forests Abroad Will Keep Ag State Economies Strong” May 26, 2010. switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/slyutse/securing\_us\_agricultural\_compe.html>/CS

The benefits are clear, but do we have the tools to end deforestation and keep farm state economies strong? Yes, key provisions in a comprehensive climate and clean energy bill would create significant financial incentives to protect tropical forests and level the playing field for American farmers, ranchers, and foresters. These policies, coupled with international cooperation, would help to quickly slow and stop deforestation by 2030. If these goals are met, tropical forests will be valued for their environmental benefits and kept intact, and the land will not be used to produce artificially cheap agricultural commodities that undercut producers in states like Iowa, Illinois, Texas and Pennsylvania. These state economies and rural communities depend on strong markets for U.S. agricultural and forestry exports. Unfortunately, as my colleague discussed here, while the Senate bill includes most of the key tools to aid the world in addressing global warming, it lacks adequate funding to reduce deforestation. The Senate bill must be strengthened by adding key incentives for public and private sector investment in tropical forests. By valuing tropical forests for the carbon they store and cracking down on illegal logging, this investment will not only address a major source of global warming pollution but help secure markets for U.S. farm exports, paying dividends for America’s farm state economies.

# 2NC Solvency – Spills Over

**Counterplan spills over internationally**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

“The destruction of tropical forests is at the crossroads of our two greatest environmental challenges: reducing greenhouse gas emissions and protecting the biological integrity of our planet,” noted Cristián Samper, Director of the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History, “international and domestic climate policy cannot ignore this necessity and still succeed.” The report uses Brazil as a case study to stress both the problem posed by tropical deforestation and a model for moving forward. Emissions from deforestation alone in Brazil account for 2.5-5.0 percent of total global greenhouse gas emissions, helping to make the country the fourth largest emitter in the world. Brazil represents a major opportunity, however, for a test ground for the Commission’s recommendations. Unlike many tropical forest countries, Brazil is already well positioned to monitor and verify emissions reductions and has set an ambitious national target of reducing deforestation in the Amazon by 80 percent by 2020. U.S. Leadership is Vital to International Action The Commission’s report calls on the United States to galvanize bold international action by enacting strong domestic policies and guiding international agreements and incentives to anchor a new push to conserve the planet’s climate forests. Former Ambassador to the United Nations Thomas Pickering reiterated the importance of the United States to this mission. “Tropical forests offer a chance for developed nations, led by the U.S., to work hand-in-hand with developing nations to address climate change. The U.S. is the nation best suited to answer that call – and we must, not only to prevent catastrophe, but to restore our position as the leading global diplomat.” Highlighting how including forests could help bring the world closer to consensus on global climate policy, former Chief U.S. climate change negotiator, Frank Loy, said, “Industrialized and developing countries see the problem differently. Reducing tropical deforestation addresses exactly these barriers. It puts developing and industrialized countries more on the same side, and dramatically lowers the cost of what we must do.” Taken together, the Commission’s recommendations describe a pragmatic mix of market mechanisms, government incentives and international collaboration that would enable the United States to work with other nations to make dramatic and quick gains against deforestation.

# 2NC Solvency – Ag Competitiveness

**Ending deforestation for foreign agricultural land is key to US agricultural competitiveness**

**Lyutse in 10** – Policy Analyst for the National Resources Defense Council - <Sasha. “Securing U.S. Agricultural Competitiveness by Stopping Deforestation: New Report Shows How Protecting Forests Abroad Will Keep Ag State Economies Strong” May 26, 2010. switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/slyutse/securing\_us\_agricultural\_compe.html>//CS

Earlier today, the National Farmers Union (NFU) and Avoided Deforestation Partners (ADP) released a report linking the protection of tropical rainforests to stronger U.S. competitiveness in global agricultural and timber markets. TitledFarms Here, Forests There; Tropical Deforestation and U.S. Competitiveness in Agriculture and Timber, the report details how illegal and unsustainable overseas agriculture and logging operations are rapidly deforesting the world’s rainforests, flooding the market with cheap commodities, and driving down commodity prices, thereby costing American farmers, ranchers and timber producers hundreds of billions of dollars. The report does three important things: First, it highlights how tropical deforestation has historically hurt American farmers, ranchers and foresters and estimates the revenue losses American agricultural and forestry commodity producers will suffer over the next 20 years if deforestation continues unchecked (my colleague discusses this here). Second, the report details how dedicated funds and incentives for investing in protecting tropical forests in U.S. climate and clean energy legislation will directly benefit U.S. agricultural and timber producers, as discussed here. Finally, it breaks down these revenue gains by U.S. state, showing how global efforts to protect tropical forests will give a big boost to our farm state economies and local rural communities. So how does deforestation in Brazil and Indonesia affect soybean farmers in Iowa and cattle ranchers in Texas? In many countries, timber, farming, and ranching operations clear tropical forests, usually through the destructive practice known as “slash and burn”, without having to pay for the enormous loss of carbon associated with such practices. This has given foreign producers what amounts to a subsidy in cheap land and timber that allows them to undercut U.S. producers in global markets. More than 300 million acres have been deforested worldwide since 1997–land cleared for timber, cattle, and other agricultural commodities like soybeans and palm oil, which the NFU-ADP report examines. These commodities compete directly with products from farms in states like Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota and Indiana, cattle ranches in states like Texas, Kansas and Oklahoma, and timber operations in states like Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Florida, significantly impacting farm state competitiveness in these global markets. How big a difference can stopping deforestation make to U.S. farm state economies? To take one example, deforestation has enabled such as swell in South American soybean production that, according to the USDA, the increased supply has put downward pressure on U.S. soybean production (see here and here). For top soybean producing states like Indiana, this translates into major revenue losses. Soybeans are Indiana’s second largest agricultural commodity and, according to USDA, represent nearly 25% of the state’s total farm receipts and 8.4% of U.S. soybean production by value as of 2008. Indiana also ranks 4th in the U.S. in soybean exports, with 2008 export revenues of nearly $1.6 billion. The NFU-ADP report estimates that stopping tropical deforestation would bring cumulative revenue gains of $2.7-$4.2 billion for Indiana soybean farmers from 2012-2030, dollars the state would lose if deforestation is allowed to continue unchecked. For states like Missouri and Ohio, soybeans represent the top state agricultural export, with annual export values of over $1 billion each. According to the report, stopping deforestation would bring both states additional soybean revenues equal to roughly 2-3 times this amount over the period 2012-2030. This table provides a great summary snapshot of the revenue gains other soybean-producing states in the South and Midwest could see if deforestation is stopped by 2030: The USDA estimates that over 60% of deforestation in Brazil is attributable to cattle ranching. According to the report, stopping deforestation would boost total revenues for the top 5 beef-producing states by $25.5-$31.6 billion from 2012-2030: The report tells a similar story when it comes to the potential revenue increases top U.S. oilseed and timber-producing states could see from a strong global effort to conserve tropical forests:

**CP solves Ag competitiveness and reduces CO2 emissions**

**Maron in 10 -** <Dina. “Earning Billions for U.S. Farmers by Stopping Global Deforestation” Scientific American. May 27, 2010. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=earning-billions-for-us-farmers-by-stopping-deforestation&print=true>//CS

As forests in tropical nations are cleared to make way for large-scale agricultural plots, U.S. farmers may be taking a hit to their wallets. A new report issued by the National Farmers Union and Avoided Deforestation Partners yesterday finds that hundreds of billions of dollars are lost when forestlands are converted into croplands or cattle feeding grounds. The foreign timber, beef, soy and grain that flood the U.S. market from those fields undercut domestic goods, leading to price hikes, the report warns. Staving off this rainforest destruction -- and subsequent revival of forestlands -- through conservation efforts like the United Nations' Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) program would be a big win for U.S. farmers, ranchers and loggers, according to the report. The findings underscore what a cadre of environmental and utility groups have been saying as they lobby for the inclusion of tropical rainforest offset funding in U.S. climate legislation. Though they say the forest preservation measures included in the draft bill put forth by Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) fell short of needed levels, these groups remain hopeful that strengthened provisions to safeguard existing forest carbon stocks might still be included in final legislation. "We hope to demonstrate the powerful benefits to the U.S. agriculture and timber industry of protecting tropical rainforests," Glenn Hurowitz, Washington director for Avoided Deforestation Partners and director of the Tropical Forest and Climate Coalition, said of the motivation behind the report, which comes just as senators will be heading to their home states for the Memorial Day weekend. Globally, about 32 million acres of forest is destroyed each year, mostly in the tropics and, because trees absorb carbon dioxide, deforestation is responsible for some 15 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions. Curbing tropical deforestation, the report finds, would yield as much as $221 billion in additional revenue for U.S. soybean, oilseed, beef and timber producers by 2030. That figure rises to as much as $270 billion when accounting for potential increased market needs from U.S. producers, estimated cost savings from complying with climate regulations due to lower energy and fertilizer costs, and also projected offsets. But getting loggers to put down their axes will not be possible without policies that ensure U.S. financial support for forest preservation, Hurowitz cautions. Trees worth more dead than alive Unlike the House version of the climate bill, which set aside 5 percent of all pollution allowances to pay for tropical forest conservation, the Kerry-Lieberman legislation aspires to the same goal of conserving forests but devotes no specific funding to the effort. That leaves the financing of such programs tied to annual appropriations, which forest advocates say would ultimately be a fatal blow to international forest conservation efforts. Forest advocates are also pushing for offset standards in the Senate bill to be relaxed, since they say the restrictions around what type of credits could be counted for companies' investment will effectively block company investment in forest conservation. The Senate bill would not allow rainforest offset credits to be counted unless tropical nations already have a national or state-level deforestation cap in place -- systems which would likely take years to develop. With the current Kerry-Lieberman language, Hurowitz said, "There is no chance we would meet the target of stopping deforestation by 2030, because there won't be enough incentives for individuals or countries to meet them." Currently, the trees are worth more dead than alive, he said. Offset programs could be poised to change that: A 2007 World Bank report estimated that each hectare of rainforest land could bring in $1,500 to $10,000 as a carbon storage asset. That same hectare only brings in $200 to $500 as pastureland. Yesterday's deforestation report details the cost savings for states that stand to benefit if there were a decline in deforestation and a subsequent drop in competition for their crops, timber or cattle. U.S. timber producers, for example, could see increases in revenue of $36 billion to $60 billion in the next 20 years, with the biggest gains in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Florida, Virginia and North Carolina.

**Deforestation allows foreign competitors to flood the market with cheap goods – kills agricultural prices. The counterplan is key to solve.**

**Hurowitz and Cunningham in 10** <Glenn and Ryan. “U.S. Farmers, Timber Producers Call for an End to Tropical Deforestation” May 26, 2010. <http://adpartners.org/pressrelease260510/>>

Leading U.S. farm and forest products groups today called on Congress and the administration to help end tropical deforestation. The groups cited a new report showing that overseas agriculture and logging operations are expanding production by cutting down the world’s rainforests, allowing them to flood the world market with cheap commodities that undercut American goods. The report estimates that ending deforestation will boost revenue for U.S. producers by between $196-$267 billion by 2030 – approximately equivalent to the entire amount projected to be spent by farmers on energy during that time. At a teleconference to release the report, The National Farmers Union, the American Forest & Paper Association, the United Steelworkers (representing forest products workers), and the Ohio Corn Growers Association called for the protection of tropical forests as part of comprehensive energy and climate legislation and other policies. They noted that the clearing and burning of tropical forests by unsustainable overseas agriculture industries produces more greenhouse gases than all the cars, trucks, tractors and farm equipment in the world combined. “Saving rainforests isn’t just for treehuggers anymore,” said Fred Yoder of the Ohio Corn Growers Association, immediate past president of the National Corn Growers Association. “It is in all of our best interests to protect forests.” The report, entitled “Farms Here, Forests There: Tropical Deforestation and U.S. Competitiveness in Agriculture and Timber” was authored by Shari Friedman of David Gardiner & Associates on behalf of the National Farmers Union and Avoided Deforestation Partners. It is available at www.adpartners.org/agriculture, along with state-by-state and industry-by-industry data on the effect of tropical deforestation on U.S. agriculture and timber producers. “American farmers and ranchers know the importance of being good stewards of the land,” said National Farmers Union president Roger Johnson, who recently returned from a weeklong trip to Brazil where he studied the interaction between agriculture and deforestation. “With family farmers fighting to hold onto their land, we’ve got to make sure we’re not being undercut by irresponsible practices like deforestation.” The report’s section on the timber industry highlights the billions of dollars per year lost to U.S. producers because of illegal logging. The report comes just two days after top enforcement officials in Brazil’s Mato Grosso state were arrested for involvement in illegal logging rings. “Continued rampant illegal logging in tropical countries shows we need to strengthen law enforcement efforts to allow Americans to compete on a level playing field,” said Donna Harman, President of the American Forest & Paper Association. “At the same time, protecting tropical forests through offsets can provide an affordable way for the forest products industry and other manufacturers to keep energy costs affordable as we address climate change.” According to the report, tropical forest offsets cut the cost of climate legislation by a quarter to a half. However, although the recently introduced American Power Act includes important provisions aimed at protecting tropical forests, it reduces both public funding and private incentives for tropical forest conservation. “America is losing many thousands of jobs because of illegal logging and tropical deforestation at a time when instead we should be growing jobs here at home,” said Keith Romig, Strategic Issues Representative for the United Steelworkers. “Any climate policy that aims to protect American jobs also has to protect tropical forests.”

**Incentives would generate massive amounts of revenue for the agricultural sector**

**Hurowitz and Cunningham in 10** <Glenn and Ryan. “U.S. Farmers, Timber Producers Call for an End to Tropical Deforestation” May 26, 2010. <http://adpartners.org/pressrelease260510/>>

Ending deforestation through incentives in US and international climate policy would boost U.S. agricultural revenue by $190 to $270 billion between 2012 and 2030. This increase includes $141 to $221 billion in direct benefits from increased production of soybeans, beef, timber, palm oil and palm oil substitutes. Including affordable tropical forest offsets in U.S. climate legislation would save US agriculture and related industries an estimated $49 billion in compliance costs due to lower energy and fertilizer costs. U.S. timber producers would see increases in revenue of $36 billion to $60 billion by 2030, with the biggest gains in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Florida, Virginia and North Carolina. Soybean-producing states like Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana and Nebraska each stand to gain between $2.6 and $6.8 billion in increased revenue if tropical deforestation is halted by 2030. Oilseed-producing states across the US (including Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota and the Dakotas) stand to gain a total of $18-40 billion by 2030 if deforestation is halted. The U.S. beef industry would gain between $53 and $68 billion by 2030 if deforestation is halted, with the largest increases in revenue going to Texas, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma.

# 2NC Solvency – Warming

**The counterplan solves warming– accounts for more emissions than the global transportation sector.**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

Reminding readers that tropical deforestation is responsible for 17 percent of global carbon dioxide emissions, more than the entire global transportation sector, the report underscores the need to incorporate international action on deforestation into both U.S. and global climate solutions. The report, “Protecting the Climate Forests: Why reducing tropical deforestation is in America's vital national interest," presents a blueprint for U.S. leadership on arresting tropical deforestation in advance of the December UN climate talks in Copenhagen and further debate on climate legislation in the Senate. The report notes that a well-designed cap-and-trade program would provide an effective mechanism for financing and implementing the Commission’s recommendations. Four of the Commission’s thirteen recommendations deal directly with how to reduce emissions from tropical forests through a cap-and-trade system. The report notes that while prospects for Senate approval of a national, economy-wide cap-and-trade bill are uncertain, U.S. leadership in stemming deforestation must not be. Former Rhode Island Senator and Commission co-chair Lincoln Chafee said, “It is truly time for America to launch a comprehensive response to this manageable threat. Protecting the planet’s climate forests and fighting climate change can be the defining bipartisan issue of our time, but so far that bipartisanship has been largely absent. The Commission strongly urges our elected leaders to recognize the obligation we have and embrace this opportunity for collaboration. Time is running out, and our actions now will have implications for generations to come.” Fellow Commission co-chair and Center for American Progress President and CEO John Podesta also stressed the urgency of action. “Climate change is a challenge unlike any we’ve ever seen, demanding strong domestic policies and vigorous global leadership from the United States. That means effective near-term solutions at both the national and international levels that fundamentally change our environment’s dangerous trajectory. The Commission strongly urges the U.S. to enact strong domestic climate policy and lead an international effort to provide sufficient resources to ensure tropical deforestation is addressed. We must accomplish this goal. Our common future depends on it.”

**CP solves warming and is financially sustainable**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

The Commission’s report lays out thirteen recommendations for addressing tropical deforestation through U.S. policy. Chief among them is an investment of $1 billion in public funding by 2012; by 2020 the Commission recommends mobilizing $9 billion annually in private-sector forest conservation investments and increasing the annual public contribution to $5 billion. Although the sums are substantial, these investments would actually help save U.S. consumers and companies $50 billion by 2020 compared to the cost of pursuing comparable domestic climate strategies alone. “We must find solutions to address global warming in an economically viable way,” emphasized Michael G. Morris, Chairman, President, and CEO of American Electric Power, the largest electric utility in the United States. “Preventing deforestation and degradation in tropical regions is an important part of the answer – it is one of the most effective and inexpensive tool for addressing climate change, and provides an excellent way to mitigate the costs of other climate solutions.” Sam Allen, President and CEO of Deere & Company agreed and offered a unique perspective on the importance of tropical forests. “A robust global economy is critical to expanding the agricultural output necessary to meet the increasing needs of a growing and increasingly affluent population,” said Allen. “Rational, market-based protections that control the cost of carbon reductions offer the best approach to enabling farmers around the world to meet the food production challenge in a sustainable manner. Halting that destruction makes business sense as a cost-containment measure and as a long-term investment in healthy cropland and forest economies.” “A low-carbon economy holds tremendous potential for American job creation – but we have to get there first,” said former Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman. “A smart climate policy would address the near-term costs of transitioning to clean energy, and protecting tropical forests as part of that policy provides a solution. Not only can we reduce a major source of CO2 – we can also lay a solid foundation for a new economy built on energy efficiency, advanced renewable power, smart grids and beyond. ” Among other recommendations, the report endorses U.S. companies investing in forest protection through strong and verifiable “offset” programs. The report recommends a detailed policy framework to ensure transparency and achieve the greatest return on investment from forest financing projects. “Reducing deforestation and creating new forests are the quickest and most cost-effective ways to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. But it must be done the right way. Proper monitoring, reporting and verification are essential to the success of any program we create. We have a choice – to act now and launch an effective global system, or to watch our broader efforts on climate fail. I think the choice is clear,” added Commissioner D. James Baker of the Clinton Global Initiative and former Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. “With other nations, the United States has an opportunity to shape a strong international response that takes advantage of the multiple co-benefits to economic growth and social change of reducing deforestation in developing countries,” said Nancy Birdsall, President of the Center on Global Development. She continued, “The plain and simple economic reality is that doing so is among the cheapest and most effective single vehicles for reducing emissions on the table for the next decade and beyond.” The Solution to Multiple Problems According to the report, slowing climate change would be one of many benefits from dramatically reducing tropical deforestation. A global effort to conserve tropical forests would strengthen U.S. national security by reducing international instability, help alleviate global poverty and conserve the priceless biodiversity found in the planet’s most productive ecosystems.

# 2NC Solvency – National Security

**Counterplan is key to US National Security**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

Former U.S. Army Chief of Staff and chair of the Military Advisory Board Gen. Gordon Sullivan noted the importance of tropical forests to maintaining stability and security in key regions around the globe. “We know unequivocally that climate change, left unaddressed, will become a threat multiplier in dangerously unstable regions of the world – and tropical deforestation is a threat multiplier for climate change. Deforestation not only accelerates that change, but it causes soil degradation, loss of fresh water and reduced access to natural resources – all of which displace populations and intensify security issues. Sherri Goodman, former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security, added, “Our national security leaders have wisely recognized the threat posed by climate change, and the unavoidable next step is to address its causes – of which tropical deforestation is a major one. Many forest-abundant nations are central to U.S. interests, and are located in regions where fragile states, extremists and political unrest are already a serious concern. Swiftly and effectively stopping deforestation and slowing climate change must therefore be a national security priority.” “Tropical forests serve as the lungs of the Earth: they manage the world’s carbon dioxide levels, are home to the world’s most diverse species and provide essential services – such as food, water and shelter – to millions of people across the globe,” underlined The Nature Conservancy’s President and CEO Mark Tercek. “The good news is preserving these forests requires no new technologies – just a truly collaborative effort that provides incentives to protect forests long-term. Successful on-the-ground projects prove we can achieve carbon emission reductions while working with local stakeholders to incentivize forest preservation.” “Seeing firsthand the devastating effects of tropical deforestation is humbling. Many local communities, through conservation partnerships, are conserving tropical forests, but only U.S. policy leadership can galvanize global action with the speed, scope, and scale necessary to prevent catastrophic forest losses,” said Commissioner and former Deputy Secretary of the Interior Lynn Scarlett.’’’

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**The counterplan could be pushed by the CCTF, doesn’t link to politics**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

Washington, D.C. – With momentum building in the United States for cost-effective action on climate change, the bipartisan, multi-sector Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests released its report today calling on the United States to lead a global effort to halve emissions from tropical forest destruction within a decade. The report identifies tropical deforestation as a threat to vital national interests and recommends that U.S. policymakers and the international community move rapidly to scale-up a global effort to protect tropical forests as the most cost-effective way to achieve fast, large-scale reductions in CO2 emissions.

**CP is bipartisan**

**CCTF in 9** <Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests. “Major bipartisan Commission calls for U.S. leadership to protect ‘climate forests’” October 7, 2009. http://www.climateforestscommission.org/news/major-bipartisan-commission-calls-for-us-leadership-to-protect-climate-forests.html>/CS

Reflecting the broad appeal of this approach, the Commission on Climate and Tropical Forests includes Democrats and Republicans; former elected and Cabinet officials; former high-level U.S. diplomats and military leaders; scientists and climate experts; business leaders in manufacturing and energy production; and environmental and development experts and advocates. A complete list of Commissioners and their bios, along with the complete report text, are available here. Former Nebraska Senator Chuck Hagel noted, “Tropical deforestation is a major element of the climate threat and requires our immediate attention, as any other global crisis would. It is clearly in our national interest – economic, foreign policy, national security and beyond – to confront this threat. As the world’s largest economy and most powerful nation, we must work closely with our allies in both the developed and developing worlds to cut emissions from tropical deforestation in half within a decade. We have helped the world face potentially catastrophic threats before. We must heed the call to do so again. Saving forests is a climate strategy that makes sense regardless of one’s political views.”

# Aff – No Solvency

**Counterplan fails – can’t be effectively implemented**

**Chiono in 12** – Policy Analyst at Pacific Forest Trust <Anton. “New Federal Report Spotlights Global Deforestation, Importance of Domestic Action” January 18, 2012. http://pacificforest.org/news\_story10205.html>/CS

The considerable carbon storage capacity of forests and the emissions associated with their loss make forests a central concern in addressing global climate change. In its assessment**, the CBO** recognizes the great potential of forests in climate change, but **identifies several challenges that first must be overcome before this potential can be more fully realized.** For instance, unlike many other emissions sources—where GHGs can be tracked at the end of a smokestack—quantifying emissions and sequestration from forests is much more challenging. Generally, this requires monitoring changes in forest carbon storage from year to year, and converting gains and losses in wood volumes to GHG equivalents. However, with 95% of forest-based emissions arising from only 25 countries, most of which are developing nations in the tropics, existing forest inventory data are often inaccurate at best—or nonexistent at worst. Further, the CBO notes that **designing policies to reduce emissions through avoided deforestation can pose substantial challenges. For instance, when deforestation is halted in one location, demand for the goods that would have been produced may simply displace deforestation to another location.** As a result, unless policies can find ways to prevent this demand-driven “leakage,” **avoiding deforestation in one location may, in actuality, do little to reduce atmospheric GHG concentrations. Finally, even if these challenges can be overcome, governance issues in developing countries may complicate the implementation of policies to reduce forest loss.**

# Aff – No Implementation

**Counterplan fails – can’t be effectively implemented**

**Chiono in 12** – Policy Analyst at Pacific Forest Trust <Anton. “New Federal Report Spotlights Global Deforestation, Importance of Domestic Action” January 18, 2012. http://pacificforest.org/news\_story10205.html>/CS

The considerable carbon storage capacity of forests and the emissions associated with their loss make forests a central concern in addressing global climate change. In its assessment**, the CBO** recognizes the great potential of forests in climate change, but **identifies several challenges that first must be overcome before this potential can be more fully realized.** For instance, unlike many other emissions sources—where GHGs can be tracked at the end of a smokestack—quantifying emissions and sequestration from forests is much more challenging. Generally, this requires monitoring changes in forest carbon storage from year to year, and converting gains and losses in wood volumes to GHG equivalents. However, with 95% of forest-based emissions arising from only 25 countries, most of which are developing nations in the tropics, existing forest inventory data are often inaccurate at best—or nonexistent at worst. Further, the CBO notes that **designing policies to reduce emissions through avoided deforestation can pose substantial challenges. For instance, when deforestation is halted in one location, demand for the goods that would have been produced may simply displace deforestation to another location.** As a result, unless policies can find ways to prevent this demand-driven “leakage,” **avoiding deforestation in one location may, in actuality, do little to reduce atmospheric GHG concentrations. Finally, even if these challenges can be overcome, governance issues in developing countries may complicate the implementation of policies to reduce forest loss.**

# Aff – US Action Fails - Drugs

**US Can’t stop deforestation – driven by drug demand, government intervention now is failing**

**Peters in 11** <Joey. “Illegal Drug Drives Deforestation in Colombia” April 29, 2011. Scientific American. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=illegal-drug-drives-deforestation-columbia>

A recent study published in Environmental Science & Technology shows the linkage between the illegal production of coca and the continuing destruction of Colombia's rainforest. New plots of coca between 2002 and 2007 accounted for the direct destruction of 890 square kilometers of rainforest. That's roughly 6 percent of total rainforest lost in that period, which totaled to 14,000 square kilometers, or an area slightly larger than Jamaica. Most of the loss is linked to agriculture. But the study, led by Liliana Dávalos, an assistant professor of evolution and ecology at the State University of New York, Stony Brook, concludes that the closer the jungle is to newly developed coca plots, the more susceptible it is to destruction. It also found that the more land is protected by the government, the less likely it is that coca growers will use it. It wasn't exactly what the researchers were expecting they would find. With coca may come troublesome neighbors "We were expecting the more coca you had, the more migration you had, and the more migration you had, the more deforestation you had," Dávalos said. "But having new coca didn't necessarily lead to a gain in the number of people." What's going on is more complex and has to do with lack of development on land near new coca production, Dávalos said. "When you take into account the people there, it's not just the coca itself." The coca plots are located in remote areas that attract other entrepreneurs. An example could be a person setting up a beer stand close to where a new coca plot is, Dávalos said. She speculates that activities like these, along with the region's ongoing armed conflicts, could be indirectly leading to a larger pattern of deforestation. Dávalos said the most encouraging part of the findings was the level of protection that government can provide on land to curb deforestation. The research also suggests land that should be protected. The study analyzed land cover change in Colombia's rainforests in the northern Andes, Chocó and the Amazon. Colombia, Bolivia and Peru are the three commercial producers of coca. World market for cocaine grows While cocaine use has declined minimally in the United States in recent years, it's on a global rise, particularly in places like Argentina, Brazil, Eastern Europe and the United Kingdom, Dávalos said. "People wouldn't be going out of their way to plant this if there wasn't an eager market," she added. The three big producing countries have been making efforts to stop coca production. In a separate 2009 study, Dávalos measured the effectiveness of the strategies governments followed to curb coca production. The study found spraying herbicide to kill the coca bushes, a path that Colombia followed, to be very ineffective. The amount of hectares sprayed outnumbered the amount of coca eradicated by a 30-to-1 ratio, she said. Bolivia and Peru responded to the crisis differently through measures like attempting to provide alternative work to coca farmers. U.N. data from 2010 show Peru leading the world in global coca production, with 45 percent of the market. Colombia accounted for almost 40 percent, while Bolivia produced just over 15 percent.

# Aff – US Action Fails - Profit

**Agricultural companies won’t respond to intervention, want to make a profit**

**Mendaz in 10** <Steven. “Why Can’t We Stop Deforestation?” September 10, 2010. http://globalwarming-articles.org/deforestation/stop-deforestation/>

Beyond humanity’s unfortunate sense of entitlement over nature, there’s also the profit motive, which makes things much more complicated. In Brazil, for example, despite widespread efforts to check the destruction of the rainforests, major logging and agricultural companies continue to clear out large expanses of formerly virgin forest merely because it means profit for them. And while it’s good for governments to have a business-friendly attitude, some businesses go too far, which is why regulations need to be in place. As long as we allow companies to pursue profits at the expense of all else, nothing is going to stop them from destroying our natural world, and if we’re not careful this destruction is going to be the suicide of the human race. It’s not too late to save ourselves, but time is running out. To save our planet from global warming, we have to stop deforestation within years, not decades.

# \*\*\*Econ CPs

# ---Startup Act STEM CP

Text: The United States Federal Government should pass the Startup Act 2.0

**Counterplan solves economy and leadership**

**Hoover 5/25** - Washington Bureau Chief <Kent. “Bipartisan Startup Act 2.0 aims to aid entrepreneurs” Business Courier. May 25, 2012. http://www.bizjournals.com/cincinnati/print-edition/2012/05/25/bipartisan-startup-act-20-aims-to-aid.html>//CS

It’s a relaunch, so Startup Act 2.0 is a good name for legislation introduced by a bipartisan group of senators who want to boost entrepreneurship in the U.S. Like the original Startup Act, the new version is a grab bag of ideas: • Foreigners who receive postgraduate degrees from U.S. universities in science, technology, engineering and math would be given green cards so they could stay in this country. So would foreigners who start new businesses in the U.S. • Investments in startups would be permanently exempted from capital gains taxes, as long as the stock is held for at least five years. • A targeted research and development tax credit would be offered to companies less than five years old and with less than $5 million in annual revenue. • Commercialization of university R&D would be accelerated. • Government agencies would be required to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of proposed rules that have an economic impact of $100 million or more, and assess whether these rules hurt the formation of new businesses. One of the original Startup Act’s goals – making it easier for young companies to get capital -–was addressed by Congress in the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act. The JOBS Act got rare bipartisan support in Congress and was signed into law by President Barack Obama on April 5. Supporters of Startup Act 2.0 contend more needs to be done, however, to foster the growth of new companies. “Startup 2.0 is the logical next step,” said Sen. Mark Warner, D-Va. “Our bipartisan economic growth plan sets out to prove the critics wrong: Congress can get something done during an election year by coming together to strengthen the economy and create jobs,” said Sen. Jerry Moran, R-Kan.

# K2 Economic Leadership

**STEM Reform key to Economic Leadership**

**Professional Services Close-Up in 11** <Professional Services Close-Up. ”Rep. Fattah Says Equity in Education Resources is 'Economic Imperative' for U.S. World Leadership” August 8, 2011. Proquest.>//CS

The Office of Congressman Chaka Fattah, a Congressional leader in school finance reform and equitable distribution of educational resources, announced that Fattah told the Center for American Progress that providing all young people with the equal resources for quality education is an "economic imperative" for the United States to maintain its world leadership. According to a release, Fattah was the keynote speaker at a special program on school finance reform and equity at CAP headquarters in Washington and distributed to the public nationwide by internet. Fattah is the architect of Gear Up Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs the $3 billion success story that has prepared and assisted some 12 million low income and underserved students as young as sixth grade for the rigors of higher education since its enactment in 1998. He has led the fight for Pell Grant funding and other programs that provide college education opportunities for students from poor families. Fattah, from Philadelphia, said American education suffers from "selective amnesia we know how to provide quality education but poor children end up in a situation where their schools have fewer resources and they have less opportunity to succeed." The American economy remains the world economic leader and number one in technology and innovation, Fattah said, but those advantages, "rather than absolute, are now relative." To maintain our leadership, he said, "we must give all our young people the chance to live up to the very best. ... We should not participate any longer in a system where some children have the best in every way and other children, in every way, have less than that."

**STEM Key to economic leadership**

**DOC 12** <Department of Commerce in consultation with the National Economics Council. “The Competitiveness and Innovative Capacity of the United States.” January 2012. Pgs 10-14. [www.commerce.gov/sites/default/files/.../competes\_010511\_0.pdf](http://www.commerce.gov/sites/default/files/.../competes_010511_0.pdf)>

The U.S. economy reigned supreme in the 20th century, becoming the largest, most productive, and most competitive in the world; amazing new technologies were invented and commercialized; the workforce became the most educated in the world; and incomes soared while a large middle class emerged and thrived. As the 21st century approached, however, alarms began to sound about the U.S. economy’s ability to remain in this preeminent position. Incomes stagnated and job growth slowed. Other countries became better educated and our manufacturing sector lost ground to foreign competitors. Observers have expressed concern that the scientific and technological building blocks critical to our economic leadership have been eroding at a time when many other nations are actively laying strong foundations in these same areas. In short, some elements of the U.S. economy are losing their competitive edge which may mean that future generations of Americans will not enjoy a higher standard of living than is enjoyed in the United States today. Innovation is the key driver of competitiveness, wage and job growth, and longterm economic growth. Therefore, one way to approach the question of how to improve the competitiveness of the United States is to look to the past and examine the factors that helped unleash the tremendous innovative potential of the private sector. Among these factors, three pillars have been key: Federal support for basic research, education, and infrastructure. Federally supported research laid the groundwork for the integrated circuit and the subsequent computer industry; the Internet; and advances in chemicals, agriculture, and medical science. Millions of workers can trace their industries and companies back to technological breakthroughs funded by the government. The U.S. educational system in the 20th century produced increasing numbers of high school and college graduates, more so than anywhere else in the world. These highly skilled workers, in turn, boosted innovation. The transformation of infrastructure in the 20th century was nothing short of amazing: the country became electrified, clean water became widely available, air transport became ubiquitous, and the interstate highway system was planned and constructed. All of these developments helped businesses compete by opening up markets and keeping costs low.

**US economic leadership failing now – STEM is key**

**DOC 12** <Department of Commerce in consultation with the National Economics Council. “The Competitiveness and Innovative Capacity of the United States.” January 2012. Pgs 10-14. www.commerce.gov/sites/default/files/.../competes\_010511\_0.pdf>

After reviewing 16 key indicators—such as the number of scientists and engineers, corporate and government R&D, venture capital, productivity, and trade performance—the July 2011 *Atlantic Century* report indicated that the United States had made little or no progress in its competitiveness since 1999 and now ranks fourth in innovation‐based competitiveness.16 A report from 2005, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*—a volume authored by a committee convened in 2005 by the National Academy of Sciences—expressed deep concern that the U.S. COMPETITIVENESS AND INNOVATIVE CAPACITY 1 – 7 scientific and technological building blocks critical to the economic leadership of the United States were eroding at a time when many other nations were actively laying strong foundations in these same areas.17 In their 2010 follow‐up report, that same committee unanimously stated that “our nation’s outlook has not improved but rather has worsened.”18

**US needs STEM reform – key to economic leadership**

**Vergano in 10** - Member at National Association of Science Writers, Fellow at Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard, Washington D.C. correspondent at Medical Tribune <Dan. “Report: Poor science education impairs U.S. economy” 9/24/2010. USA Today. http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2010-09-23-science-education\_N.htm>

Stagnant scientific education imperils U.S. economic leadership, says a report by leading business and science figures. Released Thursday at a congressional briefing attended by senators and congressmen of both parties, the report updates a 2005 science education report that led to moves to double federal research funding. Nevertheless, the "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" review finds little improvement in U.S. elementary and secondary technical education since then. "Our nation's outlook has worsened," concludes the report panel headed by former Lockheed Martin chief Norman Augustine. The report "paints a daunting outlook for America if it were to continue on the perilous path it has been following": •U.S. mathematics and science K-12 education ranks 48th worldwide. •49% of U.S. adults don't know how long it takes for the Earth to circle the sun. •China has replaced the United States as the world's top high-technology exporter. Although U.S. school achievement scores have stagnated, harming the economy as employers look elsewhere for competent workers, the report says that other nations have made gains. If U.S. students matched Finland's, for example, analysis suggests the U.S. economy would grow 9%-16%. "The real point is that we have to have a well-educated workforce to create opportunities for young people," says Charles Vest, head of the National Academy of Engineering, a report sponsor. "Otherwise, we don't have a chance." "The current economic crisis makes the link between education and employment very clear," says Steven Newton of the National Center for Science Education in Oakland.

# Startup Act is Bipartisan

**Counterplan is bipartisan and solves competitiveness and economic leadership**

**Sanchez and Grimm 6/4 -** Reps. Michael G. Grimm (R-NY) and Loretta Sanchez (D-CA) <”Reps. Sanchez and Grimm Introduce Startup Act 2.0 to Create U.S. Jobs and Reform High-Skilled Visa Policy” June 4th, 2012. http://lorettasanchez.house.gov/press-release/reps-sanchez-and-grimm-introduce-startup-act-20-create-us-jobs-and-reform-high-skilled>//CS

WASHINGTON, DC – Last night, Reps. Michael G. Grimm (R-NY) and Loretta Sanchez (D-CA), introduced the Startup Act 2.0 (H.R. 5893) in the House of Representatives, with Reps. Robert Dold (R-IL), Jared Polis (D-CO), Kevin Yoder (R-KS), Russ Carnahan (D-MO), and Devin Nunes (R-CA). The Startup Act 2.0 is a bill to create and keep jobs in America; increase America’s access to talent in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) by reforming high-skilled visa policies; and create opportunities for startup businesses with tax incentives and access to resources for innovation. “I’m proud to lead Startup 2.0 in the House. U.S. immigration policy should help, not hurt, the ability of U.S. companies to attract top talent. As our economy continues to recover, we must further enable our entrepreneurs to grow and to create jobs. Startup 2.0 legislation is a natural follow-up to our efforts to jumpstart the economy and it is exactly the kind of legislation the United States needs to keep up with India, China and the rest of the global market,” said Rep. Sanchez. “Startup 2.0 is about creating American jobs. Too often we educate the world’s best and brightest in STEM fields, only to send them back to countries like India and China to open businesses and compete against us. This bill will keep top talent here in the U.S. to build businesses that hire Americans, and drive U.S. innovation and competitiveness. I thank Senator Moran for his leadership on this legislation in the Senate and thank my colleagues in the House for working together across the aisle for the greater good of the American people and the U.S. economy,” said Rep. Grimm. “The one thing we can all agree on is the need to jumpstart our economy and create jobs here at home. Startup Act 2.0 is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that will help to spur the economy and empower job creators by recognizing the importance of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, empowering small businesses, and rethinking burdensome regulations that prevent job growth,” said Rep. Dold. “Americans need more jobs now, which means we should be doing everything possible to encourage the launch of great new American companies. By helping startups grow and succeed, we unleash the creative energies of entrepreneurs and innovators to take their great ideas and turn them into new job creating businesses. This is exactly the kind of bipartisan, job-creating legislation that Congress should act on immediately,” said Rep. Polis

**Startup Act 2.0 solves competitiveness and jobs and avoids the link to politics**

**Sanchez and Grimm 6/4 -** Reps. Michael G. Grimm (R-NY) and Loretta Sanchez (D-CA) <”Reps. Sanchez and Grimm Introduce Startup Act 2.0 to Create U.S. Jobs and Reform High-Skilled Visa Policy” June 4th, 2012. http://lorettasanchez.house.gov/press-release/reps-sanchez-and-grimm-introduce-startup-act-20-create-us-jobs-and-reform-high-skilled>//CS

 “The Startup Act 2.0 is a great example of Congress working in a bipartisan manner to put Americans back to work. This legislation will help keep America a global leader in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields, and in the competition for the brightest minds of future generations. Additionally, it will give small businesses much-needed support to stay afloat and add employees. I’m glad to be a part of this team working to move the Startup Act 2.0 through the House,” said Rep. Yoder. “The Startup Act will encourage investors who want their money to grow American jobs and it will put funding for research and development right on the cutting edge of discovery, at our colleges and universities. It will give the men and women who are educated in America, who want to innovate and invent in America, a chance to do exactly that. We can create jobs in America that can never be sent overseas. We can build products that lead the world. We can do what we have always done in this nation; invent, innovate and deliver on our potential. The Startup Act will help make that happen,” said Rep. Carnahan. “America has always attracted the best and brightest entrepreneurs. If we are to continue building on this legacy, we must act now. The Startup Act represents a powerful bipartisan approach in this regard,” said Rep. Nunes. Startup 2.0 helps increase America’s access to talent by creating a new set of conditional visas for 75,000 immigrant entrepreneurs and 50,000 foreign STEM graduate students, that are linked to the creation of American jobs. Research has demonstrated the positive impact of immigrants on American job creation: More than 40 percent of all Fortune 500 companies were founded by an immigrant or the child of an immigrant, and each foreign-born advanced degree holder who stays in the U.S. to work in a STEM occupation created an estimated 2.6 American jobs. The bill also creates tax incentives for the creation of new businesses. Research shows that startups create 3 million jobs per year, on average. In addition, over the past 30 years, companies less than five years old have created almost all the new net jobs in America. The bill has received industry support from Microsoft, Google, National Small Business Association (NSBA), CTIA, Consumer Electronics Association (CEA), Financial Services Forum, Computer and Communications Industry Association (CCIA), TechAmercia, Information Technology Industry (ITI), Compete America, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, and TechNet.

**STEM is bipartisan**

**Mervis 10** - coordinating coverage of science policy <Jeffrey. “Obama Advisers Call for Greater Emphasis on STEM Education” September 2, 2010. http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2010/09/obama-advisers-call-for-greater.html>//CS

A new report to President Barack Obama from his science advisers urges the federal government to improve science and math education in U.S. schools by both leading the way and rooting from the sidelines. Speaking today at a meeting of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), which adopted but didn’t release the report, co-chair Eric Lander said that the country needs many more specialized schools that focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). He called for a program that would give special recognition to master STEM teachers--“not the rare award, but maybe 5% of the teacher corps”--so that they could help improve the performance of their colleagues. And he said that the effective use of technology means a lot more than giving schools computers. The fact that the federal government provides only about 8% of total funding for elementary and secondary education, however, means that it must work closely with states to achieve these and other goals, Lander added. The report, expected out by the end of September, backs most of the Administration’s current strategies to raise student achievement in elementary and secondary schools. But he said a more concerted effort and greater resources are needed. “The federal government hasn’t been organized with a coherent strategy and leadership capacity for K–12 STEM education,” said Lander, director of the Broad Institute of the Masschusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University. “There have been many STEM programs started, some of them very good. But they are growing somewhat disconnected from each other. Given the importance of STEM education, and its bipartisan support, it’s essential to bring coherence to that vision.” Lander said the report applauds the efforts of individual states to adopt common standards in core subjects to ensure that a high school degree represents a similar level of knowledge by students in every state. He also expressed his hope that science will soon follow reading and math as subjects that have been adopted by a growing majority of states that have signed onto the common standards movement. But a solid preparation in STEM areas isn’t the only thing that students should expect from their education, he added. “Inspiration is also needed, at all levels, and we have to make sure that every element of our educational system is set up to both prepare and inspire.” Those twin missions are highlighted in the title of the report, Prepare and Inspire: STEM Education for America’s Future. The report reflects the consensus of a year-long discussion among some 20 experts both within and outside PCAST, explained the panel’s co-chair, University of Maryland physicist James Gates. It’s the first of two reports on STEM education. The second, dealing with STEM in higher education, has yet to get under way. PCAST’s work on K–12 STEM education is not done, however. “We expect to meet with the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation in the next 6 to 12 months” to see how PCAST can help those and other federal agencies to implement the report, Lander said. “We want to stay on top of this.”

**Counterplan bipartisan – assumes its an election year**

**Sanchez and Grimm 6/4 -** Reps. Michael G. Grimm (R-NY) and Loretta Sanchez (D-CA) <”Reps. Sanchez and Grimm Introduce Startup Act 2.0 to Create U.S. Jobs and Reform High-Skilled Visa Policy” June 4th, 2012. http://lorettasanchez.house.gov/press-release/reps-sanchez-and-grimm-introduce-startup-act-20-create-us-jobs-and-reform-high-skilled>//CS

"Technology companies are driving vital job growth and opportunity that is crucial to America's economic recovery. To sustain this growth, companies like Microsoft need to be able to recruit and retain the world's brightest minds, enabling them to work with our large number of American employees. We applaud Representatives Grimm and Sanchez for introducing this critical legislation that will help fuel innovation and create more jobs in this country. We urge Congress to pass this bipartisan legislation quickly,” said Brad Smith, General Counsel and Executive Vice President of Microsoft. “Now is the time to give America’s small businesses every tool possible to help them grow and create jobs. The Startup Act 2.0 does just that, including requiring cost-benefit analyses of federal regulations, bolstering research and innovation through tax credits and much more. I applaud Reps. Grimm and Sanchez for their leadership on this legislation,” stated NSBA President and CEO Todd McCracken. “This legislation consists of common sense approaches that will spur innovation, entrepreneurship and job creation. It is imperative that we allow foreign-born, U.S.-educated immigrants to remain in America and use their training to build businesses and create domestic jobs. Startup Act 2.0 makes it easier for innovators to raise funds, and clears away a variety of anachronistic regulations that have made it difficult for small businesses to expand and thrive. This bill is a slam-dunk. We applaud the introduction of this legislation and urge both the Senate and House of Representatives to pass these bills expeditiously,” said Michael Petricone, Senior VP of Government Affairs, Consumer Electronics Association (CEA). The Startup Act 2.0 was also introduced in the Senate on May 22, 2012 by Senators Jerry Moran (R-KS), Mark Warner (D-VA), Marco Rubio (R-FL), and Christopher Coons (D-DE). “To get America’s economic engine roaring once again, entrepreneurs must be free to pursue their ideas, start businesses in the United States, and create American jobs. These ideas have bipartisan support, and I am pleased my colleagues in the House are joining me in the effort to prove the critics wrong: Congress can get something done during an election year by coming together to strengthen the economy and create jobs,” said Senator Moran. “Startup 2.0 provides commonsense steps to support and encourage America’s innovators and entrepreneurs. Working together, we have come up with bipartisan proposals to help us compete and win in the global contest for talent, and this legislation is the logical follow-up to passage of the bipartisan JOBS Act earlier this year,” said Senator Warner. “There are so many ideas for strengthening our economy that Democrats and Republicans agree on, but Congress seems to focus obsessively on the areas we don’t. Startup Act 2.0, like the AGREE Act I was proud to introduce with Senator Rubio last fall, is about finding common ground and moving forward on it. I’m proud that this common ground now reaches into the House, thanks to Reps. Grimm and Sanchez, and look forward to working with them to help the bill pass in both chambers,” said Senator Coons.

**Counterplan is popular – empirically proven with similar bills**

**Case 6/5 -** chairman and CEO of Revolution, as well as co-founder of AOL <Steve. “Congress Should Pass The Startup Act 2.0” June 5, 2012. http://techcrunch.com/2012/06/05/startup-act-2-0-steve-case/>//CS

Believe it or not, Washington is listening these days. When Senators Warner and Moran joined together last year to introduce the original Startup Act to help entrepreneurs, and when Senators Coons and Rubio joined together a few weeks earlier to introduce the AGREE Act to support new business formation, most political observers assumed the bipartisan duos were making a thoughtful gesture heading into a presidential election cycle, not offering legislation that had a chance. Yet many of the proposals in the original Startup and AGREE Acts, along with additional recommendations by President Obama’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness, helped pave the way for the bipartisan JOBS Act. And in early April of this year, despite partisan gridlock, Majority Leader Eric Cantor stood with President Obama in the Rose Garden of the White House as the JOBS Act – which increases access to capital and removes costly regulatory barriers for startups at every stage of their growth – was signed into law. It was a rare bipartisan victory in Washington and an even bigger victory for entrepreneurs across the country. The strong headwinds of a high-stakes election season will not make passing the Startup Act 2.0 easy, but its introduction of in the Senate, and now the House, suggests positive momentum on the issue. That’s a good sign, because in the last three decades, new businesses less than five years old created nearly forty million American jobs – all the net new-jobs created during that time period. Big corporations and small businesses on main street support current levels of employment and contribute to the dynamism of the U.S. economy, but new job creation is driven primarily by new businesses starting up. And in recent years, the trends are alarming: startups are down almost a quarter since 2007 and new startups are adding fewer jobs on average than ever before. Initial public offerings for small and middle-sized firms are down considerably, and other countries are rapidly improving their entrepreneurial ecosystems adding fresh competition to our firms. Simply put, the window to act is closing. Let’s urge our leaders in Washington to defy the odds once again in 2012 so that our entrepreneurs can usher in a new wave of iconic, American companies.

# Solves Competitiveness

**Startup solves job creation and competitiveness**

**Litan 5/22 –** Vice President of Research and Policy at the Kaufman Foundation, <Robert. “Senators Unveil Bipartisan Startup Act 2.0” May 22, 2012. Kaufman Foundation. http://www.kauffman.org/newsroom/senators-unveil-bipartisan-startup-act-2.aspx>//CS

Four U.S. Senators today introduced Startup Act 2.0 – bipartisan legislation designed to jumpstart the economy through the creation and growth of new businesses. Startup Act 2.0 builds upon the original Startup Act, introduced by Senators Jerry Moran (R-Kan.) and Mark Warner (D-Va.) in December 2011, and the AGREE Act, introduced by Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and Chris Coons (D-Del.), in November 2011. Startup Act 2.0 creates new opportunities for American-educated and entrepreneurial immigrants to remain in the United States where their talent and ideas can fuel economic growth and create American jobs. The bill also alleviates regulatory burdens that make it more difficult for businesses to expand and create jobs. Finally, Startup Act 2.0 makes changes to the tax code to encourage investment in startup companies. Many of the principles included in Startup Act 2.0 are based on the research and analysis of the Kauffman Foundation, and have been endorsed by President Obama's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness. Kauffman Vice President of Research and Policy, Robert E. Litan, joined in the news conference where the Senators presented Startup Act 2.0. "Kauffman's research solidifies the wealth of contributions new firms make to job creation and the economy, and the time is ripe for legislative action that will fuel our nation's entrepreneurial engine," said Robert E. Litan, Kauffman Foundation Vice President of Research and Policy. "We need reforms such as better access to capital, visas for STEM graduates and foreign-born entrepreneurs, and regulatory improvements for new firms to start, hire and innovate." In 2011, the Kauffman Foundation presented a proposal of ideas it called the Startup Act that offered policy reforms that would make it easier for new firms to start and grow.

**Talented graduates are being forced to leave the country now – only Startup keeps them in the United States – key to competitiveness**

**Case 6/5 -** chairman and CEO of Revolution, as well as co-founder of AOL <Steve. “Congress Should Pass The Startup Act 2.0” June 5, 2012. http://techcrunch.com/2012/06/05/startup-act-2-0-steve-case/>//CS

For investors, Washington policymakers, casual observers of the stock market, and members of the media, the big story for entrepreneurs over the last few weeks has been the highly anticipated initial public offering of Facebook. While the largest tech IPO in history won the news cycle, there was an equally important, if not overlooked story for entrepreneurs brewing over on Capitol Hill. A bipartisan group of senators joined together to unveil a bill called the Startup Act 2.0. Democrats Mark Warner and Chris Coons, and Republicans Marco Rubio and Jerry Moran, failed to read the memo stating that Washington can’t come together and pass meaningful legislation in an election year. Startup Act 2.0 builds on the JOBS Act passed a few months ago, to improve the environment for entrepreneurs to create new businesses, expand existing companies, and create jobs across the country. The House of Representatives is taking up the legislation this week. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies in the U.S. were founded by immigrants or their children, and these firms alone employ over 10 million individuals. Some of our country’s most iconic brands – including IBM, Google, and Apple – were founded by an immigrant or the child of an immigrant. And nearly half of the top 50 venture-backed companies in the U.S. had at least one immigrant founder. Yet, existing and arbitrary caps are forcing almost 20,000 American-educated degree holders to leave the U.S. every year, and in turn, join or set up competitor businesses in competitor countries. Imagine if we trained men and women at our Air Force and Naval Academies, equipped them with the tools they need to lead and succeed in battle, and then kicked them out of our country to join other militaries? In effect, that is what we are doing when we train the world’s most talented immigrants to innovate and start businesses at our great universities, then send them off to start companies in China, India, and South Korea. The Startup Act 2.0 reforms high-skilled immigration law in three sensible ways. First, the Act creates a new STEM visa so that U.S.-educated students who graduate with a masters or PhD in science, technology, engineering or math can receive a green card to stay in country. Second, the Act creates an entrepreneur’s visa for legal immigrants to stay in the United States so long as they start a business that employs American workers. And third, the Act eliminates the per-country cap for employment-based immigrant visas which currently prevents American CEOs from having the flexibility to recruit the most talented workers. Beyond addressing high-skilled immigration reform, Startup Act 2.0 provides incentives for investors to put capital into startups on the verge of growing and hiring. Instead of tax policy rewarding flash trades on Wall Street, the Act encourages investors to make a five year or longer financial commitment to a startup by lowering the investors’ effective tax rate. From a policy standpoint, this will allow our nation’s entrepreneurs to have more resources to innovate, expand, and hire. Finally, the Act offers a research and development credit to offset some early taxes for entrepreneurs, helps universities transfer cutting-edge ideas from campus to the marketplace, and makes other sensible policy reforms.

# US Falling Behind

**US falling behind in economic leadership now**

**Sunday Herald 11** <Sunday Herald. “World leaders must act now to stem economic crisis” 7 August 2011. Proquest.>

NEARLY US$3 trillion was wiped off the value of the world's stock markets last week - the UK FTSE 100 index of leading companies alone lost more than pound(s)150 billion. This is clearly more than just a silly season panic and requires prompt, intelligent action by world leaders. The aftershocks of the 2008 financial crash are still reverberating around the world. America has now lost its AAA credit rating. That verdict, by rating agency Standard & Poor's, on the country's ability to pay off its debts may seem academic, but it could cost US taxpayers tens of billions of dollars if the cost of government borrowing rises as a result. It is time for the largest economy in the world to devise a credible plan for growth that does not simply involve exporting US debts through debasing its currency. If the dollar is to remain the world's reserve currency, as good as gold, then it has to show that it can hold value as well as the yellow metal. If President Barack Obama needed a reminder that this was a priority, it came yesterday in the unprecedented and forceful warning from China that America must cure its addiction to debt. Europe is in no position to throw stones. Last week the eurozone leaders demonstrated a lamentable lack of vision and co-ordination. Two weeks ago, the German chancellor, Angela Merkel, and her French counterpart, President Nicolas Sarkozy, claimed that they had put in place the financial means to deal with the rolling sovereign debt crisis threatening the social and economic stability of Europe. They promised to allocate sufficient funds to the European Financial Stability Facility, not only to rescue the Greek economy but also to provide pre-emptive support to any other country that faced a debt crisis. They then went off on holiday without making clear exactly how this was to be achieved. Say what you like about Gordon Brown, but the former UK chancellor would not have left without dotting the Is and crossing the Ts. No-one in Europe has matched the leadership he demonstrated in October 2008 when he mobilised the G20 nations to deliver a co-ordinated economic stimulus to ward off the banking crisis. What is needed now is the establishment of a proper European central financial authority with the power not only to bail out countries in distress but also to issue bonds underwritten by the European economies as a whole. If the euro is to be saved it must now become the currency of a "fiscal union", with an autonomous Treasury and the apparatus of a federal government with power to raise taxes, issue debt and transfer funds among member states. The present ad hoc arrangements have become a large part of the problem. Of course, this would mean the EU was becoming the federal superstate many voters in the member countries say they do not want. Well, the people of Europe are going to have to ask themselves whether they accept the consequences of being in a dysfunctional currency union which threatens the economic stability of Europe and the world. If the euro unravels, and EU countries were to restore national currencies, there would be economic chaos, as Chancellor George Osborne has pointed out. We should not get complacent: Britain may have a sound credit rating at present, but our deficit is one of the highest in Europe, and the economic recovery seems to have stalled. This means that it will be harder for the Treasury to raise through taxation adequate funds to meet financial obligations. Britain needs a bold plan for growth based on a revival of manufacturing industry. There are signs industry has made progress, thanks to the low pound. But more needs to be done to create a sound economic basis for the future - one that doesn't rely on fly-by-night funds flowing through the City of London. In America, Europe and Britain, the immediate problem is the same: a failure of leadership. Politicians may not have all the answers but they need to show that they at least understand the questions. The people of the world deserve better.

# Aff – Startup Fails

**Startup rejects the best applicants for STEM – kills solvency**

**Ammosov 6/10 -** M.P.A., Princeton University, Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship at Department of Computer Science, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, and co-founder of 6 STEM startups - <Yuri. “Startup Act 2.0: Great For Foreign Graduate Students, But Not Foreign Tech Entrepreneurs” June 10th, 2012. http://techcrunch.com/2012/06/10/startup-act-2-0-great-for-foreign-graduate-students-but-not-foreign-tech-entrepreneurs/>//CS

Startup Act 2.0 was just introduced in the U.S. Congress, and hearings of the bill are starting shortly. When it comes to U.S. visas, company founders are among the most discriminated folks. Unlike employees, they cannot get a work visa (called H1-B) – or any other long-term visa. I care about attempts to enact legislation that will make it easier for foreign-born entrepreneurs to move to the U.S and start companies here for a good reason. I train students that graduate with master’s degree in Math and Computer Science from definitely most selective and arguable the best technology school in Russia and go on to Ph.D. programs and employers worldwide. Our program includes a year of startup building, and a lot of my graduating students not only have the ability and drive to succeed as entrepreneurs but frequently also a team that worked together for several years and a prototype. Many of these projects could take off as startups in Silicon Valley – if only the young founders could get here and stay. I read the new bill with a marker – and the more I read, the greater was my disappointment. The most important issue about any visa is “eligibility”. Who can get a visa? Well, to start, there are two types of new visas. Section 3 creates 50 000 visas for those who have “advanced degrees” (master’s or doctor’s) in STEM fields. STEM is a shortcut for “Science, Technology, Engineering and Math” but the bill references a specific Homeland Security document that lists all degrees that are “STEM”. Here’s where fine print starts. STEM includes many bona fide science professions but also contains items like dairy science, paleontology, personality psychology, archaeology and actuarial science. Professions that require a graduate degree like MBA, JD, MD, architecture and so on, are not eligible, as well as STEM disciplines that are not listed (no “storage” or “cloud”, for example). On to more fine print. “The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).” What the heck is section 101? It is a 1998 amendment to 1965 law. Well, here’s where things start getting sour – (a) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION- For purposes of this Act, other than title IV, the term `institution of higher education’ means an educational institution in any State that– No need to read further. “In any State…” – only graduates of U.S. universities can get a visa. To make sure there is no confusion, next section 102 defined non-US universities. So, the first visa is only for folks with U.S. “STEM” graduate degree. And only for those with active student visas – you have just one year after graduation to apply (Sec.216B(b)). All other STEM masters and doctors who went back home are not welcome. Maybe, a second visa is better? The section is titled “Immigrant Entrepreneurs” and promises them 75 000 visas. Keep reading to Definitions in Sec. 210A(e)(3) and check out this – The term ‘qualified alien entrepreneur’ means an alien who– ‘(A) at the time the alien applies for an immigrant visa under this section– ‘(i) is lawfully present in the United States; and ‘(ii)(I) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b); or ‘(II) has completed or will complete a graduate level degree in a STEM field from an institution of higher education; Full stop. You can apply only if you are already in the U.S. and are an H-1B employee or have a STEM graduate degree from a U.S. university. No exceptions. If section 210 would refer to Section 102 instead of 101 of Higher Education Act of 1965 – gates to foreign entrepreneurs would open. But it says 101. Go get a U.S. STEM degree to be counted as immigrant entrepreneur. Now, join me for an imaginary experiment. Imagine you are a USCIS officer in charge of reviewing petitions of immigrant entrepreneurs. Act to the letter of the law and take decisions. Here’s your stack: Peter Thiel. Germany. Founder of PayPal. J.D., Stanford Law School. Michael Moritz. Wales-Britain. Sequoia Capital. M.A., History, Oxford, M.B.A., Wharton School. Steve Chen. Taiwan. Founder of YouTube. Dropped out of University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign after 3 years. Linus Torvalds. Finland. Creator of Linux core. M.Sc, Computer Science, University of Helsinki. Shai Agassi. Israel. Founder of TopTier and BetterPlace, ex-CEO of SAP. B.Sc, Computer Science, Technion – Israeli Institute of Technology. Marten Mickos. Finland. Founder, MySQL. M.Sc., Technical Physics, Helsinki University of Technology. Serguei Beloussov. Russia-USSR. Founder of Parallels and Acronis. Ph.D., Computer Science, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology. Max Levchin. Ukraine-USSR. Founder of PayPal and Slide. B.A., Computer Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Elon Musk. South Africa-Canada. Founder of Tesla Motors. Dropped out of Applied Physics and Material graduate program at Stanford. Niklas Zennstrom. Sweden. Founder of Skype. M.Sc, Engineering Physics, Uppsala University. Janus Friis. Denmark. Co-Founder of Skype. High school dropout. Mark Shuttleworth. South Africa. Founder of Thawte. Bus.Sc., Finance and Information Systems, University of Cape Town. Stepan Pachikov. Russia-USSR. Founder of Evernote. Ph.D., Math Logic, Soviet Academy of Sciences. Vivek Wadhva. India. Founder, Relativity Technologies. MBA, New York University. Your action? REJECT ALL APPLICATIONS. And if Bill Gates (Microsoft), Steve Job (Apple) and Mark Zuckerberg (Facebook) were not lucky enough to be U.S. citizens by birth, they would have also been added to pile of rejections. All these people (and many more I should have named) are permanent residents or citizens of the U.S., but not because of what they accomplished as entrepreneurs. Some were brought in by parents as children, others came as students or employees and found a way or loophole to become residents and eventually citizens. None of them entered U.S. to build a startup. Startup Act 2.0 is not worthless. There are still many science and tech graduate students who will be able to take advantage of it. But it would be more appropriate to rename it to STEM Masters’ and Doctors’ Visa Act. This will be a better description of what’s inside. In the meantime, I will tell my students to go get a master’s degree in any STEM field at any U.S. graduate school, get legalized in the U.S. and then start a company. Disclaimer: the author, as M.P.A., Princeton University, Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship at Department of Computer Science, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, and co-founder of 6 STEM startups, is also not eligible for a “Startup Visa”.

# Aff – STEM Now

**US economic decline killed STEM, not the other way around. Plan key to solve**

**Vergano in 10** - Member at National Association of Science Writers, Fellow at Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard, Washington D.C. correspondent at Medical Tribune <Dan. “Report: Poor science education impairs U.S. economy” 9/24/2010. USA Today. http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2010-09-23-science-education\_N.htm>

"The current economic crisis makes the link between education and employment very clear," says Steven Newton of the National Center for Science Education in Oakland.In 2007, however, an analysis led by B. Lindsay Lowell of Georgetown University found U.S. science education worries overstated. It saw three times more science and engineering college graduates than job openings each year. Other reports have found top science and engineering students migrating to better-paying jobs in finance, law and medicine, since the 1990s.

# Aff – Links to PTX

**CP Links to Politics**

**Marks 5/31** <Gene. “Why the Proposed Startup Act 2.0 Is Embarrassing” June 31, 2012. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gene-marks/startup-act-20\_b\_1554536.html>

As a business owner and an American I'm embarrassed that such a fuss is being made over something that has been needed for so long and everyone agrees is necessary. That will clearly help this country over the long term by keeping those people who our own universities educated here, where many of these students want to be, rather than forcing them to leave. As a small business owner it seems so fundamentally right that it's unbelievable that these rules weren't changed decades ago. I hate that. I also hate that we're celebrating the "bipartisanship" of the proposal. "I would guess that 80 percent of my colleagues in Congress would agree with the visa provisions in this legislation," says one of the bill's sponsors, Senator Jerry Moran. "And what I would encourage is that we not take the attitude or approach that unless we do everything, we can't do anything." With all that Congress has not accomplished during their past few sessions, we're applauding them for agreeing on something so fundamentally obvious and right? And who are the 20% of those that would oppose something like this? I hate that we have elected representatives that actually think this way. It's embarrassing.

**Startup will cost capital – election year politics**

**Mayeux in 12 -** management team of CBV, PhD in biomedical science <Jacques. “STARTUP ACT 2.0: MOVING BEYOND THE JOBS ACT” June 6, 2012. http://beventureso.me/2012/06/06/startup-act-2-0-moving-beyond-the-jobs-act/>

The Startup Act 2.0 provides benefits in addition to those resulting from immigration reform. The Act also looks to encourage investors into placing capital in startup companies by offering investment incentives. If investors make a five year or longer commitment to a startup company, the act provides an incentive that lowers the investors’ effective tax rate. This is great news for the entrepreneurs in America as this policy will provide them with resources to hire, expand, innovate, and grow. It will not be easy for a bipartisan act to be passed, especially in a high-stakes election year. It is my hope that congress can see the importance of this Act, and that it sees the same support that helped the JOBS act succeed. After all, acts such as these help new businesses, and new businesses help America. In fact, over the last three decades new businesses (less than five years old) accounted for more than 40 million jobs (4). So get out there and show your support for the Startup Act 2.0!

**CP Links to politics, immigration reform is controversial**

**US News 12** <US News. “Immigration Reform” June 2012. http://www.usnews.com/topics/subjects/immigration-reform>

Congress remains deadlocked over immigration. Many Republicans and border state legislators emphasize securing the U.S. border with Mexico as the critical first step toward reform. Arizona Sens. John McCain and Jon Kyl in April 2010 called for 3,000 National Guard troops to help close the border and stem cross-border violence. A bill sponsored by Democratic Sens. Claire McCaskill and Chuck Schumer became law in August 2010, sending about 1,000 additional enforcement personnel to the border and providing increased funding for unmanned surveillance drones. Republicans have also called for an expansion of guest worker programs and for an end to birthright citizenship, which, under the 14th Amendment, means anyone born on U.S. soil is a citizen. Democrats, led by Sen. Harry Reid, argue for a “comprehensive” approach--which critics derisively characterize as “amnesty”--including not only border security but also a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants who are already in the country.

# ---Corporate Tax CP

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan text: The United States Federal Government should cut the corporate tax rate to 28%.**

**That solves for long term economic growth and competitiveness while avoiding the link to politics**

**Hodge 11** (Scott president of the tax foundation “Ten Benefits of Cutting the U.S. Corporate Tax Rate” <http://taxfoundation.org/sites/taxfoundation.org/files/docs/sr192.pdf>)JC

There is near unanimous bipartisan agreement in Washington that the U.S. corporate tax rate is out of step with rates levied by most industrialized nations and that america’s global competitiveness is suffering as a result. What seems to be lacking to fix the problem, however, is a sense of political urgency and a broader understanding of the substantial economic benefits that a lower corporate tax rate will generate. president obama’s two bipartisan “blue ribbon” panels – the economic Recovery advisory Board, chaired by paul Volcker, and the National commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, chaired by erskine Bowles and alan Simpson – made strong cases for cutting the corporate tax rate and reforming the entire corporate tax system. the economic Recovery advisory Board, for example, found that: the combination of a high statutory rate and numerous deductions and exclusions results in an inefficient tax system that distorts corporate behavior in multiple ways. the high statutory corporate tax rate reduces the return to investments and therefore discourages saving and reduces aggregate investment. 1 the so-called Bowles-Simpson report simply concluded that “america’s tax code is broke and must be reformed.” Moreover, the corporate income tax “hurts america’s ability to compete. on the one hand, statutory rates in the U.S. are significantly higher than the average for industrialized countries (even as revenue collection is low), and our method of taxing foreign source income is outside the norm… the current system puts U.S. corporations at a competitive disadvantage against their foreign competitors. results in an inefficient tax system that distorts corporate behavior in multiple ways. the high statutory corporate tax rate reduces the return to investments and therefore discourages saving and reduces aggregate investment. 2 While many lawmakers are understandably concerned about the budgetary consequences of cutting the corporate tax rate, they should give greater weight to the benefits that such a move would mean to the American economy. Some key members of congress have moved the debate forward with serious plans to cut the corporate income tax rate. For example, the House-passed budget resolution for 2012 calls for cutting both the corporate rate and individual tax rates to 25 percent. in the other chamber, Senators Ron Wyden (D-oR) and Dan coats (R-iN) have introduced the “Bipartisan tax Fairness & Simplification act of 2011” that would cut the corporate rate to 24 percent. Growing the economy and making the U.S. more competitive are critical solutions to the long-term fiscal issues facing the nation. While there are many benefits of cutting the U.S. corporate tax rate, we’ve compiled 10 that should help convince lawmakers that this is the right policy direction for the nation. Benefit #1: Cutting the corporate tax rate will promote higher longterm economic growth. cutting the U.S. corporate tax rate will help put the country on a long-term growth path. an important 2008 report by economists at the organization for economic cooperation and Development (oecD) measured the relationship between different types of taxes and economic growth. the evidence showed that the corporate income tax is the most harmful tax for long-term economic growth, followed by high personal income tax rates. consumption taxes and property taxes were seen as less harmful. indeed, the report found that “corporate income taxes appear to have a particularly negative impact on GDp per capita.” 3 lowering statutory corporate tax rates, they determined, “can lead to particularly large productivity gains in firms that are dynamic and profitable, i.e. those that can make the largest contribution to GDp growth.” 4 oecD economists speculate that this could be because these are the firms that rely most heavily on retained earnings to finance their growth. 5 Higher taxes mean fewer retained earnings, which means less growth. an earlier study by economists Young lee and Roger H. Gordon looked at the relationship between corporate tax rates and economic growth for 70 countries over a 27-year period. they found that “statutory corporate tax rates are significantly negatively correlated with cross-sectional differences in average economic growth rates” and that “cutting the corporate tax rate by 10 percentage points can increase the annual growth rate by around 1.1%.” 6 Studies such as these should be a red flag to lawmakers because not only does the U.S. have a high corporate tax rate, it also has one of the most progressive personal income tax systems among industrialized nations, according to the oecD. this suggests that we are severely retarding the nation’s growth potential by maintaining such high tax rates. Benefit #2: Cutting the corporate tax rate will improve U.S. competitiveness. at more than 39 percent, the overall U.S. corporate tax rate is the second-highest in the world, 15 percentage points higher than the oecD average of 25 percent and china’s 25 percent tax rate. over the past four years, 75 countries have cut their corporate tax rates to be more attractive to business investment. in contrast to many of our major trading partners, the U.S. has no official policy regarding our tax competitiveness. the canadian government has set an explicit goal of having “an overall tax rate on new business investment that is the lowest in the Group of Seven (G7) countries,” and “the lowest statutory corporate income tax rate in the G7” by 2012. 7 on January 1 st , canada lowered its federal corporate tax rate from 18 percent to 16.5 percent. the rate will eventually fall to 15 percent. At more than 39 percent, the overall U.S. corporate tax rate is the second-highest in the world, 15 percentage points higher than the OECD average of 25 percent and China’s 25 percent tax rate. the British government has also set out a detailed plan to “create the most competitive corporate tax regime in the G20.” 8 a key element of that plan is lowering the British corporate tax rate from 28 percent to 23 percent by 2014. the rate was lowered to 26 percent this year as a first step toward that goal. Finally, the Japanese government approved a plan last December to cut their effective corporate tax rate by 5 percent “in order to promote domestic investment and job creation through enhancing Japanese companies’ international competitiveness as well as improving the environment for business establishment.” 9 that plan was scheduled to go into effect on april 1, 2011 but was put on hold after the recent earthquake derailed the government’s legislative agenda. 10 the high “sticker price” of the U.S. corporate tax rate not only makes the american economy less competitive globally, it makes american businesses less competitive. cutting the corporate tax rate will make the U.S. a more attractive place to do business in, and do business from. the White House and the congress should set out an explicit goal of making the U.S. corporate tax system more competitive before the nation falls too much further behind our major trading partners.

# 2NC Solvency - Competitiveness

**Corporate taxes kill the United States competitiveness**

**Mason 12** (Joseph is a Chair of banking at the Ourso School of Business at Louisiana State University and a senior fellow at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania “World’s Highest Corporate Tax Rate Hursts U.S. Economically” http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/economic-intelligence/2012/04/02/worlds-highest-corporate-tax-rate-hurts-us-economically)JC

United States-based companies and hardworking Americans face a steadily growing problem, one oddly self-imposed by Uncle Sam. Our current tax system puts businesses and workers at a competitive disadvantage in the global market and discourages companies from investing in operations here at home. On Sunday, April 1, Japan lowered its corporate tax rate, leaving the United States with the highest effective rate among developed countries: 39.2 percent. Under the "worldwide" tax system the United States employs now, companies' profits generated abroad are subject to taxes both domestically and in the country they were earned. Certain provisions are built into the tax code to alleviate that burden, but even those protections are being challenged by members in Congress who seem ensconced on repealing these important incentives for U.S. industry. According to a 2011 Business Roundtable report: American companies can face a tax rate on their remitted foreign earnings a full 16 percentage points higher than the rate faced by their foreign competitors. Operating under a higher tax rate automatically puts U.S. based firms at a competitive disadvantage to their foreign counterparts. Developments in technology and greater global integration have opened international boundaries. Companies today have fewer deterrents from relocating their operations to areas that provide the most economically conducive environment, putting an inestimable pressure on nations to create commerce-friendly conditions. We've already seen this at a state by state level. California, which boasts one of the most burdensome state tax systems, has witnessed companies relocate at an accelerating pace. In 2011, companies moved out of California at an average of about five a week. Altron Inc., an information technology company laid off 74 employs to open headquarters in South Carolina. CGI Federal Inc. fired 170 people to move to Canada. Petco, the well-known supplies retailer, shut down its headquarters in San Diego to move to Texas. The list goes on and on. American companies that operate internationally directly sustain over 22 million U.S. jobs and a further 41 million indirectly. Additionally, the average U.S. company operating globally buys $3 billion in goods and services from small businesses here at home, with a cumulative impact of more than $1.52 trillion. Unreasonable tax policies put all of that at an unnecessary risk. Moreover, monitoring the tax activity of U.S. based multinationals under the current system creates sizeable costs. Both government agencies and private firms devote valuable time and resources to tracking and taxing foreign income. According to the Tax Foundation, the IRS estimates American companies and individuals spend 7 billion hours a year filing tax forms. Under a simplified "territorial" system, governments would see gains that would offset most, if not all, short-term reductions to tax revenue. Moreover, the long-term gains caused by increased economic activity and decreased compliance costs would dwarf any immediate losses. Taxing U.S. companies on profits earned abroad also discourages managers from repatriating profits, thereby reducing domestic investment. Similarly, hefty taxes deter foreign investment in the United States since prospective financers recognize the drag they will create on revenues. The business world is becoming increasingly global. In 2007, international commerce accounted for 35 percent of worldwide Gross Domestic Product. But America is failing to keep pace. Today, U.S. investment in foreign firms is three times greater than in American companies, and in 2010, only six of the 20 largest global companies were U.S. based, down from 13 in 1985. Switching to a territorial tax system offers the United States a practical way to bolster international trade, increase tax revenues, and re-establish itself as a leader of global innovation and commerce. Many U.S. leaders espouse this view and a growing number recognize its practicality. For the sake of our domestically based businesses and workers, it's important we carefully reconsider our current tax policy.

**High tax rates kill U.S. competitiveness--- empirics prove reducing corporate taxes prove them solves**

**Kamarack and Pinkerton 4/4/12** (Elaine and James staff writers at reuters “We need lower corporate tax rate” http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2012/04/04/we-need-a-lower-corporate-tax-rate/)JC

The United States is used to being a world leader, but this time, it’s bad news for American jobs and growth: As of Apr. 1, we now have the highest corporate tax rate of all the industrialized nations in the world. Japan has officially reduced its combined corporate tax rate from 39.5 percent to 38.01 percent, leaving the U.S. in the dubious position of being number one in anti-competitiveness with a current combined rate of 39.2 percent. That’s right: Our combined corporate tax rate, and federal rate at 35 percent, leaves us in a weaker position relative to other leading economies. That’s the bad news. The good news is that there is a sensible solution to lowering it and many signs that, in a surprising turn of events, the political will to achieve it exists in both parties. In February, Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner announced the outlines of a plan to reduce the U.S. corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 28 percent. Meanwhile, House Republican leaders have united around an even lower rate of 25 percent – the worldwide average tax rate among Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. So now the negotiations begin – even during an election year. A rate more in line with the OECD average coupled with the elimination of special interest tax credits and deductions has broad support among policymakers and in the business community. When President Ronald Reagan and congressional Democrats took this approach in the 1980s, it set off a period of record economic growth that produced millions of new jobs and laid the foundation for a period of prosperity that lasted two decades. It also proved to be a model for the world, much of which followed suit. Over the last 20 years, America’s competitors have lowered their top corporate rates to levels as low as 12.5 percent and 8.5 percent in the cases of Ireland and Switzerland, while the U.S. has not. This has significantly affected America’s ability to compete in an increasingly interconnected global economy. Reforming the tax code presents an opportunity to level the playing field and have every U.S. corporation pay the same, competitive rate. By doing so, we create a fairer, more streamlined code with a broadened base that makes the United States an attractive place to do business. The Information Technology and Innovation Foundation described the problem last July, saying: “The United States is at risk of losing its global competitive advantage and with it faster per-capita income growth. To effectively respond, the nation must take concerted and strategic actions in a host of areas, including reform of the corporate tax code to transform it into a more effective tool to support private sector efforts to innovate and be more productive.” Simply put, the nation is in great danger of losing a key component of its competitive edge now that the U.S. has the highest corporate tax rate among industrialized nations. U.S. companies also understand the urgency for the United States to have a competitive tax rate and have begun working for reform: “Being taxed at higher effective tax rates means we have less money available to make capital improvements, invest in innovation and stay competitive, create new jobs, offer higher compensation and better benefits to our employees and offer lower prices to our customers, and [it] makes us less attractive to investors in the capital market,” said Brad Mays, senior vice-president for tax at Macy’s Inc. The current economic recovery is the most anemic in the postwar period. And a dramatic solution is needed. The time has come for both parties to implement corporate tax reform, spur investment and create more jobs in this country.

# 2NC Solvency – Economy

**Corporate taxes are killing the economy--- reducing them encourages economic growth**

**Roff 5/16/12** (Peter, staff writer for us news and world report “Obama Should Cut the Corporate Tax Rate” http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/peter-roff/2012/05/16/obama-should-cut-the-corporate-tax-rate)JC

As of April 1, 2012, the United States has the highest corporate tax rate of any country in the world. Does it have to be said that this is not a good thing? High rates chase businesses and jobs out of the country. In fact, as a new study by O'Melveny and Myers's Jonathan Sallet and Robert Rizzi found, high corporate tax rates stifle innovation and retard economic growth. Key findings of the Rizzi-Sallet paper include: The United States has continued to adhere to the policy of high corporate tax rates combined with targeted narrow tax breaks. This approach to tax policy creates substantial uncertainty regarding future policies and undermines job creation. Firms facing a burdensome corporate tax rate like those in the United States are at a competitive disadvantage against their international counterparts and could potentially "fall behind in innovation and productive capacity." A lower federal corporate income tax rate will lead to additional capital investment and greater productivity. This boost in earnings and capital will serve as a direct catalyst for job creation and growth. Lower corporate tax rates equal a lower cost of capital while higher rates raise the cost of capital to firms. Studies have shown that companies facing high corporate tax rates will reduce a firm's capital investment. "Innovation has spurred American growth and economic vitality for decades," said James P. Pinkerton, cochair of the Reforming America's Tax Rates Equitably Coalition and former White House domestic policy adviser to Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. "By highlighting the importance of lowered tax rates and a simplified code to innovation and its impact on economic growth, Robert Rizzi and Jonathan Sallet have made a critical contribution to the tax reform debate." "Experts and policymakers on both sides of the aisle agree that a nation's innovative capacity is directly tied to investment, job creation and ultimately, economic growth," said Elaine Kamarck, cochair of the coalition along with Pinkerton and a former adviser to President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore. "The fact that the United States must be the world leader in innovation is yet another subject on which Democratic and Republican lawmakers agree and adds to the growing number of issues related to corporate tax reform on which there is bipartisan consensus." Something needs to change, and quickly. If Congress fails to act, taxes will increase dramatically at the beginning of next year—including major hikes in the dividend and capital gains tax rates. While that may meet with the approval of the "soak the rich" crowd, the reality is that these tax increases in particular will be very bad for the U.S. economy and could turn anemic growth into a full blown recession.

**Corporate taxes are killing the economy---reducing them encourages economic growth**

**Brownfield 4/2/12** (Mike, Assistant Director of Strategic Communications at The Heritage Foundation “Morning Bell: The Highest Taxes in the World” http://blog.heritage.org/2012/04/02/morning-bell-the-highest-taxes-in-the-world/)JC

There aren’t many American-owned companies more iconic than Anheuser-Busch, the famous producer of Budweiser beer based in St. Louis, Missouri. That was true up until 2008, when the Brazilian-Belgian company InBev executed a hostile takeover of the historic brewer, leading to layoffs of more than 1,800 workers. Unfortunately, conditions in the United States are growing ripe for even more takeovers like these to occur, especially now that the nation’s corporate tax rate is officially the highest in the world. As of yesterday, the U.S. corporate tax rate of 39.2 percent claimed the world’s top spot, edging out Japan which recently lowered its rate from 39.5 percent to 36.8 percent. (The U.S. rate includes the 35 percent federal rate plus the average rate the states add on.) That’s well above the 25 percent average of other developed nations. Heritage’s Curtis Dubay explains the impact on companies based in the United States: This gaping disparity means every other country that we compete with for new investment is better situated to land that new investment and the jobs that come with it, because the after-tax return from that investment promises to be higher in those lower-taxed nations. Our high rate also makes our businesses prime targets for takeovers by businesses headquartered in foreign countries, because their worldwide profits are no longer subject to the highest-in-the-world U.S. corporate tax rate. Until Congress cuts the rate, more and more iconic U.S. businesses such as Anheuser-Busch will be bought by their foreign competitors. Unfortunately, in the face of this tax rate, the Obama Administration is proposing measures that will make matters even worse for U.S. companies. Last week, Vice President Joe Biden proposed a “global minimum tax” in a wrongheaded effort to encourage companies to invest in the United States instead of overseas. Just like the rest of President Obama’s corporate tax policy, it will just make matters worse — punishing firms that seek new opportunities in growing markets by taxing their earnings in those developing markets even more heavily than they’re already taxed. The net result will be to make it even more likely that the companies’ assets would go up for sale to overseas firms in order to escape the Obama tax penalty. Unfortunately, America’s workers pay the price for this destructive tax policy. Heritage’s J.D. Foster explains why: Economists and policymakers increasingly understand that while the tax is paid almost exclusively out of profits that would otherwise go to the shareholders, the true economic burden falls primarily on workers. The reason is simply that the higher the effective corporate tax burden, the higher the hurdle rate on corporate investment. (The hurdle rate is the minimum rate a business must earn on investment to make the investment.) The higher the hurdle rate, the less investment takes place. The less investment takes place, the slower labor productivity grows, and the slower labor productivity grows, the slower wages grow. Congress should act now to help make America more competitive on the global stage, and it can do so by reducing the corporate tax rate to match or preferably fall below the international average. The U.S. economy is struggling to recover from the global recession, and by lifting the burden of record-high corporate tax rates, Congress can give American companies incentive to grow and expand here at home. If not, the American people can expect to see more companies like Anheuser-Busch bought up by international competitors — and the jobs will go right along with them.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**Both sides are onboard**

**Puzzanghera 12** (Jim staff writer for the LA Times “Obama wants to cut corporate tax rate to 28% as part of corporate overhaul” http://articles.latimes.com/2012/feb/22/business/la-fi-mo-obama-corporate-taxes-20120222)JC

Republicans and business groups have complained that the U.S. has one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world, which drives companies offshore. Key House Republicans have said they would like the U.S. rate dropped to 25% and for any overhaul to be revenue-neutral, meaning that the lower rate would be offset by eliminating some loopholes but corporations overall would not end up paying more taxes. Some Democrats also support lowering the corporate tax rate, though not to 25%, as well as eliminating a host of tax breaks. They would like to use the savings to reduce the deficit instead of cutting government programs.

**No link--- tax cuts are bipartisan**

**Roff 5/16/12** (Peter, staff writer for us news and world report “Obama Should Cut the Corporate Tax Rate” http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/peter-roff/2012/05/16/obama-should-cut-the-corporate-tax-rate)JC

A bipartisan consensus is developing on Capitol Hill that it's time to reduce the U.S. corporate tax rate, as long as a lower rate goes hand in hand with the reduction or outright elimination of special interest credits and loopholes that distort economic behavior. If the president is looking for a real job creation program, he might want to think about getting behind this idea.

# Aff – No Solvency

**Lowering the corporate tax rate won’t help the economy**

**Foroohar 12** (Rana is Time’s assistant managing editor in charge of economics and business “Why Lower Corporate Taxes Won’t Create More Jobs” http://business.time.com/2012/02/23/will-a-lower-corporate-tax-rate-lure-jobs-back-to-america/)

Yesterday, President Obama announced a long-awaited proposal to cut corporate taxes in America, which U.S. businesses complain are much too high by international standards. The proposed reform is intended to prevent companies from shifting operations and earnings to tax havens (paging Mitt Romney!) and instead encourage companies to bring them back into the U.S., where they could create jobs and growth. What’s being missed in all this is that the corporate tax debate and the jobs debate are two separate things. Here’s why. America has the second highest corporate tax rate in the rich world. But most American businesses don’t pay it. The President is suggesting that the corporate tax rate drop from 35% to 28%. But as my colleague Fareed Zakaria wrote a few months back in Time, few of the biggest U.S. businesses are paying that rate right now; indeed, most are paying much less – 115 of the companies in the S & P 500 paid less than 20% in tax over the last five years. And 39 firms paid less than 10%. (MORE: The Corporate Tax Rate Is Lowest in Decades; Is Business Paying Its Fair Share?) That gets at the key issue: Fundamentally, lower taxes aren’t the reason that businesses choose to invest, or not, in a certain country. As Warren Buffett told me when I interviewed him late last year, “The idea that American business is at a big disadvantage against the rest of the world because of corporate taxes is baloney in my view. In the 50s and 60s, corporate taxes were 52%, and we were making all kinds of [job] gains.” True enough. In fact, you can see more and more evidence for the fact that business doesn’t locate in a particular country just because it’s cheaper to do so. Consider the recently released Harvard Business School study looking at insourcing and outsourcing decisions among 10,000 alumnae who are running American businesses. The key reason for outsourcing wasn’t labor cost, but a combination of cost, proximity to market, and (most importantly) better worker skill sets abroad. In order for America to create jobs at home, we need to do the heavy lifting to reform education and develop workers who can do the sort of jobs businesses need them to do. (On that score, I applaud the way the President is trying to link educational reform with the bolstering of American manufacturing.) This goes to the final point, which is why companies are holding such a huge wad of foreign profits abroad to begin with – $1.5 trillion by some estimates. You can make a case that they simply don’t want to be taxed at 35%. But there’s no reason to think that under our current complicated tax structure, they couldn’t find ways around that, as they do with U.S. earnings. Even more to the point: As Buffett says, nobody ever stopped investing because of high taxes. Companies stop investing because they don’t fundamentally believe in the growth opportunities in a market. I agree with Buffett that you can’t allow U.S. firms to repatriate foreign profits tax-free; it creates moral hazard. But it would be interesting to see how much of that money would flow back into the U.S. if the rate was 20%, or 12.5%, as it is in Ireland. It would tell us a lot, not only about corporate America’s belief (or lack thereof) in shared sacrifice, but also about their belief (or lack thereof) in the U.S. economy.

# Aff – Links to PTX

**Tax Holidays Unpopular – would be tied to Obama**

**Helderman et al in 11** <Rosalind. “House Republicans intent on killing Senate payroll tax cut deal” December 19, 2011. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/house-republicans-intent-on-killing-senate-payroll-tax-cut-deal/2011/12/19/gIQApBDa5O\_print.html>

House Republicans were gearing up to ditch a bipartisan Senate bill on Tuesday that would extend a federal payroll tax holiday for two months, charging that the deal represented the old ways of doing business that they were elected to change. For the first time in a month of partisan sparring over the tax break, neither party appeared confident that the issue would be resolved, averting a January tax increase for 160 million American workers. “We were elected for a reason,” freshman Rep. Renee L. Ellmers (R-N.C.) said after a Republican huddle in a Capitol basement meeting room Monday night. “That was because the American people were tired of business as usual.” At the raucous, two-hour closed-door meeting, House Republicans compared themselves to the underdog, principled Scots in the movie “Braveheart” and, over takeout chicken sandwiches, promised to knock down the Senate bill. Senate Democrats accused House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) and his leadership team of walking away from the deal as a capitulation to tea-party elements and said they had no plans to reopen talks. They said that if the House rejects a deal that was adopted in the Senate on an 89 to 10 vote, it would amount to nixing the tax cut. “It’s high-stakes poker,” said Rep. Thomas J. Rooney (R-Fla.) of the stalemate with the Senate, as he left the Republican meeting. GOP leaders announced late Monday that they would hold key votes on the Senate package Tuesday instead of late Monday night, as had been planned. But Boehner predicted the House would reject the Senate bill and seek to open negotiations over how to pay for a $120 billion, full-year extension of the tax cut. “Our members do not want to just punt and do a two-month, short-term fix where we have to come back and do this again,” Boehner said Monday night. GOP critics of the two-month deal said it would be a half­-measure that would not solve the larger problem of stimulating the economy. One House member who had been a businessman argued that “at minimum” it should have been a 90-day extension to match the quarterly schedule on which many corporations pay taxes. “That’s logic, but again, what I’m learning down here is we don’t use logic,” said freshman Rep. James B. Renacci (R-Ohio). President Obama has made extending the expiring one-year payroll tax holiday his year-end priority, arguing that letting workers keep and spend more of their paychecks would boost the still-sputtering economy. If the tax holiday is not extended, payroll taxes will jump from 4.2 percent to 6.2 percent in January, costing the average family $1,000 next year. The Senate package also includes provisions that would extend jobless benefits for millions of unemployed Americans and avert a cut in reimbursement rates for doctors who treat Medicare patients. Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) said he had no intention of restarting talks with the House. A two-month deal, he said, would provide time for the parties to work out a deal for the entire year. “I will not reopen negotiations until the House follows through and passes this agreement that was negotiated by Republican leaders, and supported by 90 percent of the Senate,” said Reid. House Minority Whip Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) called the eleventh-hour tumult “a partisan convulsion driven by the tea party.” Democrats appeared confident that the chaotic developments would reinforce their argument that Obama’s efforts to improve the economy have been thwarted by Republicans in Congress. There were fresh signs that Obama has gained ground on the tax issue, a traditional political sweet spot for Republicans. In a new Washington Post-ABC News Poll, voters said they trusted Obama to do a better “job handling taxes” than Republicans by a margin of 46 percent to 41 percent — a dramatic swing from two months ago, when voters favored the GOP, 46 percent to 39 percent. House Republicans were equally confident that Americans would blame Democrats — who have spent weeks promising to work through the holidays to settle the issue — if they now shut down talks.

**Partisan bickering about the rate means the counterplan is unpopular**

**Puzzanghera and Hennessey 12** (Jim and Kathleen staff writers for the LA times “Obama proposes cutting the corporate tax rate to 28% from 35%” http://articles.latimes.com/2012/feb/22/business/la-fi-obama-corporate-tax-20120223)

Legislative action on taxes probably will have to wait until after the November elections because the topic is tightly intertwined with key campaign issues, including how best to boost job creation, how to limit the growing size of government and whether large corporations and wealthy individuals are paying their fair share. Highlighting the political stakes, Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney chose Wednesday to release a tax plan of his own, one that calls for slashing individual rates by one-fifth. He already was on record calling for a deeper corporate tax-rate cut, to 25%, which is the same as proposed by a key House Republican. Other Republican presidential candidates want to go further. Rick Santorum is calling for a 17.5% corporate rate, and Newt Gingrich wants it to drop to 12.5%. Engler, as well as Thomas Donohue, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, criticized Obama's plan for not lowering taxes on foreign earnings. Both industry groups want corporate profits abroad to be taxed only by the country in which they are earned. The U.S. now taxes those earnings when they are brought back to the country.

**No agreement about what the tax rate should be--- means it will be politically contentious**

**Kuhnhenn 12** (Jim staff writer for the Huffington post “Obama Administration to Propose cutting corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 28 percent” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/22/barack-obama-proposing-to\_n\_1292939.html)

Romney has also called for a 25 percent corporate tax rate, in line with what some congressional Republicans want. Campaigning in Arizona, the former Massachusetts governor said that if elected president he would propose lowering the top personal income tax rate to 28 percent from the current 35. In Congress, Republican reaction was mixed. House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., said he appreciated the administration's plan, though it set a corporate tax rate that is higher than the 25 percent he has proposed. He faulted Obama, however, for not offering a wholesale overhaul of the tax system for businesses and individuals. "While this is a good step by the administration, I will borrow from the president's own words to Congress from just yesterday: `Don't stop here. Keep going,'" Camp said in a statement. But Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah, the top Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, dismissed the president's plan as a "set of bullet points designed more for the campaign trail than an actual blueprint for fixing our tax code." The issue of taxation has been a recurrent theme throughout Obama's presidency. He has reduced some taxes for small businesses and has pressed Congress to temporarily cut payroll taxes on American workers to help prime the weak economy. But he has also called for reducing the nation's long-term deficits with a mix of tax increases and spending cuts. Republicans have flatly rejected tax increases. And Romney on Wednesday criticized Obama's proposal for corporations, saying they would result in higher taxes. Under the framework proposed by the administration, the rate cuts, closed loopholes and the minimum tax on overseas earning would result in no increase to the deficit. That means that many businesses that slip through loopholes or enjoy subsidies and pay an effective tax rate that is substantially less than the 35 percent corporate tax could end up paying more under Obama's plan. Others, however, would pay less while some would simply benefit from a more simplified system. Obama's plan would result in about $250 billion in additional revenue over the next 10 years. But that money would be used to pay business tax credits that are currently temporary and that Obama would make permanent, administration officials said. Corporate income taxes have been shrinking as a share of overall federal taxes for decades. In 2010, corporate income taxes made up just 12 percent of all federal tax receipts, down from 24 percent in 1960, according to the IRS. Reducing the corporate tax rate to 28 percent would reduce tax revenues by about $700 billion over the next decade, according to an estimate prepared in October by the Joint Committee on Taxation, the official scorekeeper for Congress. That means lawmakers would have to find about $70 billion a year in tax increases to keep the package from adding to the budget deficit, hardly an easy task. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, who presented Obama's plan, acknowledged that the debate "will be politically contentious." "Some will say these proposals are too tough on business, and others will say that they're not tough enough," he said. Indeed, several liberal-leaning groups criticized Obama's plan for being "revenue neutral" and not generating more tax money to pay for government programs. "We can and should collect more tax revenue from corporations," said Bob McIntyre, the director of Citizens for Tax Justice. But the business groups objected to Obama's plan to impose a minimum tax on foreign earnings, insisting instead that the administration embrace a "territorial" system of taxation. The United States taxes U.S.-based multinational corporations on foreign profits, once that money is returned to the United States. In a territorial system, the U.S. would only tax profits made in the U.S. By taxing the foreign profits of U.S.-based multinationals, the U.S. has a worldwide system of taxation. Those foreign profits are not taxed unless they are brought to the United States. And, in many cases, they are simply reinvested overseas, so they are never subjected to U.S. taxes. Administration officials said that under Obama's plan, multinational corporations would continue to receive a tax credit for any taxes they pay overseas. Among critics of his plan were the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the high-tech industry, a group Obama has been eager to court. "The framework would punish successful companies and push investments out of the United States," said Dean Garfield, president and CEO of the Information Technology Industry Council, which represents firms such as Cisco Systems Inc., Google, Apple Inc., and Intel Corp.

# Aff – CP hurts debt

**CP fails – drives up the debt and kills jobs**

**Marr et al in 11** - Director of Federal Tax Policy at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities <Brian. “Repatriation Tax Holiday Would Increase Deficits and Push Investment Overseas” October 12, 2011. http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=3593>

Despite proponents' claims to the contrary, a proposal to enact a second tax holiday for the profits that U.S.-based multinational corporations bring back to the United States from foreign accounts would cost tens of billions of dollars in federal revenue — boosting deficits and debt – while not achieving its proponents' promise of more jobs and higher investment in the United States. Its cost is particularly troubling given the high expectation of failure. In recent days, leading private analysts have raised serious doubts about the proposal. Goldman Sachs concluded that, with a holiday, "we would not expect a significant change in corporate hiring or investment plans." [1] Fitch Ratings added that a holiday would not likely "support growth-oriented investment by U.S. firms."[2] A holiday also would violate the "do-no-harm" rule because it ultimately would encourage corporations to shift investment, profits, and jobs overseas. Proponents, part of a massive lobbying campaign for the tax holiday, are distorting an analysis by the congressional Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) on the proposal's budgetary impact. JCT found that the proposal would boost revenues initially, as companies took advantage of the holiday to repatriate some profits they otherwise would have kept overseas for a number of years. But, JCT explained, the proposal would also reduce revenues by giving companies a large tax break for those profits they would have repatriated anyway in the next few years, even without the holiday, and by giving companies a strong incentive to shift more profits overseas in the future, in anticipation of future tax holidays. JCT found that the net impact of these three different revenue effects would be to reduce revenues by $79 billion over ten years.

# Aff – CP Kills Jobs

**CP fails – shifts jobs overseas**

**Marr et al in 11 -** Director of Federal Tax Policy at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities **<**Brian. “Repatriation Tax Holiday Would Increase Deficits and Push Investment Overseas” October 12, 2011. http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=3593>

Proponents of the tax holiday, by focusing just on the proposal's short-term revenue gain and ignoring the larger revenue losses JCT identified, wrongly claim that the holiday would not increase deficits or indeed may even raise revenues. Some misleadingly argue that companies are willing to repatriate foreign income only under a holiday, so that all of the revenue derived from repatriations during a holiday represents a windfall to the Treasury. This is simply false: corporations have repatriated an average of $129 billion every year since the 2004 holiday (adjusted for inflation). A second tax holiday would also reward and encourage corporate tax avoidance. The evidence indicates that a significant share of the profits that multinational corporations book in low-tax foreign jurisdictions is, in economic terms, attributable to domestic economic activity — that these "overseas profits" were, through complicated accounting maneuvers, shifted overseas on paper specifically to avoid U.S. corporate taxes. A valuable new report[3]from the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations shows that, during the first repatriation holiday in 2004, seven of the nineteen surveyed corporations received over 90 percent of their repatriations from tax haven countries. A second holiday for repatriated profits would enable firms that have avoided U.S. taxes in this way to bring sheltered earnings back at a greatly reduced tax rate — encouraging them and other firms to shift more income earned from investments in the United States and other non-low-tax countries to offshore tax havens. The mistaken belief that a tax holiday would generate a net increase in federal revenues has sparked proposals to pair it with investments in other priorities, most notably an infrastructure bank. While the United States badly needs infrastructure improvements, a repatriation tax holiday cannot finance such a bank — or anything else — for the simple reason that it costs money rather than raises it. Policymakers would have to cut other priorities, potentially including infrastructure funding itself, to pay for this revenue loss. At a time when policymakers are focusing on reducing long-term deficits and scaling back tax loopholes — and when both the economy and the job market remain weak — it would be irresponsible to enact a tax holiday that increases deficits, rewards corporate tax avoidance, and ultimately shifts jobs and investments overseas. Lobbying Campaign Misrepresents Joint Tax Committee Analysis JCT, Congress' official scorekeeper on tax matters, recently analyzed the potential effects of a repatriation tax holiday on tax receipts and the economy.[4] The analysis drew on information from companies' current financial positions and recent behavior as well as extensive evidence from the 2004 American Jobs Creation Act, which established a one-year holiday similar to a number of the current proposals. JCT found that a second repatriation holiday would have three separate effects on revenues, compared to what would happen in absence of a holiday: It would encourage corporations to repatriate foreign earnings that they would otherwise have kept overseas over at least the medium term. This would increase revenues in the short term. It would give companies a large tax break for other foreign earnings that they would have repatriated even without a holiday. This would decrease revenues. It would increase incentives for companies to shift jobs, profits, and investments overseas in anticipation of future holidays. This, too, would decrease revenues. The combined effect of these three factors is that a holiday would raise revenues initially but would cost the Treasury considerably more in later years — for a ten-year net revenue loss of $79 billion (see Figure 1).

# ---Restoring Americas Future

# Note - What the CP does

**FYI - What the CP does**

**Minarik et al 10** - Senior VP and Director of Research, Comm. for Economic Development Former Associate Director for Economic Policy, OMB Former Chief Economist, House Budget Committee <Dr. Joseph Minarik. “Restoring America’s Future Executive Summary” Debt Reduction. November 2010.

1. Revive the Economy and Create Jobs • Enact a “payroll tax holiday” for one year (2011) – excusing employers and employees from paying the 12.4 percent tax into the Social Security Trust Funds. • Under Congressional Budget Office (CBO) assumptions, this will create between 2.5 and 7 million new jobs. • The tax holiday will not impact the solvency of the Trust Funds, which will be reimbursed in full from general revenues at the same time that they would have received payments in the absence of the holiday. 2. Reduce and Stabilize the Debt • By 2020, reduce and stabilize the federal debt below 60 percent of GDP, an internationally recognized standard for fiscal stability, and reduce annual budget deficits to manageable levels. • The plan will balance the primary budget (the budget other than interest) by 2014. • On a “unified budget basis,” which includes interest, the plan will ensure that future budget deficits are small and manageable. But, above all, it will ensure a strong economy for future generations of Americans. • Reduce federal spending from a projected 26 percent of GDP to 23 percent by 2020, with revenues at 21.4 percent. • These fiscal changes will enable the Federal Reserve to hold interest rates down longer in order to strengthen the economic recovery. 3. Create a Simple, Pro-growth Tax System• Cut tax rates; broaden the tax base; boost incentives to work, save, and invest; and ensure, by 2018, that nearly 90 million households (about half of potential tax filers) no longer have to file tax returns. Cut individual income tax rates and establish just two rates – 15 and 27 percent – replacing the current six rates that go up to 35 percent. 16 **|** P a g e Cut the top corporate tax rate to 27 percent from its current 35 percent, making the United States a more attractive place to invest. Eliminate most deductions and credits and simplify those that remain while making them better targeted and more effective. Replace the deductions for mortgage interest and charitable contributions with 15 percent refundable credits that anyone who owns a home or gives to charity can claim. Restructure provisions that benefit low-income taxpayers and families with children by making them simpler, more progressive, and enabling most recipients to receive them without filing tax returns. • Establish a new 6.5 percent national Debt Reduction Sales Tax (DRST) that – along with the spending cuts outlined in this plan – will reduce the debt and secure America’s economic future. • These reforms, taken together, will make the tax system more progressive. **4**. Restrain Rising Healthcare Costs(Savings through 2020: $756 billion, excluding interest) • Incentivize employers and employees to select more cost-effective health plans: Cap the exclusion of employer-provided health benefits in 2018, and then phase it out over ten years. • Control Medicare costs in the short term: Gradually raise Medicare Part B premiums from 25 to 35 percent of total program costs (over five years). Use Medicare’s buying power to increase rebates from pharmaceutical companies. Modernize Medicare’s benefits package, including the copayment structure. Bundle Medicare’s payments for post-acute care to reduce costs.

# 1NC Shell

**CP Text: The United States federal government should implement the Restoring America’s Future plan.**

**OR**

**CP Text: The United States federal government should**

* **Suspend Social Security payroll taxes for one year,**
* **Extend efforts to balance the primary budget by 2014,**
* **Freeze domestic and defense discretionary spending,**
* **Cut spending in farm and government retirement programs, and**
* **Create a simple, pro-growth tax system that broadens the base and reduces rates.**

**The “Restoring America’s Future” plan is bipartisan and solves the economy**

**Minarik et al 10** - Senior VP and Director of Research, Comm. for Economic Development Former Associate Director for Economic Policy, OMB Former Chief Economist, House Budget Committee <Dr. Joseph Minarik. “Restoring America’s Future Executive Summary” Debt Reduction. November 2010.

We offer this plan as proof that a group of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents can work together to create a balanced package of spending cuts and revenue increases that solves the debt crisis. Other groups might prefer other combinations of policies to reach the same ends. We created this plan to show that it can be done – and thereby encourage others from both political parties to bring their ideas to a constructive, respectful, and ultimately successful dialogue. Overview America is the strongest, most prosperous, and most resilient nation in history. However, America’s leadership and greatness, our strength and prosperity, are not guaranteed. We face two huge challenges simultaneously. First, we must recover from the deep recession that has thrown millions out of work, slashed home values and closed businesses across the country. Second, we must take immediate steps to reduce the unsustainable debt that will be driven by the aging of the population, the rapid growth of healthcare costs, exploding interest costs, and the failure of policymakers to limit and prioritize spending. These two challenges must be addressed at the same time, not sequentially. We need immediate action to sustain the recovery and create jobs, but we cannot delay putting in place measures that will restrain the buildup of debt. If we do not control the debt, the recovery will not be sustainable. With current policies in place, even when we recover from the recession, the debt will grow far larger than the economy itself, forcing the nation to borrow enormous and unprecedented sums of money, increasing our dependence on China and other foreign lenders, diminishing our living standards, raising risks of an economic crisis, and reducing America to a second-rate power. At stake are both our economic security and our national security. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warns that threats to our economy are “real and growing” and that our path is “unsustainable” because, at some point, our creditors will refuse to lend to us. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Mike Mullen calls the debt “the single biggest threat to our national security.” That’s why we face a fundamental choice: We can close our eyes, keep avoiding the problem, and generate more debt that will threaten our economy, mortgage our children’s future, and diminish our leadership around the world. To arrive at consensus on a plan of this size and complexity, each of the Task Force members made significant compromises. Not every member agrees with every element of this plan. But, each member agrees on the urgency of economic recovery and stabilizing the debt and believes that, as a whole, this plan offers a balanced, effective, and reasonable approach to the twin challenges at hand. Perhaps most importantly, the plan demonstrates that at this time of political uncertainty, a bipartisan group can craft a comprehensive and viable blueprint to tackle the nation’s most serious economic challenges. 8 | P a g e Or, we can choose a new course – one that can revive our economy, create new and better jobs, restore our financial independence, and ensure that America remains the world’s preeminent economic, military, and political power. This report, “Restoring America’s Future,” is a plan for that new course that we believe will meet both the short- and the longer-run challenges simultaneously. It was developed by the Bipartisan Policy Center’s Debt Reduction Task Force, which is chaired by former Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete V. Domenici and former White House Budget Director Alice M. Rivlin and includes 19 leading citizens from across America. The Task Force members are former White House and Cabinet officials, former Members of Congress, former governors and mayors, business and labor leaders, economists and budget experts. They are Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. They are Americans from across the country, with widely diverse views about public policy and the role of government. By 2020, the plan will reduce and stabilize the national debt below 60 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) – an internationally recognized standard – and ensure that the debt stops growing faster than our economy. The plan will balance the “primary budget,” the budget other than interest payments, by 2014. On a “unified budget basis,” i.e., including interest, the plan will ensure that future budget deficits are small and manageable. But, above all, it will ensure a strong economy for future generations of Americans. The Task Force approached its task as both a challenge and an opportunity, and recommends significant and sorely needed changes to both taxes and spending. On the spending side, this plan fixes Social Security, which is on an unsustainable path, reins in rising healthcare costs, and freezes both defense and domestic discretionary spending. On the tax side, this plan dramatically simplifies taxes by eliminating years of tax breaks – allowing major tax rate reductions, while raising additional revenues to reduce the debt. Lower corporate rates will make America more competitive, and lower individual rates with a simplified tax system will give taxpayers renewed confidence that our system is fair and understandable. A Debt Reduction Sales Tax (DRST), along with the plan’s spending cuts, will reduce our debt. Reviving the economy and creating up to 7 million new jobs Currently, millions of Americans cannot find jobs or are underemployed. At the same time, we face the long-term problem of soaring deficits and debt. Some politicians and economists present a false choice: reduce unemployment or stabilize the debt. Restoring America’s future, however, requires that we do both – and begin now. The key to both reducing unemployment and stabilizing the debt begins with a strong economy that reignites demand for goods and services and encourages businesses to invest and create jobs. This bipartisan plan calls for (in 2011) – called a “payroll tax holiday” – which will immediately add money to employee paychecks while incentivizing companies to hire new workers. This tax cut of nearly $650 billion will provide a big shot in the arm to revive our economy and create jobs. Restoring America’s Future will: • Revive the economy and create 2.5 to 7 million new jobs over two years with a payroll tax holiday. • Balance the primary budget in 2014, reduce deficits including interest to small and manageable levels, and stabilize the debt below 60 percent of GDP by 2020. • Create a simple, pro-growth tax system that broadens the base, reduces rates, makes America more competitive, and raises revenue to reduce the debt. • Reduce the unsustainable rate of growth in healthcare costs. • Strengthen Social Security to ensure that it will pay benefits for 75 years and beyond, while not increasing the retirement age and protecting the most vulnerable elderly. • Freeze domestic and defense discretionary spending. • Cut other spending, including farm and government retirement programs.

# 2NC Solvency - Econ

**Current federal budgeting is insufficient – CP key to solve**

**Minarik et al 10** - Senior VP and Director of Research, Comm. for Economic Development Former Associate Director for Economic Policy, OMB Former Chief Economist, House Budget Committee <Dr. Joseph Minarik. “Restoring America’s Future Executive Summary” Debt Reduction. November 2010.

Our growing debt and the risks of inaction At the same time, we must restore optimism about the economy’s future in order to boost investment. A comprehensive debt-reduction package will assure investors worldwide that America is back on track, with a solid plan and a stable economic future. Without action, growing deficits and debt will create serious problems for our economy, our prosperity, and our leadership role in the world. First, the higher the debt, the more interest we have to pay. At the moment, interest rates are at historically low levels because of our weak economy and because the fiscal problems of other countries leave investors around te world few attractive alternatives to U.S. Treasury securities. But as our economy recovers and other nations address their problems, interest rates will return to higher levels, which will increase interest costs on our debt significantly. In 2020, the federal government will pay $1 trillion – 17 percent of all federal spending – just for interest payments. Viewed another way, the federal government will have to allocate about half of all income tax receipts to pay interest, and interest payments will exceed the size of the defense budget. Moreover, by 2025, federal revenues will be completely consumed by the combination of interest payments, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. The Treasury will have to borrow money to finance all of its other obligations – including defense, homeland security, law enforcement, food and drug inspection and other vital operations. These projections are based on fairly moderate assumptions about future interest rates. The nation’s outlook will grow far more ominous if America’s creditors lose confidence in the federal government’s commitment to address its debt problem – which will increase interest rates. A loss of confidence in the markets could also send the value of the dollar plunging overseas, which could trigger runaway inflation and still higher interest rates. Rising debt and rising interest costs could evolve into a “death spiral,” with the two feeding off one another in an ever-more vicious cycle. No one knows when such a catastrophe might occur, but no prudent nation would put itself at such risk. Even without a crisis, rising debt will increase our reliance on foreign lenders, raising a host of other economic and national security issues. Already, more than half of U.S. federal debt is foreign-owned and China is the largest foreign holder. Rising deficits and debt will weaken the nation in other serious ways as well. Federal deficits soak up private savings that would otherwise be available for investment in factories, equipment, and jobs. At some point, without a change in policy, the federal government’s out-of-control borrowing will have to stop. The only question is whether policymakers address the debt problem now in a deliberative and thoughtful manner – or whether they will be forced to do so by a sudden economic crisis. No easy answers Most Americans would be reluctant to cut several key categories of federal spending. In fiscal year (FY) 2010: • Medicare and Medicaid consumed 21 percent of federal spending; • Social Security consumed 20 percent; • Defense consumed 20 percent; • Other mandatory spending (for example, veterans’ compensation, unemployment insurance, and food stamps) consumed 17 percent; and 13 | P a g e • Interest on the debt consumed 6 percent. • That leaves only 16 percent for everything else – veterans’ health care, homeland security and law enforcement, education and student aid, roads and bridges, food and drug inspection, energy and the environment, and so on. Clearly, there are no easy answers to the debt crisis. Policymakers cannot solve the debt crisis simply by eliminating congressional earmarks (less than one percent of the discretionary budget) or foreign aid, which is less than one percent of the total budget. Nor can policymakers significantly reduce the debt by eliminating “waste, fraud, and abuse,” although they surely should undertake efforts to eliminate as much waste, fraud, and abuse as possible. Nor can policymakers realistically solve the problem simply by cutting domestic discretionary spending. Stabilizing the debt by 2020 through domestic discretionary cuts alone would require eliminating nearly all such spending – everything from law enforcement and border security to education and food and drug inspection. Nor can policymakers rely on hopes of a strong economy to “grow our way out of the deficit.” Just to stabilize the debt at 60 percent of GDP, the economy would have to grow at a sustained rate of more than 6 percent per year for at least the next ten years. The economy has never grown by more than 4.4 percent in any decade since World War II. Nor can policymakers solve the problem simply by raising taxes on wealthy Americans. Reducing deficits to manageable levels by the end of the decade though tax increases on the most well-to-do Medicare & Medicaid21% Social Security20% Defense Spending20% Other Mandatory Spending17% Interest on the Debt6% Everything Else16% 14 | P a g e Americans would require raising the top two bracket rates to 86 percent and 91 percent (from the current 33- and 35-percent rates). There are no easy answers, no quick fixes. Following is a bipartisan, fair and reasonable plan that calls for reforms to every part of the budget and the participation of all Americans to restore America’s future for our children and grandchildren.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**CP is bipartisan**

**Minarik et al 10** - Senior VP and Director of Research, Comm. for Economic Development Former Associate Director for Economic Policy, OMB Former Chief Economist, House Budget Committee <Dr. Joseph Minarik. “Restoring America’s Future Executive Summary” Debt Reduction. November 2010.

We believe that America is facing two huge challenges that can only be surmounted if both political parties work together: recovery from the recession and restraining the soaring federal debt. We also believe that these two challenges must be addressed simultaneously. Strong action to curb the mounting debt will reinforce the recovery, not impede it. The federal budget is on a dangerous, unsustainable path. Even after the economy recovers from this deep recession, federal spending is projected to rise substantially faster than revenues and the government will be forced to borrow ever-increasing amounts. Federal debt will rise to unmanageable levels, which will push interest rates up, endanger our prosperity, and make us increasingly vulnerable to the dictates of our creditors, including nations whose interests may differ from ours. This alarming prospect was created by the actions of both political parties over many years, with strong public approval. Promises to provide benefits and services through Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and many other spending programs, as well as reductions in taxes, were extremely popular and both parties took credit for them. But now, with an aging population and increasingly expensive health care, federal spending will rise much faster than revenues if those popular policies are not changed. However, the actions needed to reduce the growth of national debt and bring deficits back to manageable levels are all unpopular. Neither party can take the required actions alone without suffering adverse political consequences. The only hope is for the two parties to come together around a bipartisan plan – which liberals, moderates, and conservatives alike see as fair – and work together to make it a reality. On January 25, 2010, the Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) – founded by former Senate Majority Leaders Howard Baker (R-TN), Tom Daschle (D-SD), Bob Dole (R-KS), and George Mitchell (D-ME) – launched a Debt Reduction Task Force to develop a long-term plan to reduce the debt and place our nation on a sustainable fiscal path. The BPC asked us to co-chair the Task Force and we were honored to accept. The two of us share strong beliefs that America must learn to live within its means, that the current budget path endangers the future of our country, and that bipartisan action is urgently needed. Each of us played a significant role in the successful bipartisan efforts that brought the federal budget into surplus for four years in a row starting in the late 1990s and reduced the debt held by the public. Senator Domenici was a leader in bipartisan negotiations that crafted the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Alice Rivlin was part of the Clinton Administration’s effort, working first with a Democrat-led and then a Republican-led Congress that achieved those surpluses. We know from personal experience that bipartisan budget agreements are extremely difficult to create – neither side gets what it wants – but they are possible. The budget outlook is even more threatening today than it was then, but we have faith that our political leaders will see the urgency of working together to take the difficult actions that will restore America to economic health and constructive world leadership. Our Task Force – 19 Americans from across the country, with diverse backgrounds and views – has examined a broad range of spending and revenue options for the federal government. Today we are releasing our plan, “Restoring America’s Future.” We believe that it provides a comprehensive, viable path to restore our economy and build a stronger America for future generations and for those around the world who look to the United States for leadership and hope.

# \*\*\*Natural Disasters

# ---FEMA CP

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan text: The United States Federal Government should ensure that there will be federal reimbursements when a disaster is predicted.**

**That ensures prepositioned resources and solves disaster relief**

**Mener 7** (Andrew professor at the university of pnnsylvania “Disaster Response in the United States of America: An analysisis of the Bureaucratic and Political History of a failing system” http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1068&context=curej)JC

In particular, FEMA did not have the administrative capacity nor the authority within the federal bureaucracy to effectively coordinate the implementation of the National Response Plan. Just as it had been in the past, strong presidential leadership was necessary to promote the needed interagency cooperation. Additionally, although FEMA did preposition supplies and personnel for Hurricane Katrina, this was not explicitly authorized by the Stafford Act before an official disaster declaration. Furthermore, although FEMA prepositioned supplies, other federal, state, and local agencies may not have prepositioned supplies since federal reimbursements are not guaranteed until an official disaster declaration is issued. For that reason, it is widely held that this law ought to be revised to ensure that appropriate resources are prepositioned when a disaster is predicted. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, there was no adequate system in place during Hurricane Katrina to provide rapid and accurate damage assessment. For that reason, key decision makers were forced to proceed without critical information. In the National Response Plan, state and local authorities are charged with providing these assessments. However, there is no adequate provision to obtain this information when state and local resources are completely overwhelmed as was the case during Hurricane Katrina.

# ---STATIM CP

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should invest in and deploy the STATIM Shelter.**

**That solves natural disasters**

**PR Newswire 12** (premier global provider of multimedia platforms that enable marketers to key audiences “Tsunami Shelter Developer, Brahman Industries, Announces Collaboration with Martinez Marine Design and Creative Systems” <http://www.bizjournals.com/prnewswire/press_releases/2012/03/08/MM66718>)

ST. THOMAS, U.S. Virgin Islands, March 8, 2012 /PRNewswire/ -- Brahman Industries, LLC, developer of an innovative tsunami and flood shelter system that promises to revolutionize how governments and communities address these natural threats, announces collaboration with Martinez Marine Design, Inc and Creative Systems, Inc. Through this collaboration Brahman aims to refine and validate the STATIM shelter's design and capabilities as a floating structure, looking forward to production and testing of the initial full scale prototypes. The STATIM (acronym for Storm, Tornado And Tsunami Interconnected Modules) Shelter consists of an enclosable hull comprised of a series of precast, lightweight concrete modules, similar to large diameter concrete pipes. Once assembled, it provides a water-tight environment with buoyancy and self-righting capability. Inside, the shelters are equipped with secure seating for occupants, ventilation, and options of survival supplies capable of sustaining the occupants during and after a disaster. It is the equivalent of an "inland life boat." This cost-effective technology, capable of being produced in mass, has been issued a U.S. patent, with 14 international patents pending. "There are thousands of islands, communities and coastal resorts around the world where topography, proximity faults, remoteness, or lack of vertical evacuation alternatives make them extremely vulnerable to the devastation of tsunamis and floods," explained Miguel Serrano, CEO of Brahman. "The STATIM Shelter is a straightforward approach which already represents a major breakthrough in natural disaster preparedness."

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**Only the counterplan solves disaster relief**

**Gupta 11** (Sujata staff writer for NewScientist “Building Shelters that can withstand a tsuanami” http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn20253-tsunami-survival-emergency-shelters-needed.html)

Building towers and berms - artificial embankments - that can provide high ground for residents of low-lying areas is difficult and expensive. Brahman Developments of San Juan, Puerto Rico, has proposed an innovative and affordable alternative: a submarine-shaped reinforced concrete structure that would literally ride the waves, keeping up to 80 people safe inside. Known as the *STATIM Shelter System*, the tubular structures would be tethered, but could float freely. They are designed to survive temporary submersion and to be self-righting. Built from reinforced concrete, they should also be sturdy enough to survive being battered with debris in a major tsunami. It's like "an inland lifeboat", says inventor Miguel Serrano of Brahman. "It's not a fun ride, but you would survive." The company projects that each shelter would cost about $100,000 and could be equipped with communications systems, GPS and enough food and water for inhabitants to survive for up to a week without aid. They could be deployed every few blocks in densely populated areas. That's an appealing prospect, given that many of those who perished in Japan were elderly people who lacked the mobility to flee to higher ground. Japan already has some permanent structures designed as tsunami escape havens. Nishiki Tower in Mie prefecture, for instance, is five storeys tall and doubles as a public toilet, museum and storage space. While more such structures are needed, Japan is well ahead of the rest of the world. In the US's Pacific northwest, for instance, city leaders are just starting to plan for a tsunami that could be generated by a rupture of the Cascadia fault - which threatens an earthquake of magnitude 9.0 or greater. Cannon Beach, Oregon, has an ageing city hall that it hopes to tear down and rebuild as a [state-of-the-art tsunami refuge](http://www.ci.cannon-beach.or.us/community/teb.html). The building would have sea walls to the front and rear, says Yumei Wang, a geotechnical engineer for the state, and sit upon concrete pillars reinforced with tension steel cables. These would allow water and debris from a tsunami to pass underneath while local residents take refuge on the upper floor and roof. Long Beach, Washington, meanwhile, is considering [building a berm](https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/34dfc1850d83600a5663cb56889f906b6b0135f1c4fca115ccf6cd61f511502e?inline=1) next to the town's elementary school. It would normally provide a grassy slope for spectators to watch school sports, but provide shelter for up to 1000 people should a tsunami strike

# Natural Disasters

# ---AmeriCorps

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan Text: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase funding for AmeriCorps**

**That solves natural disasters**

**Warfield 12** (Samantha Jo, department of the chief executive officer-immediate office strategic coordinator “More AmeriCorps Members Deploy in Response to Midwest Tornadoes” http://www.americorps.gov/about/newsroom/releases\_detail.asp?tbl\_pr\_id=2080)

Washington D.C. – Additional AmeriCorps members have deployed to provide disaster relief in the areas of five states that saw significant destruction during the recent storms. An AmeriCorps NCCC team of 12 members began work in West Liberty, KY, after traveling to the area from the campus in Vicksburg, MS over the weekend. Three AmeriCorps VISTAs have opened a Volunteer Reception Center (VRC) in the same city and seven additional VISTAs are supporting a state-run call center in Frankfort, KY on a rotating basis. Kentucky saw considerable damage, as it was struck by tornadoes and serve storms on both February 29 and March 2. Areas of the state received an official federal disaster declaration on March 6 and Robert Velasco, II, Acting CEO for the Corporation for National and Community Service called Kentucky Gov. Steve Beshear to brief him on the national service response. A 10-member AmeriCorps NCCC team based out of the Denver campus has deployed to Missouri to contribute to relief efforts in Branson and Kimberling City. They arrived on Saturday March 3 and immediately started work coordinating volunteers in the field, removing debris, and conducting assessments on the needs of affected homeowners. The AmeriCorps NCCC members joined the AmeriCorps St. Louis Emergency Response Team, which arrived in Taney and Stone counties less than 24 hours after the storms hit and established two Volunteer Reception Centers (VRCs) in Branson and Kimberling City. “It is an honor to work alongside AmeriCorps St. Louis to serve the people of Missouri,” said Nick Connolly, Team Leader with AmeriCorps NCCC Sun 3 Team. “Through volunteers, robust disaster relief and recovery efforts are able to help those affected get back on their feet.” To date, the AmeriCorps St. Louis Emergency Response Team has registered more than 550 volunteers to assist with disaster relief efforts, and more than 30 affected homeowners have received assistance with debris removal, tarping, and other services. In Indiana, ten Senior Corps members with the Interfaith Council Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) of New Albany are administering a VRC in Clark County, home of the seriously damaged communities of Henryville, Marysville, and Borden. This week, ten AmeriCorps members with Lutheran Social Services of Illinois will partner with the 1st Baptist Church of Harrisburg and Williamson County Emergency Management to assist with clean-up and supply distribution. Four members with the AmeriCorps Red Cross AmeriCorps program are currently stationed in Cincinnati, OH to assist the American Red Cross with client intake, casework, and sheltering. Last week, AmeriCorps members met with senior leaders from the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), the agency which oversees AmeriCorps programs. Kelly DeGraff, Senior Advisor for Disaster Services, and Idara Nickelson, Chief of Programs Operations, toured Branson and Kimberling City to survey national service efforts in response to the Leap Day tornadoes and spoke with stakeholders on additional opportunities for AmeriCorps members to help affected communities. In the coming weeks, DeGraff will travel to Kentucky to survey the disaster response work of AmeriCorps programs and speak with those involved. “The work being done by AmeriCorps in Missouri and others states speaks to the critical role that national service plays in disaster relief efforts,” said DeGraff. “Affected communities can count on AmeriCorps to get things done.”

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**NCCC is key to protection against natural disasters**

**STATES NEWS SERVICE 4-4-2006** ( “Mikulski Calls for Restoration of President’s Massive AmeriCorps Cut” <http://www.mikulski.senate.gov/media/record.cfm?id=253416>)

The NCCC is a full-time residential program for 18 to 24 year olds designed to strengthen communities and develop leaders through team-based service projects. Each year, approximately 1,100 participants reside in its five campuses nationwide. The Perry Point campus houses 200 **AmeriCorps** members every year, and since 1994 its residents have logged more than 350,000 service hours.

NCCC teams are well trained and deployed throughout the country to build homes, clear thousands of acres of burned trees created by wildfires, and tutor children. Most recently, they have provided more than 250,000 service hours valued at $3.8 million to projects in the Gulf Coast region, which reflects their critical service during **every American natural disaster since the program started**.

**AmeriCorps are critical in responding to Natural Disasters**

**STATES NEWS SERVICE 2006** FROM THE OFFICE OF MD SENATOR MIKULSKI

Senator Barbara A. Mikulski (D-Md.) has joined several of her Senate colleagues to urge Subcomittee on Labor, HHS, Education and Related Agencies Chairman Senator Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) and Ranking Member Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) to restore an essential AmeriCorps program that President Bush cut in his FY 2007 budget proposal. The President's budget would eliminate the National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) and close its five campuses, including one in Perry Point, Md.

AmeriCorps volunteers tutor teens, start neighborhood crime watches, turn vacant lots into neighborhoods and help communities clean up and rebuild after natural disasters**.** These volunteers are needed now more than ever, said Senator Mikulski. As a founder of AmeriCorps, I have been its chief advocate in the Senate. I fought to create AmeriCorps, I fought to strengthen AmeriCorps, and I will fight to save AmeriCorps.

The NCCC is a full-time residential program for 18 to 24 year olds designed to strengthen communities and develop leaders through team-based service projects. Each year, approximately 1,100 participants reside in its five campuses nationwide. The Perry Point campus houses 200 AmeriCorps members every year, and since 1994 its residents have logged more than 350,000 service hours.

Teams are well trained and deployed throughout the country to build homes, clear thousands of acres of burned trees created by wildfires, and tutor children. Most recently, they have provided more than 250,000 service hours valued at $3.8 million to projects in the Gulf Coast region, which reflects their critical service during every American natural disaster since the program started.

**AmeriCorps solve natural disaster relief**

**MCCAIN 2001 – “**PUTTING THE ‘NATIONAL’ IN NATIONAL SERVICE” WASHINGTON MONTHLY OCTOBER 2001

Another example is AmeriCorps' National Civilian Community Corps, a service program consciously structured along military lines. NCCC members not only wear uniforms and work in teams, as City Year members do, but actually live together in barracks on former military bases, and are deployed to service projects far from their home base. This "24/7" experience fosters group cohesion and a sense of mission. AmeriCorps' NCCC members know they are part of a national effort to serve their country. The communities they serve know that, too. In April of last year, when the Mississippi's flood waters threatened the town of Camanche, Iowa, an AmeriCorps NCCC team was brought in to coordinate volunteers and help plug leaks in the town's levee. "This AmeriCorps crew has probably single-handedly saved $1 million to $1.5 million worth of property damage since they've been here," Camanche Public Works Director Dave Rickertsen told the St. Louis Post Dispatch. NCCC teams also helped out last year after floods in Ohio and Florida, a hurricane in North Carolina, and forest fires in six western states, providing disaster relief to an estimated 33,500 people. This year they've been dispatched to help combat nine floods and dozens of forest fires. When not providing disaster relief, NCCC teams often work in national parks, clearing overgrown trails and rebuilding cabins. In the spring, they help Habitat for Humanity run its Collegiate Challenge, a program that convinces thousands of college students each year to spend their spring breaks not in bars in Ft. Lauderdale but building homes for low-income families. In May of last year, one NCCC crew descended on the home of Stella Knab, an 80-year-old former cleaning lady, now confined to a wheelchair. Knab lived with her handicapped son in New Orleans' Bywater district, in a decrepit house with cracked plumbing and rotted wood floors with holes big enough for neighborhood rats to pay visits. The NCCC team moved Knab and her son into a motel for two weeks, and in partnership with a local nonprofit group, the Preservation Resource Center, completely gutted and rebuilt the interior of her house. "It was pretty scary. I really can't imagine someone living like this," Paula Dora, 23, one the AmeriCorps members, told The New Orleans Times-Picayune. "It felt more like the Third World than it did the ŒLand of the Free.' It feels so good to be able to make such a difference." Only about 1,000 of AmeriCorps' 50,000 members are a part of NCCC. City Year accounts for another 1,200. Congress should expand these two programs dramatically, and spread their group-cohesion techniques to other AmeriCorps programs. Indeed, the whole national service enterprise should be expanded, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that every young person who wants to serve can serve. Though this will require significantly more funding, the benefits to our nation will be well worth the investment. At the same time, we must encourage the corporate sector and the philanthropic community to provide funding for national service, with federal challenge grants and other incentives.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**AmeriCorps has bipartisan support**

**Waldman 9** (Steven staff writer at the wall street journal “The Real Sotry of How AmeriCorps Became Bipartisan” http://blogs.wsj.com/capitaljournal/2009/03/27/the-real-story-of-how-americorps-became-bipartisan/)

On my wall I have a copy of an old fashioned Senate roll call sheet – the handwritten tally from the clerk recording the passage of the original law creating AmeriCorps in 1993. There were hash marks next to just seven Republicans. Yesterday the Senate approved a bill authorizing a tripling of AmeriCorps. It passed 79-19 – with 21 Republican votes. That’s right, more Republicans voted for the measure than against it. In 1993 those Republicans who did support it were mostly moderates. This time supporters included conservatives like **Roger Wicker** and **Thad Cochran** of Mississippi, **Michael Enzi** of Wyoming and **John McCain** of Arizona. I’m thrilled. It’s a great bill that will do more for the country than many things the Congress has done in years. Having been (unfairly) criticized for his failure to engender bipartisanship in other areas, Obama may (unfairly) get credit for creating it in this case. He does deserve some credit. He used his quasi State of the Union address to urge Congress to act – and then Congress did in record speed. More important, the White House made a shrewd decision to piggyback onto an existing (very bipartisan) legislative process rather than writing a brand new bill. Early in 2008 Senator **Edward Kennedy** began talking to his good friend **Orrin Hatch**, the conservative Senator from Utah, about collaborating on legislation promoting service. Hatch had voted against the original service bill in 1993 and was skeptical about big government anything. Yet they came to agreement, in part proving how personal relationships still matter in politics. It’s not that Hatch agreed to this because he likes Kennedy; it’s that he agreed to take months looking for common ground, because he likes Kennedy. (In honor of the ailing Kennedy, they renamed the act after him). But ultimately, the reasons AmeriCorps became bipartisan go much deeper than one relationship. A half million people have served through AmeriCorps now – a voting constituency – and every member of Congress has shaken their hands and heard their stories of how they’ve worked in schools, nursing homes, crime-ridden neighborhoods to help communities. More important, lawmakers have met with the heads of the local non profit groups that run the AmeriCorps programs, often popular and influential leaders in any congressional district. Advocates for AmeriCorps now include not just national service fetishists like myself (wrote a book on the subject) but the entire non-profit and charitable sector. AmeriCorps members, you see, don’t work for the government. The feds offer the money for a small stipend and scholarship but most of the corps members are recruited and managed by non-profits. For charities, AmeriCorps has become a valuable form of in kind subsidy. Indeed, it’s often a way to increase a charity’s ability to use unpaid volunteers – a key reason it’s won over hardcore conservative like Hatch. “National service programs [have] a multiplying effect,” he declared during the debate. Based on past patterns, the 250,000 AmeriCorps members will help recruit or manage seven million unpaid volunteers. “This is a conservative program in many respects,” Hatch said. Some of the seeds of AmeriCorps’s ultimate political success were sewed in the original legislation. Money is distributed through state commissions, appointed by the governors, to local non profit programs. This has created substantive problems. It’s very hard for the federal government to maintain quality around the country, and there’s no sense of one big national service effort the way there was for the CCC or the Peace Corps. But the structure gave Republican governors (and their allies in DC) a stake in the program.

**Key leaders support AmeriCorps**

**Shmitz 12** (Paul CEO of Public Allies “Leave no young adult behind” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/paul-schmitz/leave-no-young-adult-behind\_b\_1578716.html)

There is one recommendation that I especially believe the President and Congress should act on immediately. Sixty-nine percent of these young people want to make a difference improving the lives of others and few are connected to volunteer opportunities where they can give back. The bi-partisan Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act that passed in 2009 can put these young people to good work. The bill was supported by over three-quarters of Congress with many prominent Republican co-sponsors. Mitt Romney, while Governor of Massachusetts, led his fellow governors in supporting AmeriCorps funding at the federal level. National service programs help young people gain skills, experience, and become better citizens while they help strengthen our schools, health centers, and neighborhoods that need all the help they can get. During the 2008 Presidential campaign, Senators John McCain and Barack Obama came together and agreed on this which resulted in the 2009 act. Our nation would be heartened amid all the partisan rancor if this year's candidates could come together again on something they agree on that is good for our communities and our economy.

**NCCC has continued bipartisan support**

**Etienee 10** (Ashley and AmeriCorps spokeswoman “National Service Board Elects Bipartisan Leaders” http://www.americorps.gov/about/newsroom/releases\_detail.asp?tbl\_pr\_id=1740)

The Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service has elected Mark Gearan to serve as Chair and Eric Tanenblatt to serve as Vice Chair, continuing a tradition of bipartisanship that has been a hallmark of the board since its creation. The bipartisan leadership team has extensive experience in the service movement, both having worked at the Peace Corps and served on the Corporation’s board. They bring a keen understanding of the American political process, having served in senior government positions under four Presidents. “Mark and Eric are bipartisan leaders with decades of high-level experience who will continue to provide critical insight as we increase the impact of service in tackling our most pressing problems,” said Corporation CEO Patrick Corvington, who made the announcements at today’s spring board meeting, his first since taking office. Tanenblatt assumed his duties immediately, and Gearan will become Chair on June 1, replacing Stephen Goldsmith, who was recently named Deputy Mayor of New York City. Goldsmith, former Mayor of Indianapolis and a top adviser to President George W. Bush, served as board chair for most of the past nine years, overseeing significant management reforms, the strengthening of programs, and an increase in bipartisan support. Goldsmith will leave the board at the end of the month. The board sets overall policy and direction for the Corporation and its programs. The Corporation is the nation’s largest grant maker for volunteering and service, engaging more than five million Americans of all ages and backgrounds in service each year through its Senior Corps, AmeriCorps, and Learn and Serve America programs, and leading the President’s United We Serve initiative. Gearan, President of Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, New York, was first appointed to the board by President Clinton in 2000, was reappointed by President Bush in 2004, and began serving his current term in 2007. “I’m excited to take on this role at a time of growing need and momentum for service in America,” said Gearan. “I want to thank Stephen Goldsmith for his decade of leadership that strengthened our agency and programs. With the leadership of President Obama, the bipartisan support of Congress, and a renewed ethic of service across the country, we are entering an exciting era of innovation, expansion, and impact for service.”

# Aff – Links to Ptx

**AmeriCorps lacks congressional support**

**Cooper 11** (Ryan, business manager of the Washington monthly “Obama, Americorps, and Jobs” http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/ten-miles-square/2011/11/obama\_americorps\_and\_jobs033206.php)

It was the National and Community Service Trust Act, signed by President Clinton in 1993, that technically created AmeriCorps, though the first President Bush laid the foundation with the National Service Act of 1990. Its objectives—providing a lot of the grunt work for Habitat for Humanity, for instance—are so unobjectionable it is one of a vanishingly few programs that still enjoy some bipartisan support—more Senate Republicans voted for Obama’s expansion than against. George W. Bush, though his funding of the program was somewhat uneven, consistently supported the ideal of volunteerism, and held an event at the White House celebrating the 500,000th AmeriCorps volunteer. However, now the Tea Party holds the House, AmeriCorps is suspended over the garbage disposal for the third time this year. House Republicans don’t just want to cut the program—they want to eliminate it entirely. House Republicans, in their latest draft budget, have completely eliminated its funding. In support, Senator Jim DeMint says the program is “the federal government reaching further into the world of civil society.”Given the previous Republican support, this seems odd. But a descent into the fever swamps could help explain the new GOP position. . One facet of opposition involves former AmeriCorps Inspector General Gerald Walpin, who was fired back in 2009. It’s a long story, butsee here for a list of reasons the AmeriCorps board (who asked for him to be removed) had for sending him off. On that list was a complaint from a US Attorney that in an investigation of Sacramento Mayor Kevin Johnson (an Obama ally), Walpin was behaving unprofessionally: trying “to act as the investigator, advocate, judge, jury and town crier.” Walpin’s sued to get his job back; his suit was thrown out and he lost the appeal. But the conservative media uses Walpin as an example of a clearly politically-motivated firing, and cites his unproved allegations cited as obvious fact. It goes on in this vein. Michelle Malkin calls AmeriCorps “FoodStampCorps,” claiming it is “essentially a special taxpayer-funded pipeline for radical liberal groups backed by billionaire George Soros that masquerade as public-interest do-gooders.” Glenn Beck compared the program to the SS, the Nazi paramilitary organization. Ed Morrissey insists that volunteers should not be paid. (Leave it to the 1 percent, then?)

# \*\*\*Oil Dependence

# ---Keystone XL

# 1NC Shell

Text: The United States Federal Government should fully construct and operationalize the Keystone XL pipeline.

**Keystone XL solves US foreign oil dependence**

**Petty in 12**  <Kathleen. “Dewhurst says Keystone XL Pipeline needed to decrease America's foreign oil dependency” February 24, 2012. http://www.mywesttexas.com/top\_stories/article\_fe7651e5-9398-5373-9532-7290e2f36587.html>//CS

Passing legislation that will allow to develop the Keystone XL pipeline is instrumental in weaning America from its dependency on Middle Eastern oil, Lt. Gov. David Dewhurst said Wednesday. "I have long wanted to end America's dependence on foreign oil," he said, speaking during an interview at the Reporter-Telegram. "The Keystone pipeline provides 20 percent of what we need to end our demand." President Barack Obama rejected the proposed pipeline, but TransCanada Corp.'s Keystone XL could re-submit its application with tweaks to the pipeline route. Both Dewhurst and fellow Senate candidate Ted Cruz blame Obama for not signing a deal they say would have created jobs, revenue and a decrease in purchasing of oil from foreign countries, particularly in the Middle East. Obama has responded to criticizing Republicans during speeches by saying he's supporting domestic exploration for oil, the development of alternative energies and nuclear facilities and other possibilities. Dewhurst said the idea that Obama has done anything supportive of the oil and gas industry is laughable. "President Obama's claim of supporting oil and gas activity is disingenuous and insulting," he said. "Here's a man who seemingly hates hydrocarbons. Here's a man who has helped propose numerous taxes on the oil and gas industry and restricted their drilling. President Barack Obama is no friend of the oil and gas industry. I know, because I've been in the oil and gas industry for almost the entirety of my career." Cruz agreed and said in a statement that Obama's decision is another example of his policies that over-regulate and stunt economic growth. "President Obama's decision killed tens of thousands of jobs with the stroke of a pen," he said. "The president could do the right thing and let construction of the pipeline proceed, which would transport hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil from Canada to U.S. refineries. But, unfortunately, we've seen this before: The president has engaged in a three-year war on jobs. And, the American people have paid the price."

# 2NC Solves Dependence/Prices

**Keystone XL solves oil prices and dependence**

**NPN 12** <National Petroleum News. “Refiners to U.S. House: High crude oil prices drive high gasoline prices” March 28, 2012. https://www.npnweb.com/ME2/dirmod.asp?sid=901D2CC3506F4C1187DF5BE4A8A2C0FF&nm=&type=MultiPublishing&mod=PublishingTitles&mid=8F3A7027421841978F18BE895F87F791&tier=4&id=4D1DB78127494E7CBB83363976B04A70>//CS

High crude oil prices are the primary factor behind high gasoline prices, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers President Charles T. Drevna told a House subcommittee. The most effective actions to help U.S. consumers would be to increase U.S. oil production, increase oil imports from Canada and reduce overregulation, Drevna said. Drevna noted that, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, "only six cents of every dollar that Americans pay for gasoline goes to the refining industry that AFPM represents. The cost of crude oil accounts for 76 cents, followed by taxes at 12 cents, and distribution and marketing also at six cents. "Refiners, as well as petrochemical manufacturers, are the first customers of a barrel of oil and the first to be impacted when oil prices rise," Drevna said in written testimony for a March 7 hearing on gasoline prices by the House Subcommittee on Energy and Power. "Refiners don't set the price of oil any more than automakers set the price of steel, bakers set the price of wheat or restaurants set the price of cattle," Drevna added. "Oil is an international commodity that trades in the free market and its price is not controlled by its purchasers." Drevna called on the Obama administration to allow increased exploration and development of vast oil and natural gas resources on federal lands and in federally controlled waters to meet U.S. energy needs, create jobs and improve economic and national security. In addition, Drevna advocated approval of the Keystone XL pipeline to bring 700,000 barrels of oil a day from Canada to Gulf Coast refineries. Drevna said overly burdensome and conflicting government regulations threaten U.S. competitiveness. He said some regulations are not doing anything to protect the environment but only jeopardize jobs and raise consumer costs. Examples of these are Tier 3 regulations to reduce sulfur in gasoline, greenhouse gas regulations, lengthy permitting delays, and requirements under the Renewable Fuel Standard involving biofuels, Drevna said. Oil prices have risen recently because of concerns about the future of Iranian oil production, increased oil demand in developing nations and the decline in the value of the U.S. dollar, Drevna said. "Historically, the best mechanism available to address high crude oil prices has been to take actions to increase the global crude oil supply," Drevna said. "When America has taken such actions in the past, it has sent a message to the market that our country is serious about meeting our energy and national security needs." Drevna said U.S. exports of refined petroleum products -primarily diesel fuel because there is an excess domestic supply -are benefitting American consumers. He pointed out that America imports about 60 percent of the crude oil the nation needs and is not a net exporter of gasoline. "Exports don't raise gasoline prices," Drevna said. "Rather, exports bring billions of dollars to America, preserve and create jobs, strengthen our economy and reduce our trade deficit. In fact, in allowing domestic refiners to run at higher utilization rates, exports are likely keeping consumer costs from rising further. If all American manufacturers and agricultural interests were prohibited from exporting their products, they would produce less -and that could actually raise consumer prices." AFPM, the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers (formerly known as NPRA, the National Petrochemical & Refiners Association) is a trade association representing U.S. manufacturers of gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, other fuels and home heating oil, as well as petrochemicals used as building blocks for thousands of vital products in daily life. AFPM members make modern life possible and keep America moving and growing as they meet the needs of our nation and local communities, strengthen economic and national security, and support 2 million American jobs.

# Solves Econ/Oil

**CP solves Oil Dependence and the economy**

**Kelly in 12** <William. “Allen West: Keystone XL pipeline would reduce foreign oil dependence” January 5, 2012. http://www.palmbeachdailynews.com/news/news/allen-west-keystone-xl-pipeline-would-reduce-forei/nMFLK/ >//CS

The Keystone XL oil pipeline would create 20,000 jobs in the nation’s manufacturing and construction sectors, boosting the economy while helping put the United States on the road toward energy independence, U.S. Rep. Allen West told a Rotary Club of Palm Beach audience on Thursday. West cited Iran’s threat to close the key global oil passageway, the Strait of Hormuz, as evidence of the need for the United States to end its dependence on foreign oil. About one-sixth of the world’s oil passes on tankers through the Strait of Hormuz, and analysts have warned the price of Brent crude could temporarily jump to as high as $210 if the strait is closed; the current price is $112.66, according to Oil-Price.net. The U.S. has pledged to keep the shipping route open. Nearly 50 percent of the oil consumed in the United States is imported from foreign countries. The 1,661-mile pipeline would bring tar sands oil from Alberta, Canada, to refineries in Texas. Congress recently passed legislation that contains a provision requiring President Barack Obama to make a decision within 60 days on whether to allow the pipeline.

**Keystone XL solves dependence and boosts the economy**

**Hoeven in 12** <John. “Why we need the Keystone Oil Pipeline” February 24, 2012. http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/23/opinion/hoeven-keystone-pipeline-defense/index.html>//CS

**The Keystone XL pipeline represents a big step toward true North American energy independence, reducing our reliance on Middle Eastern oil** and increasing our access to energy from our own nation and our closest ally, Canada, along with some oil from Mexico -- to 75% of our daily consumption, compared with 70% now. That decades-long goal for our country is finally within reach, but we need to stay focused on the big picture, and we need to act**. This** $7 billion, 1,700-mile, high**-tech transcontinental pipeline is a big-time, private-sector job creator, and it will also hold down the gas prices** for consumers and reduce our energy dependence on an unstable part of the world. Finally, it will do so with good environmental stewardship. That's why I, along with 44 of my colleagues from across the nation, introduced new legislation to move the project toward approval and construction after President Barack Obama's rejection of the project last month. Another view: Ted Turner on the case against the Keystone XL pipeline Sen. John Hoeven The Hoeven-Lugar-Vitter amendment to the highway funding bill, which we are now working to pass, authorizes TransCanada to construct and operate the Keystone XL pipeline from Alberta, Canada, to the Midwest and Gulf Coast, transporting an additional 830,000 barrels of oil per day to U.S. refineries. This includes 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day from the Bakken region of North Dakota and Montana. That's key to my state, because providing pipeline capacity and gathering systems for that much North Dakota crude will take as many as 500 trucks a day off of roads in the oil patch. That's a win-win for producers, state revenues and most importantly, public safety on our Western highways. Cutting through the Keystone XL hysteria **The Keystone XL project is** good for North Dakota, but it is **vital for the nation. Some 75% of the pipe for the Keystone XL pipeline will be made here in North America,** 50% of it in Arkansas. Some 90**% of all other construction materials will come from companies in the United States and Canada.** From an environmental perspective, the project has been under review since September 2008, more than three years, and the State Department's environmental review, completed in August 2011, found "no significant impacts on most resources" providing environmental restrictions are met. Further, our new legislation includes all federal and state safeguards and sets no time limit on Nebraska's ability to further review the pipeline's route through the state, the only portion of the route in contention. Additionally, 80% of the new Canadian oil sands development is being developed "in situ," meaning, it has a similar carbon footprint and emissions as conventional oil wells.

**Solves oil dependence and the economy**

**Olson in 12** <Pete Olson. “We need a domestic energy solution to reduce dependence on foreign oil” February 18, 2012. http://thehill.com/special-reports/energy-and-environment-february-2012/209607-we-need-a-domestic-energy-solution-to-reduce-dependence-on-foreign-oil>

With gas prices climbing and projected to rise beyond $4 per gallon by spring, the ripple effects are on the way too. Higher energy costs mean higher food prices, potential job losses for small businesses and less money for families to meet their basic needs. The erratic rise and fall of gas prices is a direct result of poor energy policies and America’s unhealthy reliance on energy from unstable regions of the world. The recent escalation of tensions between Iran and Western nations has resulted in a threat to close the Strait of Hormuz. This strait is a critical pathway for a huge portion of global oil. As a Navy aviator who flew over the Strait of Hormuz, I know firsthand the importance of this region to the world’s energy supply. Iran knows it too, which is why it has threatened to shut down the strait — threats that have a direct impact on today’s oil prices. We know the instability in the Middle East causes volatility in markets. What’s the solution? Reduce our reliance on this region for our oil. America needs a comprehensive energy policy that allows us to develop more of our own resources here at home, allow the Keystone XL pipeline to go forward without delay and give America true energy independence. President Obama has repeatedly declared that America needs an “all-of-the-above” energy strategy. Yet his words do not match his actions. His administration has issued rule after rule to stifle energy production and increase the cost of developing domestic energy. The most recent example is the Bureau of Land Management’s dramatic scaling back of a plan to develop domestic resources by reducing the available acreage for oil-shale and oil-sands development by about three-fourths in Utah, Colorado and Wyoming. The Environmental Protection Agency is also feverishly trying to tie hydraulic fracturing to contamination in groundwater. Yet, each time it has been proven wrong — at a great expense to the very industry that is revolutionizing domestic energy production. In Texas, the EPA usurped state authority in a groundwater case involving hydraulic fracturing by issuing an emergency order to take over the state’s investigation. It also sent an alert to the environmental community prior to its public announcement, claiming it was about to “make big news” before producing any evidence that groundwater contamination was linked to hydraulic fracturing. Last December, the EPA released a preliminary report that “theorized” hydraulic fracturing in the Pavillion, Wyo., area “may have” caused chemical contamination of “some” water wells. But there has been no independent verification of this conclusion, and the EPA itself admits there is no direct connection. Hydraulic fracturing has been used to extract gas from wells for 50 years without a single confirmed contamination report. States have exercised appropriate oversight, and are best suited to monitor the energy-development efforts of their individual states. Texas has some of the strictest disclosure requirements in the country. Yet the Obama administration has systematically worked to slow down, if not stop, the use of fracturing. This process, if allowed to develop properly, will drastically reduce our need to import oil from volatile regions and hostile nations. In the meantime, we could begin to reduce our Middle East imports sooner if the president would approve the Canadian Keystone XL pipeline now. If the United States continues to stall, China is lined up to take our place and take that crude. It was also reported this week that China is buying up Saudi Arabian oil, while negotiating further deals with Iran. Iran faces harsh U.S. economic sanctions and an oil embargo from the European Union. All of this means that oil prices will continue to escalate on a global scale. The president can reduce our reliance on unstable foreign sources of oil by approving the Keystone XL pipeline, opening up more of our own domestic resources for development and ensuring that the federal government plays an appropriate role in these operations. All of these actions will reduce our reliance on unstable nations for oil, create high-paying American jobs, bring millions in revenue into the federal Treasury and strengthen our national security. My colleagues and I in the House will continue to push for a comprehensive energy policy that achieves these goals.

# Avoids PTX - Agenda

**Counterplan has bipartisan support – especially with Republicans**

**Cornilles in 12** <Rob. “How bipartisan is support for the Keystone XL oil pipeline?” January 10, 2012. http://www.politifact.com/oregon/statements/2012/jan/14/rob-cornilles/how-bipartisan-support-keystone-xl-oil-pipeline/>

The major party candidates in the 1st Congressional District are on opposite sides of whether President Barack Obama should approve the building of a massive oil pipeline project from Canada to Texas. Democrat Suzanne Bonamici is opposed; she worries about the environmental impact. Republican Rob Cornilles is supportive; he said in last week’s televised debate, about halfway through the program, that the project has bipartisan support. "I do support the Keystone Pipeline. It’s a bipartisan proposal. Democrats and Republicans alike in Congress want this to move forward, because it’s not only a job creator, it’s also a way for us to responsibly manage how that oil is transferred from Canada to Mexico. Does the pipeline have bipartisan support? Much of the really vocal support for this project comes from Republicans. Democrats, not so much, although there are some who want the project. Environmentalists are opposed while labor’s AFL-CIO has decided not to take a formal position. Senate Democrats who like the project are Max Baucus D-Mont., Jon Tester D-Mont., Mary Landrieu D-La., Mark Pryor, D-Ark., and Mark Begich, D-Alaska, Claire McCaskill, D-Mo., and Kent Conrad, D-N.D. We queried our delegation. Sens. Ron Wyden and Jeff Merkley are opposed. Rep. Earl Blumenauer was among 32 House Democrats who sent a letter urging the State Department to reject the route. Schrader is opposed to the expedited process, but not necessarily against — or for — the project. We don’t think the support of one Democrat or one Republican makes a proposal bipartisan, but it’s clear some Democrats are on board with the project. If we had to picture a bipartisan meter, the needle probably would surpass the halfway mark but fall short of 75 percent.

**Counterplan avoids the link to politics - bipartisan public and congressional support**

**Gabbay in 12** <Tifanny. “SENATE BLOCKS KEYSTONE PIPELINE BILL, 11 DEMOCRATS DEFECT” March 8, 2012. http://www.theblaze.com/stories/senate-blocks-keystone-pipeline-bill-11-democrats-defect/>//CS

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Senate killed Republican-backed attempts to overturn several of President Barack Obama’s environmental and energy policies Thursday as lawmakers worked against a March 31 deadline to keep aid flowing to more than 100,000 transportation construction projects around the country. The two-year, $109 billion transportation bill before the Senate has wide, bipartisan support, but has become a magnet for lawmakers’ favorite causes and partisan gamesmanship. Among the amendments batted aside were GOP proposals to bypass Obama’s concerns about the Keystone XL oil pipeline, to delay tougher air pollution standards for industrial boilers and to expand offshore oil drilling. Action on those and other amendments came under an agreement between Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., and Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., aimed at clearing the way for passage of the transportation bill next week. Obama lobbied some Senate Democrats by telephone ahead of the Keystone vote, urging them to oppose an amendment by Sen. John Hoeven, R-N.D., that would have prevented the president from intervening in decisions related to construction of the pipeline and would have speeded its approval. Pointing to the administration’s environmental concerns about the project, which would carry tar sands oil from Canada to the Texas Gulf Coast, Republicans accused Obama of standing in the way greater oil supplies at a time when Americans are coping with rising gasoline prices. But some Democrats, especially those from oil producing states, were torn between support for the pipeline and their support for the president. The amendment was defeated 56-42, even though 11 Democrats broke ranks to support it. Sixty votes were needed for passage. Republican leaders jumped on the White House lobbying. “Most Americans strongly support building this pipeline and the jobs that would come with it,” McConnell said in a statement. The president’s lobbying against the Keystone provision came “a week after the president signaled to me and to Sen. McConnell that he might be willing to work with us on some bipartisan steps forward on energy legislation that the American people support,” House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, told reporters. “If we’re going to have bipartisan action on energy, the Keystone pipeline is an obvious place to start.”

# Avoids PTX - Elections

**Public supports Keystone, avoids elections net benefit**

**Johnson in 12** <Charles. “AMERICANS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT KEYSTONE PIPELINE” February 25, 2012. http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/02/25/pew-poll-americans-overwhelmingly-support-keystone-pipeline>//CS

Is Barack Obama governing for the 23% who oppose the Keystone pipeline? It seems a new poll from the Pew Research Center says yes. There is far more support for the Keystone XL pipeline that would carry upwards of 800,000 barrels of oil a day from Canada to Texas, even though only 24% of Americans have even heard about the issue and 37% of Americans haven't heard anything at all about it. Of those who have heard of it, 66% of Americans say the government should approve the pipeline, including 49% of Democrats, 66% of Independents, and 84% of Republicans. It seems the pipeline is a winning issue for Republicans, but only if they succeed in educating more people about its importance. It's easy to see why one would want to support Keystone. It would create 200,000 jobs during its beginning phases and could create upwards of half a million jobs by 2035. Both labor unions and businesses support it. Why doesn't the president? Republicans would do well to keep emphasizing this issue, especially if so few Americans have heard of it and especially as the price of gas continues to reach historic highs.

# A2 Pipeline = Emissions

**Emissions from Canadian oil production is inevitable**

**Hoeven in 12** <John. “Why we need the Keystone Oil Pipeline” February 24, 2012. http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/23/opinion/hoeven-keystone-pipeline-defense/index.html>

If the Keystone XL pipeline isn't built, Canadian oil will still be produced -- 700,000 barrels a day of it -- but instead of coming down to our refineries in the United States, instead of creating jobs for American workers, instead of reducing our dependence on a turbulent part of the world, that oil will be shipped to China. It will have to be carried there on large oil tankers, creating more carbon emissions, and it will be processed at facilities with weaker environmental safeguards.

# A2 Leaks

**No leaks – pipeline is safe**

**Hoeven in 12** <John. “Why we need the Keystone Oil Pipeline” February 24, 2012. http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/23/opinion/hoeven-keystone-pipeline-defense/index.html>

Finally, it's important to point out that the Keystone XL pipeline is nothing new. Thousands of pipelines crisscross our nation, delivering refined products to fuel our cars, heat our homes and power our industries. In fact, the original Keystone pipeline, which became operational in 2010, runs from Alberta through my state of North Dakota. Contrary to claims by critics, the pipeline itself has never leaked. The leaks happened at fittings and seals at above-ground pumping stations, which were properly and promptly fixed. I have worked toward approval of the Keystone XL pipeline, first as governor of North Dakota and now as a U.S. senator, because I believe it helps our nation on so many levels. It is just the kind of project that will grow our economy and create jobs in the right way -- through private-sector investment. The Keystone XL pipeline will also help to wean us from our dependency on oil from volatile regions of the world and help us move toward a true energy independent future. It will make our nation safer and stronger for the American people.

# Aff – Doesn’t solve jobs

**Keystone XL wouldn’t create jobs – their authors are biased**

Johnson in 12 - chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council <Laurie. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” February 1, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_good\_for.html>//CS

Interesting quote. TransCanada and its allies can’t seem to keep their numbers straight for the proposed tar sands Keystone XL pipeline. Just the day before, the company released a press statement predicting 20,000 pipeline and 118,000 “spin-off” jobs. In September of 2010, they claimed 13,000 jobs. Two months prior to that, a “study” they commissioned was released predicting 250,000 to over half a million jobs (p. 33). The Republican Party claims over 100,000. All of these estimates contradict the statement by the company’s own Vice President, even those at the lower end. Analysts who aren’t trying to make money off the pipeline conclude that it would create far fewer jobs. Researchers at Cornell University project as few as 2,500 jobs, and the State Department up to 6,000 (p.ES-22). Notably, most projections are for short-term jobs associated with construction—something proponents don’t always make clear. (There’s nothing wrong with short-term jobs, any would be welcome, but their temporary nature shouldn’t be in the fine print). According to the State Department, as few as 20 jobs will be permanent (p. 3.10-80) (excluding “induced” jobs created from wages spent by these workers). (Click here for a good summary explaining the differences across industry and independent analyses, by the Columbia Journalism Review). So what is going on here? After failing to convince their own country’s citizens that the pipeline would be good for them, Big Oil and its Congressional protectors have launched what can only be characterized as an aggressive disinformation campaign to build the pipeline. Preying on the fears of America’s unemployed and economically insecure, they are trying to sell it as a national jobs plan and a way to increase national security by reducing dependence on foreign oil. It’s a cruel hoax. Canadians didn’t fall for it, and neither should we. The proposed project would construct a 1,700 mile conduit from Alberta, Canada for the world’s dirtiest and most corrosive form of oil (tar sands) right through the heart of America’s farmland —threatening not only the bread basket of the US, but also the world. It promises little to potentially negative economic returns for Americans. Maybe that’s why President Obama made the bold decision to reject TransCanada’s permit application. With Citizens United giving the oil industry (even more) unlimited influence, and the American Petroleum Institute’s blatant threat to the President to approve Keystone XL or face “huge political consequences,” Obama’s courage shouldn’t be underestimated.

# Aff – Kills Jobs

**Keystone XL would kill jobs**

Johnson in 12 - chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council <Laurie. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” February 1, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_good\_for.html>//CS

Here’s the truth about the pipeline: \* It will create only a very modest number of jobs. While these jobs are important and could certainly help some workers, industry has grossly overstated its case. \* It might destroy more jobs than it creates: By TransCanada’s own account, Keystone XL is expected to increase oil prices in the Midwest (building a pipeline to the Gulf Coast will eliminate an excess supply of the oil in the Midwest, pushing up prices). As part of its permit application to the Canadian government, TransCanada said (p.21) annual oil company revenues are expected to increase as a result by $2 to nearly $4 billion. In turn, our farmers could see an increase in fuel costs of $2.6 billion dollars or more over 2009 levels…Higher oil prices might be good for the oil industry, but they will increase the cost of living and doing business in the Midwest, negatively impacting its economy and potentially increasing unemployment. Pipeline leaks and spills into aquifers and water ways threaten the livelihoods of a quarter of a million farmers, and businesses providing outdoor recreation and other tourism services. Public health is also threatened, as already evidenced from a major tar sands spill in 2010 along a different pipeline (more below).

# Aff – Doesn’t Solve Oil

**Counterplan doesn’t solve oil dependence**

Johnson in 12 - chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council <Laurie. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” February 1, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_good\_for.html>//CS

Finally, the pipeline will not reduce our oil dependence or increase national security. The price of TransCanada’s oil will be determined by surging global demand for oil, and OPEC’s monopolistic production decisions that limit the world’s oil supply and increase its price (the cartel (OPEC) has almost 80 percent of the world’s known oil reserves). For all the rhetoric about energy independence and controlling the price of oil, Keystone XL’s marginal contribution to global production won’t amount to a hill of beans. There is one source of potential long-term job creation about which oil industry has remained silent: jobs created to clean up inevitable spills and leaks. So far, TransCanada has experienced major problems with the section of the Keystone project already completed. In its first year of operation, its so-called safe “state-of-the-art” pipeline has already leaked 35 times, (21 times in Canada, 14 in the U.S--p. 3.13-11). According to the University of Nebraska, approximately 91 major spills can be expected over the 50-year lifetime of the pipeline. Clean up jobs will last longer than that… There is also the potential for a major disaster. In 2010, the largest tar sands spill in U.S. history devastated the Kalamazoo River with over 800,000 gallons of oil at a price tag of over $700 million. We’re still cleaning it up, a year and a half later.

# Aff – CP Hurts Econ

**Turn – CP leads to oil spills and hurts the economy**

Johnson in 12 - chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council <Laurie. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” February 1, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_good\_for.html>//CS

A worst-case spill from Keystone XL could cause widespread groundwater and river contamination. Any resulting clean up expenditures will strain public budgets, diverting limited resources away from productive investments that generate long term job growth, such as infrastructure, education, and clean energy. Finally, there’s public health and the environment. The $700 million figure cited above was just for cleaning up. According to a November 2010 report (p.12) from the Michigan Department of Community Health, almost 60 percent of people surveyed who lived near the Kalamazoo spill experienced at least one adverse health effect following it, including respiratory, gastrointestinal and neurological symptoms (compared to a baseline of less than 5% in a community 15 miles upstream of the spill). Ethics aside, sick people do not make a healthy economy. Nor do the droughts, forest fires, extreme weather, smog pollution, and other impacts associated with climate change: extracting tar sands oil generates three times as much global warming pollution (in addition to generating other pollutants) as does conventional oil. We should take heed of Canadians' oppostion to transporting Alberta's dirty oil through their own land for their own oil; they are no fools. They know TransCanada’s Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is a terrible project: it promises few if any jobs, puts existing jobs at risk, and threatens water supplies, public health, and the environment. They know the oil industry has one objective and one objective only: to increase profits. It is not to bestow a new supply of cheap oil on the US or reduce unemployment. As PT Barnum famously said, “There’s a sucker born every minute.” Let’s make sure we’re not one of them.

# Aff – Kills Jobs

**Keystone XL would kill jobs**

Johnson in 12 - chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council <Laurie. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” February 1, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_good\_for.html>//CS

Here’s the truth about the pipeline: \* It will create only a very modest number of jobs. While these jobs are important and could certainly help some workers, industry has grossly overstated its case. \* It might destroy more jobs than it creates: By TransCanada’s own account, Keystone XL is expected to increase oil prices in the Midwest (building a pipeline to the Gulf Coast will eliminate an excess supply of the oil in the Midwest, pushing up prices). As part of its permit application to the Canadian government, TransCanada said (p.21) annual oil company revenues are expected to increase as a result by $2 to nearly $4 billion. In turn, our farmers could see an increase in fuel costs of $2.6 billion dollars or more over 2009 levels…Higher oil prices might be good for the oil industry, but they will increase the cost of living and doing business in the Midwest, negatively impacting its economy and potentially increasing unemployment. Pipeline leaks and spills into aquifers and water ways threaten the livelihoods of a quarter of a million farmers, and businesses providing outdoor recreation and other tourism services. Public health is also threatened, as already evidenced from a major tar sands spill in 2010 along a different pipeline (more below).

# Aff – Doesn’t solve jobs

**Keystone XL wouldn’t create jobs – their authors are biased**

Johnson in 12 -chief economist at the Climate Center of the Natural Resources Defense Council <Laurie. “Keystone XL pipeline: Good for Big Oil, bad for the economy” February 1, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ljohnson/keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_good\_for.html>//CS

Interesting quote. TransCanada and its allies can’t seem to keep their numbers straight for the proposed tar sands Keystone XL pipeline. Just the day before, the company released a press statement predicting 20,000 pipeline and 118,000 “spin-off” jobs. In September of 2010, they claimed 13,000 jobs. Two months prior to that, a “study” they commissioned was released predicting 250,000 to over half a million jobs (p. 33). The Republican Party claims over 100,000. All of these estimates contradict the statement by the company’s own Vice President, even those at the lower end. Analysts who aren’t trying to make money off the pipeline conclude that it would create far fewer jobs. Researchers at Cornell University project as few as 2,500 jobs, and the State Department up to 6,000 (p.ES-22). Notably, most projections are for short-term jobs associated with construction—something proponents don’t always make clear. (There’s nothing wrong with short-term jobs, any would be welcome, but their temporary nature shouldn’t be in the fine print). According to the State Department, as few as 20 jobs will be permanent (p. 3.10-80) (excluding “induced” jobs created from wages spent by these workers). (Click here for a good summary explaining the differences across industry and independent analyses, by the Columbia Journalism Review). So what is going on here? After failing to convince their own country’s citizens that the pipeline would be good for them, Big Oil and its Congressional protectors have launched what can only be characterized as an aggressive disinformation campaign to build the pipeline. Preying on the fears of America’s unemployed and economically insecure, they are trying to sell it as a national jobs plan and a way to increase national security by reducing dependence on foreign oil. It’s a cruel hoax. Canadians didn’t fall for it, and neither should we. The proposed project would construct a 1,700 mile conduit from Alberta, Canada for the world’s dirtiest and most corrosive form of oil (tar sands) right through the heart of America’s farmland —threatening not only the bread basket of the US, but also the world. It promises little to potentially negative economic returns for Americans. Maybe that’s why President Obama made the bold decision to reject TransCanada’s permit application. With Citizens United giving the oil industry (even more) unlimited influence, and the American Petroleum Institute’s blatant threat to the President to approve Keystone XL or face “huge political consequences,” Obama’s courage shouldn’t be underestimated.

# Aff – Links to PTX

**CP links to politics – lumped with partisan discussions about the transportation bill**

**Gabbay in 12** <Tifanny. “SENATE BLOCKS KEYSTONE PIPELINE BILL, 11 DEMOCRATS DEFECT” March 8, 2012. http://www.theblaze.com/stories/senate-blocks-keystone-pipeline-bill-11-democrats-defect/>//CS

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Senate killed Republican-backed attempts to overturn several of President Barack Obama’s environmental and energy policies Thursday as lawmakers worked against a March 31 deadline to keep aid flowing to more than 100,000 transportation construction projects around the country. The two-year, $109 billion transportation bill before the Senate has wide, bipartisan support, but has become a magnet for lawmakers’ favorite causes and partisan gamesmanship. Among the amendments batted aside were GOP proposals to bypass Obama’s concerns about the Keystone XL oil pipeline, to delay tougher air pollution standards for industrial boilers and to expand offshore oil drilling. Action on those and other amendments came under an agreement between Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., and Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., aimed at clearing the way for passage of the transportation bill next week. Obama lobbied some Senate Democrats by telephone ahead of the Keystone vote, urging them to oppose an amendment by Sen. John Hoeven, R-N.D., that would have prevented the president from intervening in decisions related to construction of the pipeline and would have speeded its approval. Pointing to the administration’s environmental concerns about the project, which would carry tar sands oil from Canada to the Texas Gulf Coast, Republicans accused Obama of standing in the way greater oil supplies at a time when Americans are coping with rising gasoline prices. But some Democrats, especially those from oil producing states, were torn between support for the pipeline and their support for the president. The amendment was defeated 56-42, even though 11 Democrats broke ranks to support it. Sixty votes were needed for passage. Republican leaders jumped on the White House lobbying. “Most Americans strongly support building this pipeline and the jobs that would come with it,” McConnell said in a statement. The president’s lobbying against the Keystone provision came “a week after the president signaled to me and to Sen. McConnell that he might be willing to work with us on some bipartisan steps forward on energy legislation that the American people support,” House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, told reporters. “If we’re going to have bipartisan action on energy, the Keystone pipeline is an obvious place to start.”

# ---Carbon Tax

# 1NC Shell

**The United States federal government should implement a phased carbon tax.**

**Solves oil dependence and avoids politics**

**Houser ’11** - Peterson Institute for International Economics (Trevor, American Eyes on Australia's Carbon Tax, PIIE, Op-ed in the Australian Financial Review

July 12, 2011, <http://www.iie.com/publications/opeds/oped.cfm?ResearchID=1873>)

A carbon tax has long been the favorite tool among economists for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Imposing a tax on something that reduces welfare (like pollution) can allow policymakers to reduce taxes on things that increase welfare (like employment, investment or innovation). And it’s not just liberal economists that find a carbon tax attractive. Gregory Mankiw, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors under George W. Bush and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, senior economic advisor to Senator John McCain during the 2008 Presidential Campaign, have both argued the merits of taxing carbon and using the revenue to cut economically distorting corporate and payroll taxes. It’s the deficit reduction potential of a carbon tax that could give US climate policy a new lease on life. This economic logic has elicited support from some leading Republican politicians as well. Most notable is Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska (the highest ranking Senate Republican on energy policy issues) who, while opposing efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate greenhouse gas emissions, has publically supported a carbon tax. She is joined by ExxonMobil chief executive Rex Tillerson, who argues the economic certainty that comes with a carbon tax is more important than the environmental certainty you get with cap-and-trade. And for Americans increasingly concerned with the security of the country’s energy supply, a carbon tax could yield some unexpected benefits. A colleague and I recently analyzed all leading energy security proposals currently bouncing around Washington—from vehicle efficiency standards to expanded offshore oil drilling. And we threw a carbon tax in just for fun. To our surprise the carbon tax did more to reduce US dependence on foreign oil than almost any other proposal because it both reduced oil demand and increased domestic supply. The latter occurs thanks to a) an increase in natural gas liquids production, an oil substitute pumped alongside the natural gas used to replace coal-fired power plants, and b) CO2 captured from remaining coal-fired power plants used to coax more oil out of older domestic wells.

# 2NC Solvency – Laundry List

**Solves climate change and economy – innovation**

**Bland 7/2/12** – environmental engineer and staff writer for Western Advocate (Ashley, Good reasons for imposing carbon tax, Western Advocate, http://www.westernadvocate.com.au/news/local/news/general/good-reasons-for-imposing-carbon-tax/2608992.aspx?storypage=0)

IF you don’t accept that the extraction and burning of fossil fuels is having a negative impact on our planet then you might struggle reading this. However, I urge you to consider some other good reasons for putting a price on carbon. From an economic point of view, creating a “price signal” is a well-established way for governments to correct a “market failure”. What this means is that governments make the things they want to discourage more expensive, and the behaviours they want to encourage relatively cheaper. The market failure in this instance is that companies and individuals can pollute the atmosphere with carbon dioxide, other gasses and particulates from burning fossil fuels for free. The consequences of this affect all of us – go to the CSIRO website if you want details of how. In this instance the government is doing two things, it is providing a price signal and modest compensation. So, as consumers, we can choose to continue with our current buying patterns and hope we won’t be worse off, or adapt our buying patterns, by reducing our energy consumption for example, and potentially being slightly better off. But the carbon tax is not just about carbon; it’s also about challenging the level of consumerism that, combined with world population growth, is eroding the stability and resilience of our environment. If it didn’t involve so much money for the biggest corporations on the planet I suspect we would have made much more progress than we have. As individuals, we tend not to like change. As organisations, we strongly resist it. More than 97 per cent of scientists, and hence most nations, accept that it would be wise to limit carbon emissions. The question is, how do we fairly distribute the wealth that our carbon-built economy creates? Well ... one answer is to create wealth without using as much carbon. This is the elusive win-win for the environment and consumer capitalism that means humans get what they want; just not at the expense of other poor humans in far away countries or animals and plants that are rarely seen and whose significance is often misunderstood. Here are some reasons why the carbon tax is a good thing: The emotional reasons: The vast bulk of the population is concerned about the environment (78 per cent in the most recent NSW poll). Many people just think we’ve been pushing too hard for too long. They have seen changes in their local environment which they don’t like and they are glad to see the Government doing something about it with the support of scientists and economists. The values and beliefs reasons: Out of the 180 plus countries in the world, Australia consistently ranks in the top 20 for per capita income and quality of life. Of that 20, about 10 already have a price on carbon and the other 10 have become rich from either selling oil or manufacturing ‘stuff’. Perhaps it’s quite reasonable that the rich developed countries curb their consumption of non-renewable resources and leave some for other countries and future generations? The logical reasons: Endless growth is a nonsensical concept – it’s a measure of the increasing rate at which we are using up finite resources. Endless change is how the universe works. Which one do you think we should align ourselves with? Even if you are not worried about putting extra CO2, mercury, nitrous oxides, and other pollutants and cancer-causing hydrocarbon compounds just about everywhere into the atmosphere, consider that ABARE estimates we only have about 90 years of coal left at 2008 extraction rates. Surely the price is only rising for carbon-rich commodities. Shouldn’t we save some of this resource for future generations who may be able to use it in less polluting ways? Consider also that there are proven, viable alternative sources of energy and materials which consume significantly less carbon. Renewable energy technology is already challenging the carbon-hungry model. Once the purchase price of renewable energy generators is paid off (in a few years) for the rest of its life the plant provides essentially free energy! Imagine the competitive advantage to Australian businesses in those few years when their energy costs are small compared to competitors relying on carbon heavy energy. A carbon tax provides the incentive for these business to reject the existing, inefficient energy supply which is distorted by subsidies, has limited local control and pays profits to far-away shareholders. It’s part of the search for new ways of doing business that account for environmental impacts and, in so doing, minimise them. This is why the countries that met at the Rio Earth Summit last week were searching for new ways to achieve sustainable development – one that accounts for all the things that contribute to our wellbeing. Having a price on carbon is an essential first step in this quest.

# 2NC Solvency - Phased

**A phased carbon tax is key**

**CTC ’11** (Carbon Tax Center, Charles Komanoff and Daniel Rosenblum launched the Carbon Tax Center (“CTC”) in January 2007 to give voice to Americans who believe that taxing emissions of carbon dioxide — the primary greenhouse gas — is imperative to reduce global warming. The two of us brought to CTC a combined six decades of experience in economics, law, public policy and social change. Though Dan has moved on, Charles remains as CTC director, while James Handley, a chemical engineer and attorney who previously worked in the private sector and for U.S. EPA, serves as our Washington D.C. rep, “FAQs” January 31st, <http://www.carbontax.org/faq/>)

While carbon taxes will need to be very high to create the required price incentives, they will need to be phased in to give individuals and businesses the opportunity to adjust. There is no magic formula or right number, but a tax that grows at an annual rate equivalent to 5-10% of the “baseline” cost of fossil fuels probably offers a viable combination of meaningful incentive and opportunity for adaptation. The $37 per ton of carbon “starter tax” mentioned earlier, equating to around 10 cents a gallon of gasoline, fits the lower end of that range. At least as important as the tax level is the commitment to keep raising the tax, so that energy-critical decisions, from car-buying (Hummer or Prius?) to home-buying (exurb or transit-oriented community?) to factory locating (highway interchange or rail line?), are made with carbon-appropriate price signals.

# 2NC Solvency – Oil Dependence

**Carbon tax reduces oil consumption**

**Stelzer ’11** - Senior Fellow and Director of Hudson Institute's economic policy studies group. Prior to joining Hudson Institute in 1998, Stelzer was resident scholar and director of regulatory policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute. He also is the U.S. economic and political columnist for The Sunday Times (London) and The Courier Mail (Australia), a contributing editor of The Weekly Standard, a member of the Advisory Board of The American Antitrust Institute and a member of the Visiting Committee of the Harris School of Public Policy Studies at the University of Chicago. (Irwin, Carbon Taxes: An Opportunity for Conservatives, Hudson Institute, March 2011, <http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/Stelzer%20Carbon%20Tax%20web.pdf>)

A tax on carbon, whether it takes the form of a levy on emissions, or a second-best substitute, a tax on gasoline, would accomplish a host of conservative goals. First, by reducing oil consumption it would reduce the security threat posed by the increasing possibility that crude oil reserves will fall under the control of those who would do us harm, either by cutting off supplies, as happened when American policy towards Israel displeased the Arab world, or by using the proceeds of their oil sales to fund the spread of radical Islam and attacks by jihadists. No one doubts that the execrable Hugo Chávez survives only because we pay millions for Venezuelan oil, or that Saudi funding of radical Islam is made possible in good part by our payments for the Kingdom’s oil. If we curtail our use of oil we reduce our overall imports and, thereby, the flow of funds that If the uproar in the Middle East tells us anything it is that dependence of oil from that region of the world is a security threat, now more than ever.

**Carbon tax solves oil dependence and the economy**

**Sullivan ’09** - Washington correspondent of the The Commercial Appeal (Bartholomew, FedEx CEO: Tax carbon, end our dependence on foreign oil, Commercial Appeal, September 23rd, http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2009/sep/23/fedex-ceo-smith-says-us-needs-end-dependence-forei/)

WASHINGTON -- FedEx CEO Frederick W. Smith made his case Wednesday for a tax on carbon, a reduction in the payroll tax and expensing of capital equipment, speaking at a panel discussion with other CEOs at the Council on Competitiveness National Energy Summit. Saying that ending the nation's dependence on foreign oil is more "enlightened self-interest" than a crusade, Smith noted that the Memphis-based logistic giant consumes 1.5 billion gallons of fuel a year. He called it a matter of both national and economic security. Smith said his work with the Energy Security Leadership Council with retired generals and admirals made him realize that "we're spending 600 and some odd billion dollars on national defense -- 50 to 60 cents of every dollar is directed to protect the oil trade." George A. David, chairman of United Technologies Corp., argued that more efficient building codes and standards and more investment in research and development are high priorities. He noted that the elevators his company makes use 25 percent of the energy they used to because they now recapture the energy of descent. Jonathan Lash, president of the World Resources Institute, made the case for pricing carbon and agreed with David that the free allowances in current cap and trade proposals are a mistake. John Krenicki Jr., CEO of GE Energy Infrastructure, said the U.S. came late to renewable energy compared to Europe. Smith took the opportunity in a question by moderator Richard M. Smith of Newsweek to argue that the tax code is prejudiced against capital investment. "If you want to make a blue-collar worker more productive and allow them to make more money, you have to invest in training, infrastructure and capital," Fred Smith said. "The reality is our tax code in the U.S. promotes financial speculation, leverage and private equity, and penalizes capital investment. With a stroke of a pen, the Congress could change the dynamics, and that would be to allow for the expensing of capital equipment." On the carbon tax, Smith said he prefers it to cap and trade because he suspects "an army of lobbyists" will be employed making exceptions to it so it becomes something like the 170,000-page tax code. A predictable, graduated tax would have an impact on the role of the military overseas, improve the environment and be good for the economy, Smith argued. When Richard Smith asked him how he could escape being called a socialist with his plan, Fred Smith recalled spending two years on one of the country's overseas "adventures" in Indochina. "If people want to call me a socialist for recognizing these huge costs -- externalities -- of our national defense, not to mention the 5,000 young men and women who have lost their lives in this thing and the thousands who have been maimed and wounded, we need to solve this problem," he said. "The failure to do it is not only going to create serious consequences in terms of our economy, but we're going to make a big mistake and get into a big conflagration over this thing," he predicted.

**Solves oil dependence**

**EESI ’10** (Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Moving Away from Oil: Biofuels and Biobased Products, June 30th, http://www.eesi.org/moving-away-oil-biofuels-and-biobased-products-30-jun-2010)

The unfolding disaster in the Gulf of Mexico is rapidly adding to the already high price of our nation’s oil dependence. We need to find alternative, more sustainable ways to fuel our transportation systems, heat our homes, and create products and materials we use in daily living – for the sake of our health, our climate, our economy, our national security, and the fragile ecosystems upon which we depend. The first thing we can do as a nation is to enact policies that encourage all of us to use much less petroleum. Policies such as a carbon tax on fossil fuels, or a petroleum tax, or a declining cap on fossil carbon emissions would encourage us to make different choices – to use more efficient public or alternative transit, to live closer to where we work, to use more fuel efficient vehicles, to insulate homes that use heating oil, to reduce our consumption of products that are petroleum-intensive to make and deliver. These are all things that we can start doing today voluntarily (and some are), but because the price we pay for petroleum products does not reflect the true social and environmental costs of our oil dependence, relatively few people are making these choices. To get our country moving in the right direction, we need to begin charging the full price of our oil dependence. When the whole nation begins choosing to do these things together with resolve, we will see our oil dependence decline dramatically. And, we will see thousands more jobs being created in our communities as more of our energy dollars are invested and spent closer to home.

**Carbon tax solves oil dependence**

**CTC ’11** (Carbon Tax Center, Charles Komanoff and Daniel Rosenblum launched the Carbon Tax Center (“CTC”) in January 2007 to give voice to Americans who believe that taxing emissions of carbon dioxide — the primary greenhouse gas — is imperative to reduce global warming. The two of us brought to CTC a combined six decades of experience in economics, law, public policy and social change. Though Dan has moved on, Charles remains as CTC director, while James Handley, a chemical engineer and attorney who previously worked in the private sector and for U.S. EPA, serves as our Washington D.C. rep, “FAQs” January 31st, http://www.carbontax.org/faq/)

Will a carbon tax lessen U.S. oil dependence? You bet it will. Petroleum products account for 42% of U.S. CO2 emissions from burning fuels (coal and natural gas are responsible for 36% and 22%, respectively), so a carbon tax stiff enough to cut down heavily on CO2 will necessarily put a big dent in oil consumption.

**Carbon tax is the only way to reduce consumption**

**CTC ’11** (Carbon Tax Center, Charles Komanoff and Daniel Rosenblum launched the Carbon Tax Center (“CTC”) in January 2007 to give voice to Americans who believe that taxing emissions of carbon dioxide — the primary greenhouse gas — is imperative to reduce global warming. The two of us brought to CTC a combined six decades of experience in economics, law, public policy and social change. Though Dan has moved on, Charles remains as CTC director, while James Handley, a chemical engineer and attorney who previously worked in the private sector and for U.S. EPA, serves as our Washington D.C. rep, “FAQs” January 31st, http://www.carbontax.org/faq/)

Charging businesses and individuals a price to emit carbon dioxide (CO2) is essential to reduce U.S. emissions quickly and steeply enough to prevent atmospheric concentrations of CO2 from reaching an irreversible tipping point. The transformation of our fossil fuels-based energy system to reliance on energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable fuels won’t happen without carbon fees or taxes sending the appropriate price signals into every corner of the economy and every aspect of life.

# 2NC Solvency - Warming

**Carbon tax reduces emissions - solves global warming**

**Applebaum ’07** - a columnist for the WASHINGTON POST and SLATE. She is also the Director of Political Studies at the Legatum Institute in London, where she runs projects on political and economic transition (Anne, Global Warming's Simple Remedy, The Washington Post, February 6th, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/02/05/AR2007020501248.html)

But don't get me wrong: I was convinced by the reigning consensus on global warming a long time ago, have accepted that human use of fossil fuels has caused it and am very glad so many European politicians take the scientists' words seriously. The question now is whether these same Europeans will start taking the solutions seriously. If so, they must begin by abandoning the bankrupt Kyoto treaty on climate change and encouraging the United States to do so, too. The much-vaunted treaty creates a complicated and unenforceable system of international targets for carbon emissions reduction, based on measurements taken in 1990. Critics of the American president have condemned him for failing to sign it, conveniently forgetting that the Senate rejected it 95 to 0 in 1997, a margin that reflects broad bipartisan opposition. At the same time, few of the Asian and European signatories are actually on track to meet their goals; those that will meet the targets, such as Britain, can do so because their economies rely less on industry than they once did. Canada and Japan aren't even close to compliance; China and India, whose emissions rates are growing most rapidly, are exempt altogether as "developing" countries -- which, given their economic strength, is absurd. None of which is to say that reduction of carbon emissions is impossible. But the limiting of fossil fuels cannot be carried out with an unenforceable international regime, using complicated regulations that the United Nations does not have the staff or the mandate to supervise, with the help of a treaty that effectively penalizes those who bother to abide by it. I no longer believe that a complicated carbon trading regime -- in which industries trade emissions "credits" -- would work within the United States either: So much is at stake for so many industries that the legislative process to create it would be easily distorted by their various lobbies. Any lasting solutions will have to be extremely simple, and -- because of the cost implicit in reducing the use and emissions of fossil fuels -- will also have to benefit those countries that impose them in other ways. Fortunately, there is such a solution, one that is grippingly unoriginal, requires no special knowledge of economics and is easy for any country to implement. It's called a carbon tax, and it should be applied across the board to every industry that uses fossil fuels, every home or building with a heating system, every motorist, and every public transportation system. Immediately, it would produce a wealth of innovations to save fuel, as well as new incentives to conserve. More to the point, it would produce a big chunk of money that could be used for other things. Anyone for balancing the budget? Fixing Social Security for future generations? As a foreign policy side benefit, users of the tax would suddenly find themselves less dependent on Persian Gulf oil or Russian natural gas, too. Most of all, though, the successful use of carbon taxes does not require "American leadership," or a U.N. committee, or a complicated international effort of any kind. It can be done country by country: If the British environment minister or the German chancellor wants to go ahead with it tomorrow, nothing is preventing them. If a future American president wants to rally the nation around a patriotic and noble cause, then he or she has the perfect opportunity. If the Chinese see that such a tax has produced unexpected benefits in America and Europe, they'll follow. And when that happens, we'll know that the apocalyptic climate change rhetoric has finally been taken seriously.

**Carbon tax is the most efficient way to slow warming**

**Gardner ’08** – Energy and Environment Correspondent for Reuters (Timothy, Carbon tax seen as best way to slow global warming, Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/10/09/us-climate-finance-sachs-idUSTRE4988X020081009>)

Cap and trade has emerged as the dominant attempt to slow global warming. Global deals in permits to emit greenhouse gas emissions have hit nearly $65 billion a year. The European Union, under the Kyoto Protocol, has embraced cap and trade since 2005 and voluntary markets have developed in the United States, the developed world's top carbon polluter. But a straight carbon tax on energy production -- at an oil wellhead or refinery for instance -- would be simpler and cheaper than putting a cap on tens of thousands of polluters, Jeffrey Sachs, a special advisor to the U.N. secretary general and director of the Earth Institute at Columbia University told a panel on Thursday. As the world prepares to form a successor agreement to the Kyoto Protocol by the end of next year, focus is sharpening on how well cap and trade markets are fighting emissions. Carbon taxes would quickly cut emissions across all sectors of the economy, including vehicles and manufacturing, said Sachs. It could also be more efficient than spreading the trade of permits across the financial system. "Having a lot of people engineer financial instruments for carbon when there are much more direct ways to do this strikes me as not really a great investment," Sachs said. "I'm also not so keen on sending our best and brightest off to do more financial engineering," he said. "I think the kind of (financial) meltdown we have right is a little bit of an example of how we've taken a generation of young people and put them in tasks that don't really solve social problems." Yvo de Boer, the U.N. climate chief, told the panel he doubted voters in the United States and other countries would accept new taxes. Sachs admitted that the United States is "neurotic" about new taxes, but said they would be the best way to fund research and development and subsidies for big low-carbon energy projects such as nuclear plants and transmission systems to bring solar power from the Southwest and wind power from the Great Plains states to cities on the coasts. Sachs criticized one of the mainstays of climate trade that has developed in the European Union. Under the Kyoto Protocol the Clean Development Mechanism allows rich countries to offset their carbon footprints by investing in clean energy projects like small wind farms or hydroelectric dams in developing countries. "Things like the CDM are just unfortunately very marginal small tools that aren't going to change the broad framework of how energy is produced and how technology is developed and distributed," said Sachs. De Boer said the CDM has met its goals but that a range of tools could be developed to improve it. Investments could be widened, for instance, to improve whole sectors of developing countries, such as mass transit systems in large cities.

**Carbon tax solves warming – reduced emissions and alt energy spinoffs**

**Schlesinger ’05** - member of the National Academy of Sciences and dean of the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences at Duke University (William H, Carbon Tax Provides Fairest Incentive For Curbing Global Warming , Duke Today, May 16th, 2005, <http://today.duke.edu/2005/05/carbontax.html>)

Anderson correctly recognizes that the emissions of carbon dioxide stem from many sectors of society -- from power plants and other industrial sources and from you and me, as we heat and light our houses and drive our cars on daily errands. No one sector can solve the global warming problem by itself. A carbon tax would be paid whenever a molecule of carbon dioxide is emitted to the atmosphere by burning fossil fuels. Utilities would pay it based on their smokestack emissions and pass the cost to consumers in their monthly electric bill. Each of us would pay it when we fill up with gasoline, based on the content of fossil carbon in the fuel. A carbon tax would provide the maximum incentive for bright engineers to improve the efficiency of fossil fuel use in all sectors of society. It also would maximize the potential for important "cross-sector" transfers of efficiency. For instance, if engineers find efficient ways to reduce CO2 emissions from the power plants that provide our electricity, the utilities' carbon tax savings could be passed along to consumers. The same principle might make it cheaper to operate an electric car than a gas-powered one. More of us would be motivated to buy electric cars, especially given the price of gasoline these days. A carbon tax does not necessarily mean a net increase in our cost of living. Carbon tax revenues could be directed to general government expenditures, so that income tax rates could be reduced for all Americans -- or perhaps those at the lower income levels. Importantly, our current income tax structure provides no personal choice to reduce our tax; indeed, the more we earn, the more we pay on April 15. A tax on carbon, which would show up in higher costs for electricity or gasoline, would provide an incentive for each of us to use energy more efficiently if we wanted to pay lower taxes. Still want an SUV? Buy it, but each year you'll pay more for gasoline than your neighbor who has a Toyota Prius. Want to live in the country? Fine, but remember it will cost you to drive the extra miles to work each day. Want to save some money at home and send less to the taxman? Put on a warm sweater and lower your thermostat. Conservation and efficiency must both play a role in our attempt to reduce dependence on dwindling production of foreign oil. A carbon tax provides an equal incentive for both pathways to be part of the solution. In the absence of a coherent federal energy policy, various efforts are emerging in individual states to limit carbon dioxide emissions. These are important first steps, but consider the simplicity of a national energy policy based on a carbon tax that would maintain a level playing field in the economic environment across this country. My suspicion is that a national carbon tax will be the easiest way for the United States to participate in international efforts to curb CO2 emissions. Without any national energy policy, the United States is rapidly losing an important role in the development of solar, wind and other alternative energies, like integrated gasification combined cycle. Also known as IGCC, this technology will allow power plants to make electricity from coal while capturing the carbon dioxide emissions that might otherwise lead to global warming. A carbon tax will make such energy sources competitive across this country, and spur new high-tech industries to develop them. We need to be the world's technology leader of the 21st century, not a stubborn follower of our old inefficient ways. Paul Anderson is right: keep it simple. A tax on fossil carbon emissions is the way to go.

**Carbon tax reduces emissions and solves warming**

**Vieru ’08** – science editor for Softpedia News (Tudor, Carbon Tax Effective Against Global Warming, Softpedia, October 13th 2008,http://news.softpedia.com/news/Carbon-Tax-Effective-Against-Global-Warming-95471.shtml)

The Kyoto protocol is different from all other environment agreements that came before it, in that it not only encourages states to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, but it also commits them to this action. The convention is only applied to the years between 2008 and 2012, and its main purpose is to yearly reduce the carbon emissions of top-industrialized countries by 5 percent, in reference with the carbon levels recorded in 1990. The European Union and other 37 countries were among the first to sign, but by 2005, more than 182 other parties had already ratified the agreement. But now, U.N. official Jeffrey Sachs, director of the Earth Institute at Columbia University, says that these measures are not enough to regenerate the environment. As he sees it, implementing carbon taxes is the only viable option to help reduce pollution output at an individual level. Refineries and other mass producers of fossil fuels need to be the primary target for this tax, and not the end-users. According to official estimates, the tax will directly affect the automotive industry, the main source of carbon dioxide emissions today. While it may be a serious inconvenience to people used to traveling by car anywhere, it's the only feasible option in reducing the current amount of carbon in the atmosphere. However, it's very likely that lobby groups worldwide will oppose this initiative, as some very powerful interests are in danger of being eliminated. The U.N. nevertheless believes that the Kyoto protocol needs to be replaced with a more drastic approach to the issue of global warming.

# 2NC Solvency – Economy

**Spurs economic growth – innovation and jobs**

**Drape 6/28/12** – Australian associated press writer (Julian, Carbon tax will create green jobs: Milne, Australian News, http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/breaking-news/carbon-tax-will-create-green-jobs-milne/story-fn3dxiwe-1226411123997)

GREENS leader Christine Milne says growth in the United States and Europe is being driven by the need to move away from oil to renewable energy and the carbon tax will ensure Australia isn't left behind. The "zero-carbon economy" will provide "big opportunities", she told AAP. Renewable energy includes wind, solar, thermal and wave power. The Climate Institute estimates the carbon tax could create up to 32,000 clean-energy jobs by 2030. Senator Milne said the carbon price wouldn't have become a reality without the minor party. "The Greens made it a key component of an agreement with the Gillard government in order to give it confidence and supply," she said. The Greens sank Kevin Rudd's carbon pollution reduction scheme in the Senate in 2009. Later they extracted an additional $10 billion "green bank" for renewable and low-emissions technologies under the 2011 clean energy future package and a much tougher 80 per cent reduction target by 2050. Senator Milne insist serious action is needed because the International Energy Agency has warned the world is on track for a six-degree increase in global temperatures. "That's planetary wipe-out," the Tasmania senator said ahead of the carbon tax starting on July 1. "So the sooner we can get going on this the cheaper it will be, the more innovative it will be and the more exciting it will be." Big business has argued the $23-a-tonne starting price is too high and $10 would be more in line with permits in the European Union's emissions trading scheme (ETS).

**Carbon tax would spur economic growth and competitiveness**

**McGee ’08** – political staff writer for The Irish Times (Harry, Carbon tax linked to economic growth, September 27th, 2008, http://meatthefacts.org/pdf/Irish\_Times\_27\_Sept\_08.pdf)

THE INTRODUCTION of a carbon tax could lead to economic growth and increasing competitiveness, according to a leading thinkthank on the environment. Comhar, the sustainable development council, yesterday called on the Government to introduce a carbon tax in the budget. It said the tax should be set at €20 per tonne of CO 2 emitted (or the equivalent of about Sc per litre of petrol). The average household would pay annual taxes of €246. In its pre-budget submission, Comhar contends that if revenues from the tax were used in targeted ways the result would be a growth in GNP, an increase in employment and investment in energy-efficient technologies. This would also lead to a reduction in fuel poverty. "The council believes that any revenues raised should be used to reduce labour tax, compensate lowincome groups and promote further emissions-savings activities." It says the proposed tax is approximately the same rate as the price currently facing industry under the EU Emission Trading Scheme (ETS). Comhar's director of research Dr Lisa Ryan said the immediate introduction of a tax would serve as a price signal that the cost of carbon would have to be met. "The incentive for introducing a carbon tax has been strengthened in recent times because of the economic downturn and the revelation that Ireland's carbon emissions from transport and agriculture are going to be far higher than previously expected over the next five years. "We need to act now to make sure we can meet our climate change targets. We also need to view the introduction of a carbon tax as an opportunity to stimulate our flagging economy," she said. Elsewhere, Labour's environment spokesman Joanna Tuffy yesterday called on the Government to quickly establish a national forum on climate change. Given the alarming rise being predicted in emissions, a forum would allow everyone with a stake in the issue to contribute to a solution. "It is time for Government, the public, local government, business, industry, farmers, the energy sector, the forestry sector and others to come together to decide what we can do more of - what we can do more efficiently - in order to make real progress on our carbon emissions."

**Carbon tax is essential in economic growth**

**CTC ’12** (Carbon Tax Center, Charles Komanoff and Daniel Rosenblum launched the Carbon Tax Center (“CTC”) in January 2007 to give voice to Americans who believe that taxing emissions of carbon dioxide — the primary greenhouse gas — is imperative to reduce global warming. The two of us brought to CTC a combined six decades of experience in economics, law, public policy and social change. Though Dan has moved on, Charles remains as CTC director, while James Handley, a chemical engineer and attorney who previously worked in the private sector and for U.S. EPA, serves as our Washington D.C. rep, “Scientists and Economists” April 1st, http://www.carbontax.org/who-supports/scientists-and-economists/)

Alan Blinder, former Fed vice-chairman and Princeton Professor of Economics and Public Affairs. In “The Carbon Tax Miracle Cure,” Blinder suggested on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal (Jan. 31, 2011): [A] carbon tax… should be enacted now [but] set at zero for 2011 and 2012. After that, it would ramp up gradually… What’s critical is that we lock in higher future costs of carbon today. Once America’s entrepreneurs and corporate executives see lucrative opportunities from carbon-saving devices and technologies, they will start investing right away—and in ways that make the most economic sense… I can hardly wait to witness the outpouring of ideas it would unleash. The next Steve Jobs, Bill Gates and Mark Zuckerberg are waiting in the wings to make themselves rich by helping the environment. Jobs follow investment, and we need jobs now. Blinder recommends using carbon tax revenue to reduce the deficit and underscores the advantages of a carbon tax over other deficit reduction strategies: [E]very realistic observer knows that closing our humongous federal budget deficit will require a mix of higher taxes and lower spending as shares of GDP. Forget about value-added taxes and other new levies you may have heard about. A CO2 tax trumps them all… reducing our trade deficit, making our economy more efficient, ameliorating global warming, and showing the world that American capitalism has not lost its edge.

**Carbon tax spurs economic growth**

**OECD ’09** (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Financing Climate Change Action, Supporting Technology Transfer and

Development, November 17th 2009, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/60/1/44080723.pdf)

The private sector has the greatest potential to finance action on climate change and this can be best stimulated through the use of market-based instruments in climate policy frameworks. For example, in the “Ambitious action” scenario as presented in Table 1 of the Green Growth Interim Report, where all industrialised countries use carbon taxes or auctioned emission trading permits to achieve the high end of the pledges for the Copenhagen Accord, the size of the fiscal revenues could reach 1.5% of GDP in those countries by 2020. A share of these revenues could be used to bolster economic growth, offset reductions in other taxes (e.g. on labour), and/or to help provide financing to support mitigation and adaptation action in developing countries. A clear, credible and binding policy signal on climate change is also necessary to drive private investments in lowcarbon technologies and infrastructure (Figure 2). Investors need price signals to ensure that it is worth developing technologies for a green future. For example, OECD analysis finds that patent activity related to a range of climate change mitigation technologies shot up after the 1997 agreement on the Kyoto Protocol. Putting a price on carbon emissions, for example through taxes or cap-and-trade schemes, will penalise carbon-intensive technologies and create markets for low-carbon technologies such as solar and wind energy and carbon capture and storage in the energy and industry sectors, and accelerate investment in energy efficiency.

**Solves the economy – stimulus**

**SCC ’10** (Stop Climate Change Initiative, EU carbon tax would spur green innovation and help realise climate goals, Stop Climate Change, http://www.stopclimatechange.net/Local%20Settings/fileadmin/bali/index.php?id=26&tx\_ttnews%5Bswords%5D=industry&tx\_ttnews%5Btt\_news%5D=1218&tx\_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=40&cHash=add052d91debb2e194fcd0384f2b8ec5)

Clearly, the rate at which any carbon tax is set would be crucial to its effectiveness. If set at the right the level, a carbon tax should act as a stimulus for investing in cleaner and more efficient technologies to deliver actual emissions reductions. If it is too low, it will not. To this end it is worrying that one of the key arguments in the briefing is on the need to "harmonise" the carbon price signal in sectors not covered by the emissions trading scheme, with those in the emissions trading scheme. The current carbon price (c. €15/tonne) is proving far too low. As a result, it is cheaper for industries to buy additional emissions permits, rather than investing in cleaner and more efficient technologies that would deliver actual emissions reductions. If the starting rate for a carbon tax is based on the current carbon price it will be ineffective as a stimulus, it should therefore be set at a higher level. The recent communication from the Commission suggests that a carbon price of €30 per tonne of CO2 would be necessary if the EU were to deliver a 30% emissions reduction target by 2020. A number of EU governments already assume a shadow carbon price of over €40 per tonne of CO2 for 2020 - for example €42/tonne in the UK. However, achieving ambitious climate targets, in line with what the science demands, would probably require a higher rate: certainly more than €50/tonne of CO2 by 2020 (in the French debate on a carbon tax, experts estimated a price of €66/tonne). Another problem with the Commission's logic is its assumption that a carbon tax should only apply to sectors outside of the emissions trading scheme - in order to harmonise ETS and non-ETS sectors. There is no reason why a carbon tax shouldn't be applied to all economic sectors. If the goal is to stimulate green innovation and investment in low carbon technology, a carbon tax could be used as a complement in ETS sectors as well. As noted above, the current carbon price is far too low to act as a stimulus. Even if the EU succeeds in increasing its 2020 emissions reduction target (to a 30% EU target, which would imply a 36% reduction for ETS sectors), it is not clear that this will lead to a carbon price sufficient to stimulate investment in cleaner technologies due to other imbalances in the ETS (such as the banking of surplus permits - EUAs - and external emissions permits - CERs from the first two phases of the ETS). A carbon tax could help redress this.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**Carbon tax is bipartisan**

**Romm ’12** - Senior Fellow at American Progress, editor of climate progress, and holds a Ph.D. in physics from MIT (Joe, Bipartisan Support Grows for Carbon Price as Part of Debt Deal, Climate Progress, February 24th, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/24/431830/bipartisan-support-carbon-price-debt-deal/)

At the end of this year, the United States will confront a trifecta of difficult fiscal challenges: The Bush tax cuts will be set to expire; the defense budget and spending on civilian programs will face a $110 billion sequester; and a new extension of the federal debt limit will be looming. At the same time, the evidence will be clearer than ever that urgent action is needed to protect our nation and the world from irreversible climate change. The overwhelming scientific consensus will have grown even stronger. And if 2011 is a harbinger of our future, record-breaking droughts and storms will have again afflicted our nation — at immense cost in lives and property damage. These fiscal and environmental problems may appear unrelated. But as a bipartisan group of current and former members of Congress, we want to propose a new idea: These seemingly intractable challenges are easier to address together than separately…. If budgeting is ultimately about choices, enacting a policy that reduces dangerous air pollution while providing hundreds of billions of dollars in debt relief should be a no-brainer. No other policy would do as much for our economy, our security and our future as putting a price on carbon. That’s the opening of a bipartisan Washington Post op-ed on how a price on carbon could immediately help America address two of its biggest long-term problems, global warming and the national debt. The authors: Democrats Henry A. Waxman and Edward J. Markey represent California’s 30th District and Massachusetts’s 7th District, respectively, in the House of Representatives. Republicans Sherwood Boehlert and Wayne Gilchrest formerly represented New York and Maryland districts, respectively, in the House. As I first reported last May, a “high and rising price for carbon pollution has emerged as a credible deficit reduction strategy.” Then in July, I pointed out, ”The only plausible scenario now for seriously addressing US greenhouse gas emissions in a way that would enable a global deal and give us some chance of averting catastrophic multiple, simultaneous climate impacts is for a serious carbon price to be part of the post-2012-election budget deal.” Now 4 members of Congress, 2 Ds and 2 Rs, have stated the obvious: Since higher revenues must be part of any grand bargain to address the debt, a price on pollution makes the most sense. And yes, Yes, I’m aware the two Republicans ain’t in Congress any more. Ya gotta start somewhere! Here is more of their argument: The best approach would be to use a market mechanism such as the sale of carbon allowances or a fee on carbon pollution to lower emissions and increase revenue. Using these policies, the United States could raise $200 billion or more over 10 years and trillions of dollars by 2050 while cutting carbon emissions by 17 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050, providing transition assistance to affected industries, and supporting investments in clean-energy technologies. Such a policy would have enormous benefits beyond its fiscal contributions. As the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences concluded last year, “The risks associated with doing business as usual are a much greater concern than the risks associated with engaging in strong response efforts.” Inaction on climate means more intense and frequent heat waves, more droughts, more flooding and more loss of coastline. Delaying action just until the end of the decade will quadruple costs to the global economy, according to the International Energy Agency.

**Republicans and Democrats support a carbon tax**

**Pethokoukis ’10** - Money & Politics columnist-blogger for the American Enterprise Institute (James, BP oil spill may fuel drive for carbon tax, June 3rd, 2010, Tax News, http://www.taxrates.cc/html/1006-carbon-tax.html)

Enter the carbon tax. One advantage is the possibility of significant Republican backing. It already has a smattering of support in Congress and from noted conservative intellectuals such as economists Arthur Laffer and Gregory Mankiw. Then there's its double dividend. First, a tax reduces emissions by creating a clear and certain price less subject to potential gaming by business. The downside is that it, like cap-and-trade, could also lower economic growth and employment by a "modest amount," according to the Congressional Budget Office. But a carbon tax can also be pro-growth. A US$100-per-ton levy would boost gas prices by US$1 a gallon (while also making coal and natural gas pricier) and eventually generate US$500-billion a year in new government revenue. Payroll or corporate taxes could then be lowered by an equal amount. On paper, this would be revenue neutral. But in reality it would amount to subbing a new tax on something Americans don't really want (carbon pollution) for old taxes on something it does want (work and investment.) Even a starter tax of US$15 a ton could allow a 30% cut in corporate taxes or a 10% reduction in payroll taxes. The result could be higher economic growth, which also leads to higher tax revenue. In 2011, U.S. President Barack Obama will likely face a far more Republican Congress. Joint agreement on a carbon tax today would salvage some political -- if not environmental and economic -- good from the catastrophe in the Gulf.

**Carbon tax generates political capital**

**Gallegher et. al ’07** - Associate Professor of Energy and Environmental Policy at The Fletcher School, Tufts University. Gustavo Collantes, Senior Energy Advisor, State of Washington. Henry Lee, Director, Environment and Natural Resources Program; Lecturer in Public Policy, Harvard Kennedy School. John P. Holdren, senior advisor to President Barack Obama on science and technology issues Robert Frosch, American scientist, was the fifth Administrator of NASA from 1977–1981 during the Carter administration. (Kelly Sims, Policy Options for Reducing Oil Consumption and Greenhouse-Gas Emissions from the U. S. Transportation Sector, Harvard - Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, July 27th, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/policy\_options\_oil\_climate\_transport\_final.pdf)

Other advantages related to the revenues from carbon taxes are that they could be used to create political capital and that they help to reduce the costs of the overall policy. Goulder (1995) showed that when carbon tax revenues are used to finance costs in distortionary taxes (such as income taxes), the overall policy costs are significantly reduced. Carbon tax revenues could be used to provide income tax relief to the American tax payer, to buttress social welfare programs such as social security, to help U.S.-based industry and workers to make the transition to a lower-carbon industry, to support research, development, demonstration, and deployment of low-carbon technologies, and to support public transportation. The allocation of tax revenues is, of course, ultimately Congress’s decision. The potential tax revenue would be dependent on the level of the tax imposed, but for illustrative purposes, a 50 cent tax on gasoline and diesel would generate approximately $90 billion in the first year. 50

# Aff - Links to Politics

**Links to politics – climate debate is politicized and unpopular**

**Freedman ’11** – senior science writer for Climate Central (Andrew, Congress turns a blind eye to climate science, Washington Post, April 12th, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/capital-weather-gang/post/congress-turns-a-blind-eye-to-climate-science/2011/04/12/AFxAqQQD\_blog.html)

Last week was a bewildering one for those who recognize the abundance of compelling scientific evidence showing that the climate is changing mainly due to human activities and that these changes pose risks to human health and welfare. While the news cycle was dominated by the down-to-the-wire budget negotiations in Washington, ongoing unrest in the Middle East, the nuclear crisis in Japan, a major congressional debate on climate change regulations took place in the House (and Senate) that vividly demonstrated how far off the rails we’ve gone in public discourse of climate science and policy. Let me state right off the bat that I tend to shy away from directly discussing politics in this column, instead sticking to scientific developments in the sprawling and fascinating field of climate research. At the same time, I recognize that climate science has become so politicized that it’s impossible to steer clear of politics entirely. This is understandable considering that many of the potential solutions to climate change could involve major policy changes, from federal regulations of emissions from cars, trucks, and power plants to a carbon tax on gasoline. The controversy surrounding the science is largely a front for concerns over potential regulation, as is vividly demonstrated in the book, “Merchants of Doubt”, by Naomi Oreskes and Eric Conway. With the passage on April 6 of a bill that would stop the U.S. EPA’s regulations of greenhouse gases from moving forward, the House of Representatives signaled in crystal clear legislative language that it flat out does not believe that manmade climate change is a real phenomenon that poses risks to Americans’ health and welfare. I say this because, during the debate on the EPA measure (which failed in the Senate and was not attached to the 11th hour budget agreement), the House held a separate vote on an amendment which for the first time put all Members on record about whether they agree with the scientific evidence showing that the global climate is warming, and this warming is likely due in part to human activities. This vote was as close to a climate science litmus test as you’re ever going to get.

**Public opposition to a carbon tax**

**AAP 7/2/12** (Australian Associated Press, Poll shows voters against carbon tax, The Australian News, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/breaking-news/poll-shows-voters-against-carbon-tax/story-fn3dxiwe-1226413943977>)

THE latest Fairfax/Nielsen poll shows the stand against the carbon tax by Opposition Leader Tony Abbott, which came into force on Sunday, is resonating with voters. The poll shows opposition to the tax has risen three points to 62 per cent, while support is down four points in a month, according to the poll of 1400 people taken from Thursday to Saturday. It found that 51 per cent of people believe they will be worse off under the carbon tax, which is up one point from a month ago. Amid controversies over the carbon tax and asylum seekers, the coalition has slightly widened its two-party lead to 58 per cent to 42 per cent. Labor's primary vote is up two points, but is wallowing at 28 per cent, while the coalition's primary vote is steady on 48 per cent. The approval rating for Prime Minister Julia Gillard eased one point to 35 per cent while Mr Abbott's approval is steady at 39 per cent. Both leaders were in Melbourne on Sunday campaigning on the new tax.

**Political opposition to the carbon tax**

**FR ’11** (Financial Review, Carbon tax opposition grows: Newspoll, October 25th, 2011, http://afr.com/p/national/politics/carbon\_tax\_opposition\_grows\_newspoll\_V8xXlLg7uskJw7KQbMZH8O)

There is growing opposition to the carbon tax after the House of Representatives passed bills for the scheme, a Newspoll has found. Opposition to the tax has jumped six percentage points to 59 per cent, the poll commissioned by The Australian has found. Support for the tax has fallen four points to 32 per cent. But it's not all bad news for Labor, with the poll showing there was a four-point drop in the coalition's primary vote to 45 per cent, the lowest since May this year. The Greens climbed back to a record 15 per cent primary vote support, rising three points. Prime Minister Julia Gillard's personal satisfaction with voters rose three percentage points to 31 per cent. Opposition Leader Tony Abbott's rating was down from 36 per cent to 34 per cent. However, Mr Abbott still maintained the lead as preferred prime minister at 39 per cent compared to Ms Gillard's 36 per cent. Newspoll chief Martin O’Shannessy says Labor’s primary vote is stuck on 29 per cent, unchanged from two weeks ago while the coalition’s loss of support had mostly gone to the Greens. Ms Gillard might take heart from the improvement in her approval rating, he said. But continuing opposition to the carbon tax made it hard to accept the government’s view that the passage of its legislation through parliament would improve Labor’s position. “We have been tracking this now for a while. Back in April-May it was 60, in July 59,” Mr O’Shannessy told ABC Radio. The latest Newspoll has opposition to the carbon tax still at 59 per cent.

# Aff - Doesn’t Solve Warming/Econ

**Carbon tax doesn’t solve warming or the economy**

**AN 7/4/12** (Adelaide Now, Bolt: Tax won't stop climate change, http://www.adelaidenow.com.au/ipad/bolt-tax-wont-stop-climate-change/story-fn6br25t-1226417186940)

We've had the Government foist on us a carbon dioxide tax it promised we'd never get - a tax opposed by two-thirds of Australians. Moreover, it's a tax that will kill jobs, threaten power supplies and raise bills - all to stop a global warming that paused a decade ago. It's a tax that would make such little difference to the temperature anyway that not one Government member dares say how much or, to be more accurate, how immeasurably little. So plenty of questions for a serious government to answer - about democracy, mandates, mass hysteria, jobs and useless gestures. So how does Treasurer Wayne Swan answer them this week? By waving a leg of lamb in the air, marvelling it didn't instantly go up in price. How did Minister of State Gary Gray respond? By interviewing his mum and laughing about Whyalla, a steel town, not vanishing from the map overnight. And Trade Minister Craig Emerson? Well, as newspapers in even Rome and London have noted to their astonishment, he arranged for an ABC crew to film him dancing and singing a song about horror movies and Whyalla. I felt insulted. Dirty. Serious questions are being answered by fools who clearly assume we're even bigger ones. How did we get to this? How is it that senior ministers now believe the most stupid stunts and palpable spin are substitutes for clear argument and frank information? Several things have come together to produce this tsunami of mediocrity and mendacity. First, the Government is actually selling rubbish, and it's impossible to make people buy trash without telling lies. Second, the fragmenting media and the yammering competition for attention means the first challenge for a politician today is not to be persuasive but simply noticed. So we've seen a Treasurer (Peter Costello) dance a macarena on television, another Liberal frontbencher (Joe Hockey) mince with a tutu, a senator (Steve Fielding) dress as a beer bottle and a prime minister (Kevin Rudd) summon 1000 prominent Australians to Canberra simply to provide him with a glittering prop. Third, there's a renewed tribalisation that leads to people talking more to their own, even in politics, and losing the ability to see themselves through the eyes of wary others. How else to explain the sheer unknowningness of Prime Minister Julia Gillard's big speech yesterday, in which she could warn of "real and urgent threats from climate change" such as "rising sea levels", "worse bushfire conditions", "droughts" and "extreme heat", but then say of sceptics: "In the end, the doomsayers always have to admit they were wrong". Er, Prime Minister: that's my line. And, fourth, we're slaves in this Age of Sentiment to a new culture of identity politics, in which seeming trumps doing.

# ---Plank CP

# 1NC Shell

**The United States federal government should:**

* **fund basic research on the mechanisms and processes by which chemicals produced in water may have impacts on the biological community**
* **Establish a zero tolerance policy for oil spills**
* **Establish clear responsibilities for government agencies that handle oil spills**
* **Require that all offshore oil rigs carry independent trained observers to monitor activities in offshore exploration and production**

**Prevents oil spills**

**Montevecchi ’11** – Doctorate, University Research Professor, Memorial University of Newfoundland. Contributions from Sierra club. (Bill, 2011 PROVINCIAL ELECTION - NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS, August 29th, 2011, NLEN, http://www.nlen.ca/wp-content/uploads//Environmental-Policy-Recommendations-August-29-2011.pdf)

Issue: Lack of oversight on the environmental impacts of the offshore oil sector. Policy recommendations to strengthen oversight of the environmental impacts of the offshore oil sector: 1. Implement recommendations from the Report of the Terra Nova Development Project Environmental Assessment Panel (1997), specifically: a. Operators of offshore oil projects fund basic research such as Department of Fisheries and Oceans research on the mechanisms and processes by which chemicals produced in the water may have impacts on the biological community. b. Establish a zero tolerance policy for oil spills. c. Establish clear responsibilities for government agencies that deal with and handle oil spills. d. Require that all offshore oil rigs carry independent trained observers to monitor activities in offshore exploration and production. 2. Establish a robust protocol for seabird surveys by independent observers of all offshore platforms.

**Key to solve problems that cause oil spills**

**Carter and Fraser ’11** - Political Science & Environmental Studies, Grenfell Campus, Memorial University and Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University (AV, and GS, A Framework for Effective Environmental Regulation in Newfoundland and Labrador’s  Offshore Oil and Gas Sector: Applying Lessons from the Offshore Helicopter Safety Inquiry , January 20th, http://www.swgc.mun.ca/epi/Documents/Offshore%20Environmental%20Authority%20Recommendation.pdf)

In October 2010, an independent assessment of offshore helicopter safety under the jurisdiction of the  Canada‐Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore PetroleumBoard (C‐NLOPB) was released. 1   In this report,  Honourable Robert Wells recommends a Safety Authority, which would be independent from the C‐NLOPB, to  oversee worker safety in the offshore sector.  This recommendation was needed owing to several problems  within the current regulatory system deemed inadequate for ensuring the protection of workers.  Problems  with the safety aspects of the regulations are paralleled by problems in the environmental regulatory system:   1) Lack of safety staff. Only a single individual acts as the Chief Safety Officer with the enormous  responsibility of determining if operations should be shut down when safety is at risk.  This position  lacks the “stature” and “organizational strength” to address safety issues in the new era of offshore oil  development (Wells 2010, pg 278). This problem will be exacerbated by the C‐NLOPB’s switch to a new  performance‐based regulatory approach that will require significant new staffing capacity to ensure  compliance with safety standards. 2) Lack of autonomous safety staff.  The Chief Safety Officer is an employee of the C‐NLOPB which could  place the person in a conflict of interest. It may also risk he or she experiencing “regulatory capture”,  where individuals in the regulatory role are compromised due to close working relationships with  industry. A “completely autonomous” safety authority is therefore recommended (Wells, pg 276‐277). 3) Lack of transparency regarding Board decisions. Wells notes that “very little information is  disseminated […] about the decisions it undertakes, the plans and activities of the operators […] or the  audits it conducts to verify compliance” (Wells, pg 71).

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**Oil spill bills have bipartisan support – empirics**

**Kennedy ’11** – Washington Policy Manager, writer for Surfrider Foundation Washington (Jody, Oil spill bill passed the House with bipartisan support, SFW, March 1st, 2011, http://surfriderwashingtonpolicy.blogspot.com/2011/03/oil-spill-bill-passed-house-with.html)

HB 1186 to strengthen Washington's oil spills program passed out of the House by a vote of 62-35. Huge thanks to legislators championing this bill and to everyone who contacted their representatives and asked for their support. Now the bill is in the Senate and again, we will need your help to let Senators know how important this bill is for Washington's marine waters. Sponsored by Rep. Christine Rolfes, from Bainbridge Island, HB 1186 bill will: • Improve funding for the Department’s Oil Spill Program, which is currently running a multi-million dollar deficit. • Strengthen requirements for stockpiling appropriate spills response equipment to ensure that we are ready for a large spill in Puget Sound and on the coast. • Expand spill response “drill” program to test assumptions made in our spill response plans and to better train responders. • Train, equip, and drill commercial fishermen for oils spill response to increase the region’s response capacities.

**Bipartisanship to prevent oil spills**

**McGowan ’11** – writer for Inside Climate news (Elizabeth, Oil Spills Inspire Bipartisan Surprise on Federal Pipeline Safety Reforms, ICN, August 12th, http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20110812/oil-spills-bipartisan-surprise-improving-pipeline-safety-regulations-keystone-xl-bitumen-oil-sands)

WASHINGTON—A series of headline-grabbing ruptures along the nation's 2.5 million-mile network of oil and gas pipelines is prompting a rare attempt at bipartisanship. Democrats and Republicans seem equally intent on significantly beefing up the pipeline safety standards that might have prevented some of these spills. The timing of the legislation they're considering is especially vital because the State Department is in the midst of deciding whether a Canadian company should be allowed to expand its U.S. presence by building a $7 billion pipeline through the Ogallala Aquifer and other fragile landscapes in the nation's heartland.

# Aff - Links to Politics

**Oil spill policies are partisan**

**DiPeso ’10** - vice president for policy and communications at Republicans for Environmental Protection (Jim, GOP Response to Gulf Spill a Model of Incoherence, The Daily Green, june 21st, 2010, http://www.thedailygreen.com/environmental-news/blogs/republican/bp-oil-spill-republican-response-0618)

Like a chorus of vuvuzelas, Republican commentary on the Gulf of Mexico oil spill is a din that could win the World Culp for incoherent messaging if there were such a trophy. Obama should do more. Obama should do less. The feds should crack down on BP. The feds should ease off on BP. Fix the problems that caused the blowout in mile-deep water. Keep drilling in mile-deep water. Joe Barton (right) apologizes to BP, then apologizes for the apology, which was too much even for ultra-partisan John Boehner, the GOP's top banana in the House. Michele Bachmann calls the $20 billion compensation escrow agreed to by BP a "redistribution-of-wealth" fund, as if requiring restitution for damage was the brainchild of a Marxist cabal. Sarah Palin demanded that the feds call in the Dutch. To build a dike. Or something. Somewhere. Whatever. Partisan Democrats are rollicking in the aisles at the Republicans' rhetorical fishtailing, but it doesn't serve the public interest for the elephants to shoot themselves in the foot with such alacrity. Because the Obama administration's response to the spill and its hesitant approach to recasting the nation's energy economy should be subject to critical scrutiny by a loyal opposition that has its act together. As a New York Times article disclosed this past week, county commissioners, mayors, and other local officials whose communities are threatened by the black tide are frustrated by an opaque, shamboling federal bureaucracy that supposedly is running the spilll response. Red tape is confusing lines of authority. Plans for protecting marshes and beaches are second-guessed or don't happen at all. Calls for information or help disappear into voice mail vortices. A Republican opposition that had its act together could usefully call attention to such deficiencies and put heat on the administration to fix them. A Republican opposition that had a more thoughtful energy policy than "drill, baby, drill" could credibly offer promising ideas for throttling back U.S. oil dependence, a strategic, economic, and environmental liability that will only worsen if business continues as usual. That would mean putting good governance ahead of election-year politics. In today's world, unfortunately, that might be too much to ask.

**GOP opposition – economic incentives**

**Davenport ’10** – energy and environment correspondent for the National Journal (Coral, Spill bills highlight Republican opposition, Politico, August 28th, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/40316.html>)

House and Senate Democratic leaders Tuesday rolled out their big “spill bills” — the main legislative responses to the Gulf oil spill. The proposals are packed with aggressive offshore drilling reforms that Republicans have long fought and were immediately met with fierce pushback from the GOP and the oil industry. That could make it tough to get the bills passed, especially in the Senate, where a handful of oil-state Democrats may cross the aisle to vote against the package. But strategists say the Republican “no” votes will also benefit Democrats politically — and some Republicans say that’s why the so-called poison pill provisions were included. “If, after the worst oil spill in the history of the country, Republicans were to vote no against new offshore drilling protections — can you imagine the ads?” asked one senior Democratic aide. Campaign strategists certainly can. “Republicans have found themselves on the defensive on that issue, and they are sitting on piles of big oil contributions,” said a Democratic strategist. “Absolutely, this is something we will be playing up before Election Day.”

**Partisanship over oil spill legislation**

**Efstathiou ’10** – writer for Bloomberg news (Jim, Oil Companies Face Unlimited Spill Liability In Bill Passed By U.S. House, Bloomberg, July 31st, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-07-30/house-to-vote-on-lifting-obama-s-deep-water-drilling-ban-in-wake-of-spill.html)

Oil companies drilling in U.S. waters would face unlimited liability and BP Plc would be barred from new offshore leases under legislation passed by the House three months after the worst spill in U.S. history. House Democrats on a 209-193 vote yesterday pushed through the overhaul of drilling safety and environmental rules over Republican opposition. The bill also puts into law the Obama administration’s elimination of the Minerals Management Service, the Interior Department agency cited for lax oversight. Ships assist in clean up and containment near the source of the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Photographer: Chris Graythen/Getty Images Gulf Coast lawmakers and oil-industry officials say lifting the liability cap will hurt companies, and Republicans say the measure would make the U.S. more dependent on imports. The Senate may act on its version of oil-spill legislation next week. “The House bill passed today will kill jobs, threaten our fragile economic recovery and place our energy security at risk,” Jack Gerard, president of the Washington-based American Petroleum Institute, said in a statement after yesterday’s vote. “The unlimited liability provisions will drive the vast majority of American companies out of U.S. waters because they will not be able to obtain insurance coverage.”

# \*\*\*Rare Earth Elements CP

(this will probably have some sort of spending net benefit)

# 1NC Shell

**Text: The United States federal government should enact into law House Resolution 2011, Senate Bill 1113, and Senate Bill 383. The United States federal government should provide assistance only through regulation changes.**

**Counterplan solves REE shortages**

**Montgomery 2011 –** Contributor for Research Investing News (Michael, June 27th, “The Rare Earth Debate Continues in Congress,” <http://resourceinvestingnews.com/18381-the-rare-earth-debate-continues-in-congress.html>)

Recognizing this problem, multiple US representatives have put fourth legislation in the US congress aimed at the creation of a domestic critical metals supply chain. The various bills, ‘H.R. 2011’sponsored by Doug Lamborn (R-CO), ‘S.1113’ sponsored by Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), and ‘S.383‘ sponsored by Mark Udall (D-CO), aim to fill the supply shortage of rare earth elements and other metals deemed critical to maintaining economic and national security. Policy Directives The policy directives of the bills call upon the government to assess critical metal resources in the United States, while forecasting supply chain trends. Senator Murkowski’s bill, ‘S.1113: Critical Mineral Policy Act of 2011,’ requires that the government “identifies and quantifies known critical mineral resources, using all available public and private information… provides a quantitative and qualitative assessment of undiscovered critical mineral resources throughout the United States.” The main obstacle to mining firms in the US is a long and complex permitting process that often takes ten years to accomplish. The ability of the mining companies to react to shifts in the commodity cycle and demands from new technology is hampered by the permitting process. Murkowski’s bill addresses the need to change permitting regulations, ”to encourage Federal agencies to facilitate the availability, development, and environmentally responsible production of domestic resources to meet national critical minerals needs; to minimize duplication, needless paperwork, and delays in the administration of applicable laws (including regulations) and the issuance of permits.” The permitting process often puts US mining projects at a serious disadvantage. “If commodity cycles are historically 20 years in duration, the 10 years it takes to obtain permits leaves U.S. mining still in the starting blocks with the race half way over,” stated Hal Quinn, CEO of the National Mining Association. The permitting process is underscored by the inability of firms to gain access to federally protected lands. Representative Lamborn’s ‘H.R. 2011’ requires the Secretary of the Interior to assess lands open to development and the supply and demand of the nation’s critical metal needs. “We don’t know which federal lands are open for mineral development. We also lack a decent assessment of the permitting timelines for projects on federal lands,” stated Lamborn, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources. Rare Earth Metals RecyclingThe other main policy objective of the legislations deals with the recycling of critical metals, including rare earth elements. This follows a trend towards finding economically viable methods to recycle rare earth worldwide. Until the recent price eruption, the high cost of recycling the metals was a prohibitive factor. Testifying before congress, Mark Caffferty, Executive VP of Umicore USA Inc. stated the importance of recycling rare earth metals and how the bills “call upon the Department of Energy to launch programs in the recycling of critical materials… The focus on research and development [...] will be especially important in the subset of critical materials known as the “rare earths.” There is a potential for recycling to fill part of the supply gap of rare earths. Many companies are working to develop the technology to achieve economically viable recycling methods. Umicore recently announced their partnership with Rhodia, a French rare earth processor. The companies have developed a way to separate rare earth from common batteries as well as those used on the Toyota Prius. “This is the first industrial process that closes the loop of the rare earths contained in NiMH batteries,” stated Sybolt Brouwer, General Manager Battery Recycling and Recycling Development for Umicore. The bills that are in front of congress are still in the beginning of the legislative process. They do, however, represent a first step for the creation of a domestic rare earth and critical metal supply chain. If passed, the bills will provide federal assistance through regulation changes and loan guarantees that will give US rare earth companies a leg up on the competition.

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**Rare earth minerals aren’t rare- the industry just needs to be developed**

**Homans 2010** -a special correspondent for The New Republic (Charles, June 15, “Are rare earth elements actually rare” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/06/15/are_rare_earth_minerals_actually_rare>)

Not really. The term "rare earth" is an archaic one, dating back to the elements' discovery by a Swedish army lieutenant in 1787. In fact, most (though not all) of the 15 (or 16, or 17, depending on which scientist you're talking to) elements are fairly common; several of them are more abundant in the Earth's crust than lead or nitrogen. The flints in cigarette lighters are made out of rare earths, and they've been used in incandescent gas lamps for more than a century. The stuff has been mined everywhere from Sweden to Southeast Asia to the American West. Even Afghanistan apparently has some. Today, however, rare-earth mining is almost nonexistent outside China, which came to dominate the market in the 1980s and '90s by cutting world prices and now controls as much as 97 percent of the supply of some of the elements. The United States' only major rare-earth mine, a complex in Mountain Pass, California, that was once the world's leading producer of the minerals, shut down in 2002. But the limited supply of the minerals in the marketplace is the result of economics and environmental concerns, not scarcity. Even with iPads flying off the shelves and high-end electric cars on showroom floors, the world consumes only a tiny amount of rare earth -- about 130,000 metric tons of it a year, or just over a tenth of the amount of copper produced last February alone. Market forecasters expect the global trade in rare earths to reach $2 billion to $3 billion by 2014, but even that amounts to barely 1 percent of today's iron market. And rare earth elements aren't actually worth very much at the mine -- most of their market value is added in the refining process.

**US has enough reserves**

**Bourzac 2010** – science journalist (Katherine, October 29th, “Can the U.S. Rare-Earth Industry Rebound?”, <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/421472/can-the-us-rare-earth-industry-rebound/>,)

China is not the only country with significant reserves of these valuable materials; in fact, the U.S. was their primary producer until the 1990s, when the Chinese began undercutting the Americans on cost. Now companies in the U.S. and Australia are ramping up production at two rich sites for rare earths, but the process will take years. Getting from rocks to the pure metals and alloys required for manufacturing requires several steps that U.S. companies no longer have the infrastructure or the intellectual property to perform. Contrary to their name, rare-earth metals are abundant in the Earth's crust, and significant reserves are concentrated in the United States, Australia, Brazil, and other countries. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, there are 13 million tons of extractable rare earths in the United States, 5.4 million in Australia, and 19 million in Russia and neighboring countries. In 2009, China had 36 million.

# 2NC – Domestic Mining Solves

**Domestic production ramp-up breaks Chinese monopoly**

**Worstall 2010 -** Fellow, Adam Smith Institute. (Tim, September 29th, “You Don't Bring a Praseodymium Knife to a Gunfight” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/09/29/you-dont-bring-a-praseodymium-knife-to-a-gunfight?page=full>)

But the truth is that though most of the rare earths, both metals and oxides, do come from China, this isn't the same at all as having a monopoly that is sustainable -- as Beijing is about to find out in a fairly painful manner. Now that the specter of a monopoly being exercised for political ends has been raised, there will be sufficient political will to break that monopoly. Two important facts about rare earths help explain why: They're not earths, and they're not rare. China has reached its dominant supplier position through good old-fashioned industrial aggression, not innate geographical superiority. Cheap labor, little environmental scrutiny, and a willingness to sell at low cost have made other producers give up. For competitors, like the owners of Mountain Pass, a California mine that shut down in 2002 partly due to the China factor, that has been a daunting combination. For the rest of us, it has been fantastic: Affordable rare earths have helped power the information-technology revolution, driving down the cost of everything from hybrid cars to smart bombs. But the non-rarity of the rare earths themselves means that China's position isn't sustainable. That California mine, for instance, could potentially supply 20 percent of world demand,currently around 130,000 tons a year. Another facility, Lynas Corp.'s Mount Weld in Australia, has the capacity to produce a similar amount. In fact, there are enough rare earths in the millions of tons of sands we already process for titanium dioxide (used to make white paint) to fill the gap, while we throw away 30,000 tons a year or so in the wastes of the aluminum industry. There's that much or more in what we don't bother to collect from the mining of phosphates for fertilizers, and no one has even bothered to measure how much there is in the waste from burning coal. If rare earths are so precious, why isn't the United States working harder to collect them? The main reason is that, for these last 25 years, China has been supplying all we could eat at prices we were more than happy to pay. If Beijing wants to raise its prices and start using supplies as geopolitical bargaining chips, so what? The rest of the world will simply roll up its sleeves and ramp up production, and the monopoly will be broken.

**Molycorp proves that domestic mining solves**

**Bourzac 2010** – science journalist (Katherine, December 22nd, “Undermining China's Monopoly on Rare Earth Elements”, <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/422187/undermining-chinas-monopoly-on-rare-earth/>)

Molycorp has secured the permits and funding needed to restart production at a mine in Mountain Pass, California, that would become the first U.S. source of rare earth elements in more than a decade. The mine is one of the world's richest deposits of these elements, which are critical for making components found in a wide range of technologies. On Tuesday, the company announced that it will partner with Hitachi Metals of Japan to turn materials from the mine into high-strength magnets, which are vital in electric vehicles, wind turbines, and many other products. China currently has a lock on the market for rare earth materials: in 2009 it provided 95 percent of the world's supply, or 120,000 tons. This concentration of supply has become a major issue in recent months, particularly after China temporarily blocked exports of these materials to Japan in September. A Critical Materials Strategy document issued by the U.S. Department of Energy last week points to the "risk of supply disruption" in the short term. Worldwide demand for rare earth elements was 125,000 tons in 2010 and is expected to rise to 225,000 tons by 2015. The mine is a 50-acre open pit about 50 miles outside Las Vegas, surrounded by a stark landscape of red-brown mountains, Joshua trees, and the occasional cactus. Molycorp has begun draining groundwater that seeps into the bottom of the pit and removing areas of rock called "overburden" to expose a layer of bastnäsite, a mineral rich in rare earth elements. Expansion of operations will push the mine from a depth of 500 feet to 1,000 feet in the coming years. By 2012, the revamped U.S. mine is expected to produce around 20,000 tons of rare earth materials per year. Molycorp plans to use new processing techniques that it claims are more environmentally friendly and less expensive than conventional methods. The Mountain Pass mine used to be the world's biggest supplier of rare earth elements, but it closed in 2004, after a 1998 wastewater leak and the arrival of Chinese suppliers that offered lower prices. (One reason for the lower prices is that nearly half the rare earths produced in China are made as a by-product of iron mining.) Molycorp expects to sell about 3,000 tons of rare earths this year, produced from ore stockpiled before the mine was closed. It is also gearing up for active mining, with financial support from an initial public offering this summer and recent investment from Japanese firm Sumimoto. The company's total projected production could meet the current demand for rare earths in the United States. Molycorp has not disclosed who its customers will be, but CEO Mark Smith said on a tour of the mine last week that it has inked contracts to sell 25 percent of the 20,000 tons of material it expects to produce during the first year of full-scale operations, in 2012, and has letters of intent to sell the rest. "We're focused on the U.S., Japanese, and European markets," he said.

# \*\*\*Russian Economy

# 1NC Shell

**The United States federal government should invest $50 million in aid to Russia in order to promote democracy and civil society.**

**CP spurs Russia’s economy – jumpstarts the private sector**

**Herszenhorn ’12** –journalist for the New York Times (David M, U.S. Seeking Use of Funds to Aid Russian Democracy, NYT, March 15th, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/world/europe/to-aid-russian-democracy-us-seeking-use-of-funds.html)

MOSCOW — The Obama administration is pushing to free $50 million in long-stalled aid to promote democracy and civil society in Russia, an effort that comes amid a drumbeat of accusations that the United States is meddling in Russia’s internal politics. Related For the most part, the investments turned out to be profitable and the money was reinvested. In recent years some of the proceeds were returned to the Treasury, while some money has been redirected to create foundations that provide foreign aid. Plans to redirect the $50 million back to Russia have been in the works for more than a year. But in December, Prime Minister Vladimir V. Putin accused American officials of trying to stoke unrest in Russia, and conspiracy rumors about the money have swirled ever since. The United States ambassador to Russia, Michael A. McFaul, drew new attention to the money this week in Washington, where he is working to persuade Congress to lift cold war-era trade restrictions ahead of Russia’s formal entry into the World Trade Organization. In a speech to the Peter G. Peterson Institute for International Economics, Mr. McFaul said the money would be used as part of an effort by the United States “to advance rule of law, to advance accountable government and to strengthen civil society.” But his comments drew groans in some quarters for fear of further accusations of American interference in Russian affairs. “It’s very easy to present this as a kind of subversive activity,” said Sergei S. Mitrokhin, the leader of Yabloko, a liberal, pro-Western political party. “People believe these accusations,” Mr. Mitrokhin said in an interview. “Public opinion can easily be set against the civil activists.” He added, “Unfortunately, yes, this initiative would rather harm civil society and the opposition in Russia more than it would help.” But others said the money would be welcome. “We are forced to exist on foreign money,” Lyudmila Alekseyeva, the head of the Moscow Helsinki Group, told the Interfax News Agency on Tuesday. “Our government does not consider it necessary to spend money on maintaining the nongovernmental human rights community.” The “enterprise funds” that invested American tax dollars in the former communist bloc were created during the administration of the elder President George Bush and first approved by Congress in 1989 in legislation that was called the Supporting Eastern European Democracy Act, also known as the SEED Act. Paige Alexander, the assistant administrator for Europe and Eurasia at the United States Agency for International Development, said that 10 funds, including the U.S.-Russia Investment Fund, had generated $2.3 billion in investments in local businesses. “We view the U.S.-Russia Investment Fund’s liquidation proceeds as an essential resource to continue having an impact on private sector development throughout the country while also having a positive effect on Russian civil society,” Ms. Alexander said. “Last spring we decided to consult with Congress to see if we could break the nearly five-year-old impasse.” She added, “These frozen funds present a unique opportunity.” Mr. McFaul pointed to the money as evidence that the government was working to address human rights concerns in Russia, in hopes that Congress will not use political worries to delay lifting the cold war trade restrictions. Asked about allegations that he and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton were working to sow unrest in Russia, Mr. McFaul said that he was using Facebook and Twitter among other tools to conduct “public diplomacy.” “Our strategy for dealing with that is to engage as directly and as smartly and as comprehensively as possible,” he said. “We don’t have anything to hide in terms of what we are trying to do.”

# 2NC Solvency – Political Stability

**Democratization would bolster Russian stability**

**Nichol ’06** - Specialist in Russian and Eurasian Affairs Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division (Democracy in Russia: Trends and Implications for U.S. Interests, CRS Report for Congress, August 29th, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32662.pdf)

Others reject the view that U.S. democratization aid can only be of marginal effectiveness in Russia. They argue that some of the assistance has proven beneficial, and that there would be much more of a positive effect if the aid were increased. These observers suggest that such aid will serve U.S. interests because Russia will ultimately become a more cooperative partner to the West. They warn against any reduction of such aid at the present time, because Russia’s civil society is too fragile to stand on its own in the face of threats from the Putin government. These observers claim that U.S. diplomatic and public expressions of concern to Russia about its democratic policies would be better tolerated if they were part of a robust U.S. democratization aid effort. 128 They stress that the United States, as the world’s oldest democracy and sole superpower, has a responsibility to urge Russia to continue to democratize. They have maintained that such a stance is in line with the Administration’s objective of fostering democracy and respect for human rights in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world. 129

# 2NC Say Yes (would accept aid)

**Russia would accept the aid - empirics**

**Nolan Chart ’08** (“$8 Billion in US Foreign Aid to Russia”, August 15th, http://www.nolanchart.com/article4509-8-billion-in-us-foreign-aid-to-russia.html)

Given the recent hostilities between Russia and Georgia, a brief evaluation of our foreign aid is in order. I am able to find foreign aid data only through 2006, another shining example of government efficiency. The amounts of foreign aid are not so outrageous, but taken as a whole, a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there starts adding up. One must wonder if our aid creates more enemies than friends. A table documenting oil production, sales, US imports and US foreign aid can be found at the end of this post. RUSSIA has become the world's top producer of oil, surpassing even Saudi Arabia in 2006 and 2007. In 2007 the value of Russian production was $238 billion even supplying $2.8 billion to the US. Thanks to a near doubling of the world price we can assume that the value of their production for 2008 could end up somewhere between $400 billion and $500 billion. Can we say "Windfall Profits"? Why have we provided over $8 billion in foreign aid (that we, by the way, created out of thin air) to a very wealthy aggressor that has signed arms, nuclear and energy deals with Iran?

**Russians want democracy – they’ll accept the aid**

**Rapoza ’12** – Contributor to Forbes covering Brazil, Russia, India and China (Kenneth, For Most Russians, Democracy Still A Pipe Dream, March 19th, Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/03/19/for-most-russians-democracy-still-a-pipe-dream/)

If there is one thing that can be said with relative certainty about Russians it is that they are not one for naivete. They’re a hardy bunch, more apt to believe what they see rather than dream impossible dreams. Yet, it’s not like they’re hopeless. Who was the first culture to send a man into outer space, afterall? But when it comes to modern politics, Russians are not blind. They’re just fed up. Less than 10% of them define Russia as a democratic society. For most, Western style democracy with its free press, freedom of speech and religious freedoms, is still a pipe dream. Russians are not fanciful. They’re calculating. More pragmatic, than day dreamy. And as the country’s citizens calculate the likelihood of democracy taking hold there, just as the state’s physicists did in the 1950s when designing Sputnik, democracy looks sort of, mildly, possible. According to Russia’s largest independent pollster, The Levada Center, only 8% of those polled called Russia a democratic society. But the good news is that number is up from just 4% in 2010, and this under the rule of Vladimir Putin, the man that single handedly led thousands to take to the streets protesting his very name. Another 40% of Russians said the country is only partly democratic, up 8 percentage points in the last two years. Meanwhile, about one-third of those polled (31% to be exact) do not believe that democracy has taken hold in Russian politics at all. The good news there is that number has dropped 5 percentage points since the 2010 Levada poll. Given the time frame involved, and a margin of error, that number is basically flat. On the other hand, the number of Russians who believe the country is becoming less democratic under the leadership of Putin’s United Russia party, which has a lock on the parliament and has run the Kremlin since the resignation of Boris Yeltsin, has decreased to 14% from 20% in 2010. Things are moving in the right direction. A Russian democracy? Not anytime soon. But the unique Russian form of government at least has the country more optimistic about its freedoms, and regardless of Putin’s character, he is still seen as the best man for the job out of a long line up of A-list Russians.

**Empirically, Russia has accepted aid for democratization**

**Nichol et al ’10** - Specialist in Russian and Eurasian Affairs; William H. Cooper Specialist in International Trade and Finance; Carl Ek Specialist in International Relations; Steven Woehrel Specialist in European Affairs; Amy F. Woolf Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy; Steven A. Hildreth Specialist in Missile Defense; Vincent Morelli Section Research Manager (jim, Russian Political, Economic, and Security Issues and U.S. Interests, CRS Report for Congress, January 29th, http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RL33407\_20100129.pdf)

From FY1992 through FY2008, the U.S. government budgeted almost $17 billion in assistance to Russia, including for democratization, market reform, and humanitarian needs. The bulk of assistance (over one-half) went for CTR (Nunn-Lugar) and other security-related programs. (See Table 1.) But Russia’s share of assistance fell from about 60% in FY1993-FY1994 to 17% in FY1998 and has been between 15%-22% since then. 81 Annual foreign operations appropriations bills have contained conditions that Russia is expected to meet in order to receive assistance: • A restriction on aid to Russia was approved in the FY1998 appropriations and each year thereafter, prohibiting any aid to the government of the Russian Federation (i.e., central government; it does not affect local and regional governments) unless the President certifies that Russia has not implemented a law discriminating against religious minorities. Successive administrations have made such determinations each year. • Since FY1996, direct assistance to the government of Russia has hinged on its continuing sale of nuclear reactor technology to Iran. As a result, in most years as much as 60% of planned U.S. assistance to the federal Russian government has been cut. • The FY2001 foreign aid bill prohibited 60% of aid to the central government of Russia if it was not cooperating with international investigations of war crime allegations in Chechnya or providing access to NGOs doing humanitarian work in Chechnya. Possibly as a result of Russian cooperation with the United States in its war on terrorism, the war crime provision was dropped.

# Aff – Backlash (Say no/kills relations)

**Backlash to democratization aid**

**Carothers ’06** - vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is the founder and director of the Democracy and Rule of Law Program, which analyzes the state of democracy in the world and the efforts by the United States and other countries to promote democracy. He also oversees the Carnegie Endowment’s European activities, including Carnegie Europe in Brussels (Thomas, The Backlash Against Democracy Promotion, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Foreign Affairs, March/April 2006, http://carnegieendowment.org/2006/02/28/backlash-against-democracy-promotion/2ynm)

In January, Russian President Vladimir Putin signed into law a controversial new bill imposing heightened controls on local and foreign nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) operating in the country. The new legislation, which requires all NGOs in Russia to inform the government in advance about every project they intend to conduct, is another marker of the country's dispiriting slide back toward authoritarianism. The law is also a sign of an equally disturbing and much broader trend. After two decades of the steady expansion of democracy-building programs around the world, a growing number of governments are starting to crack down on such activities within their borders. Strongmen -- some of them elected officials -- have begun to publicly denounce Western democracy assistance as illegitimate political meddling. They have started expelling or harassing Western NGOs and prohibiting local groups from taking foreign funds -- or have started punishing them for doing so. This growing backlash has yet to coalesce into a formal or organized movement. But its proponents are clearly learning from and feeding off of one another. The recent "color revolutions" in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan and the widespread suspicion that U.S. groups such as the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the International Republican Institute (IRI), Freedom House, and the Open Society Institute played a key behind-the-scenes role in fomenting these upheavals have clearly helped trigger the backlash. Politicians from China to Zimbabwe have publicly cited concerns about such events spreading to their own shores as justification for new restrictions on Western aid to NGOs and opposition groups. Yet there is something broader at work than just a fear of orange (Ukraine's revolution came to be known as the Orange Revolution). The way that President George W. Bush is making democracy promotion a central theme of his foreign policy has clearly contributed to the unease such efforts (and the idea of democracy promotion itself) are creating around the world. Some autocratic governments have won substantial public sympathy by arguing that opposition to Western democracy promotion is resistance not to democracy itself, but to American interventionism. Moreover, the damage that the Bush administration has done to the global image of the United States as a symbol of democracy and human rights by repeatedly violating the rule of law at home and abroad has further weakened the legitimacy of the democracy-promotion cause.

**Authoritarian backlash to democratization**

**Gershman ’11** - the President of the National Endowment for Democracy since its 1984 founding. He had served as the U.S. Representative to the U.N.'s Committee on human rights during the first Reagan Administration (Carl, The backlash against democracy, The Washington Post, March 12th, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/11/AR2011031105795.html)

A specter is haunting the world's remaining dictators - the specter of the Jasmine Revolution. In Zimbabwe, 46 people were arrested and charged with treason for attending a lecture on the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt. In Equatorial Guinea, a state radio broadcaster was forced off the air and suspended just for mentioning events in Libya. Two independent U.N. experts report a "dramatic surge" in executions in Iran, where opposition leaders Hossein Mousavi and Mehdi Karroubi and their wives have been placed under house arrest for supporting a demonstration in solidarity with the Middle East uprisings. In China, the harshest crackdown in recent years is underway in response to an anonymous online call for a "jasmine revolution." Five young activists have been arrested in Azerbaijan for using Facebook to announce a protest. Even the world's harshest tyrannies are taking preemptive measures to further tighten controls, with Burma reviving its National Intelligence Bureau and North Korea setting up riot squads. The autocrats' fear of revolutionary contagion is not irrational. The late Samuel P. Huntington identified "snowballing" as a key factor in the "third wave" of democratization that swept Latin America and parts of Asia and Africa and culminated in the Central European revolutions of 1989. The more recent "color revolutions" in Georgia and Ukraine alarmed Russia and other autocracies, which quickly passed laws repressing civil society and political opposition. The fear of contagion is even greater today because the Middle East uprisings resonate powerfully outside the West. For one thing, they came entirely from within, in reaction to abuses such as massive corruption, dysfunctional and unaccountable government, and the gross human rights violations that are the norm in authoritarian countries. The fact that the revolutions occurred in the Arab Middle East, the region least touched by democracy's third wave, carries a special message to people facing obstacles that have long seemed insurmountable.

# \*\*\*US-Russia Relations CP

# 1NC Shell

**The United States federal government should implement the following policy modifications with respect to Russia:**

* **Implement greater transparency**
* **Regularize bilateral consultations on regional issues**
* **Adjust public rhetoric**
* **Take domestic contexts into account**
* **Signal positive-sum intentions**
* **Be aware of and mitigate parochial interests**

**CP resolves Russian relations**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

 Washington and Moscow now face a choice: they can pursue a maximalist vision of “victory” over each another in the region (and expect a return to the near-confrontation of 2008), or they can seek “win-win-win” outcomes for the United States, Russia and the countries of post-Soviet Eurasia. The oft-invoked “grand bargains” to demarcate “spheres of influence”—enthusiastically endorsed by some, vehemently denounced by others—are figures of speech, not feasible policy options. We propose six measures to facilitate positive-sum outcomes: • Implement greater transparency. The United States and Russia should regularly convey information about their respective policies and activities in the region on a direct, government-to-government basis to avoid misunderstandings and miscalculations. • Regularize bilateral consultations on regional issues. Officials from Washington and Moscow whose portfolios include post-Soviet Eurasian countries should regularly conduct working-level consultations on regional issues. Diplomats on the ground should establish channels of communication, both with one other and, when needed, trilaterally with officials of the countries where they are stationed. • Adjust public rhetoric. Official statements about the region from the United States and Russia often contain inflammatory rhetoric that provoke counterproductive responses. The governments should modify the language they use in their public statements. • Take domestic contexts into account. U.S. and Russian officials should remember that their counterparts do not operate in vacuums. Proposals that would be anathema in the respective domestic political environments are unlikely to be met with approval. • Signal positive-sum intentions. Officials should make a point of publicly affirming a positive-sum approach to bilateral interactions in the region. • Be aware of parochial influences. Senior policymakers must be conscious of the impact of parochial agendas on policy, and take action to mitigate it when circumstances merit. The study analyzes in detail two examples of U.S.-Russia disagreement in the region—the Georgia conflicts and competing integration initiatives—and offers practical recommendations for addressing them. While implementing all of these policy recommendations would not eliminate competition between the United States and Russia in post-Soviet Eurasia—especially among firms from the two countries—it would remove a major source of tension that has in the past nearly upended the U.S.-Russia relationship. Such a breakthrough would bring important benefits to both the United States, Russia and the countries of the region.

# 2NC Shields Link to Politics

**Increased Russia consultation and transparency is popular – strategic interest**

**Acton & Gerson ’11** – Senior Associate in the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment AND research analyst in the Strategic Initiatives Group, where his research focuses on nuclear and conventional deterrence, nuclear strategy, arms control, missile defense, and WMD proliferation (James and Michael, Beyond New START advancing u.s. national security through arms control with russia, CSIS, September 2011, <http://csis.org/files/publication/110824_Acton_BeyondNewSTART_WEB.pdf>)

Arms control can enhance U.S. national security in several ways. First, and most important, it is a valuable tool for maintaining and strengthening strategic stability between the United States and Russia. There are two components of strategic stability—arms race stability and crisis stability.5 The NGWG defines arms race stability as a condition in which neither side has or perceives an incentive to build up its nuclear arsenal. We define crisis stability as an enduring condition in which neither the United States nor Russia has or perceives an incentive to use nuclear weapons out of the fear that delay might lead to the other side gaining an advantage by using nuclear weapons first. While the chances of a nuclear conflict between the United States and Russia are extremely low, its consequences would be catastrophic. Because Russia’s nuclear arsenal remains, for the foreseeable future, one of the few existential threats to the United States, further reducing the probability of nuclear use by enhancing strategic stability through arms control remains an important U.S. objective. Throughout the nuclear age, the goal of stable strategic relations between the United States and Russia (and before that the Soviet Union) has received strong bipartisan support. As President George H.W. Bush described in his 1991 submittal letter of START to the Senate, “The fundamental premise of START is that, despite significant political differences, the United States and the Soviet Union have a common interest in . . . enhancing strategic stability.” More recently, the Obama administration’s Nuclear Posture Review report accorded strategic stability with Russia a high priority.

**Cooperation through weapon transparency is bipartisan**

**ACA ’11** (Arms Control Association, “ Missile Defense Cooperation: Seizing the Opportunity” ACA Volume 2, Issue 5, May 24th, 2011, http://www.armscontrol.org/issuebriefs/MissileDefenseCooperation)

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev will meet at the G8 Summit in Deauville, France later this week, where they are expected to talk about cooperation on ballistic missile defense. Cooperation with Russia would strengthen U.S. security by enhancing our capabilities to detect a potential missile launch from Iran. This issue is central to the future of U.S.-Russian relations and the prospects for another round of nuclear arms reductions after New START, including tactical weapons, and continued cooperation on Iran's nuclear program and preventing nuclear terrorism. The timing is critical; presidential elections are looming in both nations, and the window of opportunity is rapidly closing. Now is the time for an agreement on U.S.-Russian missile defense cooperation, and a bipartisan solution is in the offing. It is in the national security interests of both countries to transform strategic missile defense from a topic of confrontation to cooperation. Doing so requires reinforcing existing assurances that future U.S. missile interceptor systems to be deployed in Europe will not undermine Russia's security. Although the Cold War has been "over" for 20 years, the two sides have so far been unable to build the trust necessary to move beyond this challenge.

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**Policy modifications would transcend barriers in relations**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

In the short term, despite the persistence of the integration dilemma, the United States and Russia can modify their existing policies to transcend the zero-sum game in postSoviet Eurasia in ways that both serve their national interests and benefit the countries of the region. But even if they do so, we should still expect a degree of competition between them in the region, especially among American and Russian firms. However, this kind of competition would differ from today’s in several key respects: it would not set back the transformation processes of the states of post-Soviet Eurasia; it would not pose a threat to other aspects of the U.S.-Russia relationship; and it would allow the two countries to develop enough mutual trust to strengthen those other aspects. It would also lay bare the extent to which U.S.-Russia competition today is divorced from the reality on the ground. When one looks at savvy regional elites’ expertise at manipulating both Moscow and Washington after twenty years of practice, or China’s determination to further its interests with little regard for U.S. or Russian objectives, the U.S.-Russia zero-sum dynamic seems truly akin to shadowboxing. Transcending the zero-sum game would clearly benefit the region, the United States, and Russia. A dissipation in U.S.-Russia tension would allow the region’s political leaders to focus on the pressing socio-economic problems plaguing their countries. In 2011, the formal sovereignty and independence of the eleven post-Soviet Eurasian states are not under threat. But they all suffer in varying degrees from poor governance, crippling corruption, economic inequities, degrading human capital, weak political institutions, ethnic violence, and social dysfunction. The zero-sum U.S.-Russia dynamic in the region did not cause these problems, but it certainly has not helped solve them, and has at times exacerbated them. If Washington and Moscow were able to jointly address regional concerns, including the protracted conflicts, regional elites could no longer credibly claim that “external forces” were responsible for their countries’ woes.

**Tension with Russia is inevitable without the CP**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

It is clear that business as usual for the United States and Russia in post-Soviet Eurasia is likely to drag down the bilateral relationship at some point. If countering the other’s influence remains a policy objective for one or both, an upswing in tensions is inevitable. Washington and Moscow face a choice: they can pursue a maximalist vision of “victory” over the other in the region and expect a return to the near-confrontation of 2008, or they can seek mutually acceptable outcomes that do not taint the rest of the bilateral relationship. To be clear: this need not and would not represent a “condominium” of big states over small ones. 33 Rather, it would facilitate “win-win-win” outcomes for the United States, Russia and the countries of post-Soviet Eurasia.

**US must be flexible and consider Russia’s domestic situation to boost relations**

**Pifer ’12** – Director of Arms Control Initiative @ Brookings (Steven, The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship, Brookings, March 21st, http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2012/03/21-arms-control-pifer)

On May 7, Vladimir Putin will return to the Russian presidency. This should not entail a change in the strategic course of Russian foreign policy, though the tone and style will likely differ from that of Dmitry Medvedev. Mr. Putin will have to confront domestic political and economic challenges that may affect his foreign policy choices: he could resort to the traditional Russian tactic of depicting a foreign adversary to rally domestic support as during his election campaign, or he could pursue a more accommodating foreign policy so that he can focus on issues at home. We do not yet know. It remains in the U.S. interest to engage Russia where engagement can advance American policy goals. In doing so, the United States will at times have to be prepared to take account of Russian interests if it wishes to secure Moscow’s help on questions that matter to Washington. For example, U.S. readiness to accommodate Russian concerns in negotiating the New START Treaty contributed to Moscow’s decision to open new supply routes for NATO to Afghanistan and to support a UN Security Council resolution that imposed an arms embargo on Iran.

# 2NC Solvency – Transparency

**Greater transparency builds trust between the US and Russia**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

The first necessary shift is a move toward greater transparency on both sides concerning their policies and activities in the region. Such an effort does not necessarily involve traditional transparency measures intended for public consumption, such as posting information on websites. Instead, the focus must be on directly conveying on a government-to-government basis the details of each country’s engagement with all the states of the region (with exceptions made for classified or proprietary information), and establishing routines to do so on a regular basis. This will help overcome the “trust gap” that currently exists. The constructive bilateral interaction in Kyrgyzstan following the instability there in the spring of 2010 demonstrated that such transparency measures need not be formalized or even based on an expectation of reciprocity. In that case, there was a high-level push in Washington on the bureaucracy to be transparent about U.S. programs and activities. Moscow eventually responded in kind, but even had it not, the additional clarity about American activities served U.S. interests as well.

# 2NC Solvency – Consultations

**Direct and regular consultation with Russia will boost relations**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

Second, after establishing routines for transparency, Moscow and Washington should begin regular working-level consultations on regional issues. Government officials from the United States and Russia who have the portfolios for the countries of post-Soviet Eurasia should keep regular contact, periodically meeting face-to-face with their counterparts. It is not enough for the Russia portfolio manager from the United States to meet with the Russian official who covers the U.S. portfolio; for example, U.S. officials who cover the South Caucasus should travel to Moscow, and their Russian counterparts should travel to Washington. On the ground, the Russian and American ambassadors should also establish direct channels of communication, and, when needed, meet trilaterally with officials of the country where they are stationed. In places where both U.S. and Russian armed forces are stationed, they should seek out opportunities for transparent, structured interactions, including jointly with their local counterparts where possible. These channels of communication should be used for discussion of both the situation in the region, as well as the sides’ concerns about the other’s policies or actions. Both Washington and Moscow have a bad habit of sharing such concerns through public statements condemning the other side’s actions in the region or, even worse, expressing them either through comments to the press or directly to policymakers in the region. Even if the intent is not to coerce, such steps give the clear impression of coercion, wedge-driving or “balancing games.”

# 2NC Solvency – Public Rhetoric

**Modifying both countries’ public rhetoric reduces miscommunication**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

Third, both Moscow and Washington can reap benefits for both the bilateral relationship and their ties with the peoples of the region by adjusting their public rhetoric. In many cases, their rhetoric actually undermines their policy objectives. Given the threat perceptions created by the Soviet legacy, every utterance of the phrase “sphere of influence” by senior Russian officials serves to undermine Russian influence by alienating elites and publics alike—as well as arousing overreactions in Washington. Indeed, Russian officials seem to be uniquely tonedeaf when it comes to understanding the impact of their words in the neighborhood, and the secondary impact of those words in Washington. U.S. officials indulge in similar shortsightedness when, for example, referring to Abkhazia and South Ossetia as merely Georgian “territories” or “areas”—terms which, given the current perceptions and recent history of ethnic victimization, imply the United States endorses wholesale denial of their aspirations for self-determination, regardless of the form in which that occurs.

# 2NC Solvency – Domestic Contexts

**Understanding mutual political environments will bolster relations**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

Fourth, policymakers in Moscow and Washington should seek to better understand the incentives and limitations created by their counterparts’ domestic political environments. For example, Russian officials and analysts have so far demonstrated little sensitivity to U.S. political culture’s instinctual distaste for “grand bargains”—agreements between two countries to decide the fate of a third—and particularly the historical baggage associated with Moscow–Washington discussions on Russia’s neighbors. (They seem to be even less sensitive to the way in which this historical legacy has affected perceptions in the region.) Specifically, they often fail to recognize that proposals extended to the United States that carry an imprint of a “grand bargain” are likely to be “dead on arrival,” since even U.S. officials who might be inclined to entertain them know that such a move would be politically suicidal. Likewise, U.S. assertions that the membership of post-Soviet Eurasian states in NATO and the EU will inevitably benefit Russia fall on deaf ears in Moscow—no matter how many times they are repeated. 34 It is unreasonable to expect any country to support its neighbors’ joining organizations when these organizations are closed to that country, and when it perceives concrete downsides to its neighbors’ membership. It will therefore remain difficult to convince Russian officials to maintain existing preferential arrangements— such as free-trade zones or favorable migration regimes—for neighboring countries irrespective of their governments’ stance on NATO- or EU membership. The refusal to continue such preferential arrangements is not in itself a manifestation of “bullying behavior” or “resurgent imperialism.”

# 2NC Solvency – Positive-Sum Intentions

**Signals of positive intentions will create high gains through cooperation**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

Fifth, officials from both countries should find ways to signal their positive-sum intentions. Most importantly, they should publicly reject the notion of “irreconcilable differences” between Moscow and Washington in post-Soviet Eurasia, and privately do so to the officials of the countries of the region as well. Such a process of “positive reassurance” is low cost and offers the potential for high gains. On this score there has been marked improvement of late, as seen in the following three examples of senior political leaders decrying zero-sum approaches to post-Soviet Eurasia. In July 2009, President Obama said in Moscow: Unfortunately, there is sometimes a sense that old assumptions must prevail, old ways of thinking; a conception of power that is rooted in the past rather than in the future. There is the 20th-century view that the United States and Russia are destined to be antagonists, and that a strong Russia or a strong America can only assert themselves in opposition to one another. And there is a 19th-century view that we are destined to vie for spheres of influence, and that great powers must forge competing blocs to balance one another. These assumptions are wrong. 35 President Medvedev echoed this sentiment in June 2011, when he said: It is ridiculous to say that in the 21st century that the world is divided into parts, with a state responsible for each of them, e.g. America is responsible for this country, Russia for that, China for that. This is just not serious. This does not fit my conceptions either. 36 The month prior, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Grigori Karasin, whose portfolio includes post-Soviet Eurasia, foreshadowed President Medvedev’s remarks: Russia is not laying claim to any exclusive role in Central Asian affairs and is open to cooperation with other states...Russia still believes that the Central Asian region can be an arena of broad international cooperation in the interests of ensuring its stability, security and sustained economic development. 37

# 2NC Solvency – Parochial Interests

**Reducing parochial interests decreases misunderstanding and bolsters relations**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

Finally, both governments should also try to be keenly aware of the influence on policy of those interest groups, bureaucratic actors and commercial entities that perpetuate rivalry for reasons inconsistent with national interests, and to take action to minimize that influence on policy design and implementation if circumstances merit. This is no easy task because of the inherent difficulty in distinguishing between “genuinely national” and “parochial” interests. However, policymakers can take steps to minimize the destructive impact of parochial agendas while not denying any group the opportunity to express itself and seek recourse for grievances through its country’s political system. Together with their parliaments and non-governmental experts, officials should exercise vigilance and make note of policy proposals that only serve the interest of a particular group (corporation, bureaucracy, lobby, etc.) while undermining the relationship. Political leaders should in turn speak out (whether publicly or within their governments) against such proposals. If attempts at implementation of parochial agendas are stigmatized, they are far less likely to be successful. For example, disputes in the region between American and Russian firms should not be treated as national security concerns. Of course, neither government can ignore the needs of their country’s companies seeking to maximize profits from their business ventures in post-Soviet Eurasia. Each government has a duty to help its businesses in their activities abroad. That said, both sides need to be frank with each other, and honest to their publics, when business interests clash. In such cases, Moscow and Washington would be well advised to acknowledge the firm-based, as opposed to state-based, nature of the dispute and the actual stakes involved. Instead of elevating the problem into the realm of national security or “strategic interests,” competition between economic actors can then remain “business as usual.” When problems do arise between the United States and Russia due to the activities of interest groups pursuing parochial agendas, such disputes should be kept in perspective of the entirety of the bilateral relationship. This effectively means comparing a particular problem to others that have been overcome in the past and, at the same time, remembering the benefits, if any, to be gained from other aspects of the relationship. No single issue should be portrayed as a sine qua non of U.S.-Russia ties.

**Narrow views of Russia harm relations – the CP solves**

**Graham ’08** - Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Thomas E, “ The friend of my enemy,” National Interest, May-June 2008, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_95/ai\_n28065584/)

 THERE ARE few issues that cause greater friction in U.S.-Russian relations than Iran's nuclear-weapons program. President Bush and other senior administration officials see Russia as critical to pressuring Iran to abandon this program and claim that Russia and the United States are working closely together toward that common strategic goal, although, they admit, there are differences over tactics. But most senior officials who work on proliferation issues, many on the Hill and much of the American political establishment--even if they accept that Russia is critical to dealing with Iran--believe that it is consciously abetting Iran's nuclear-weapons program. The evidence: sales of sophisticated air-defense systems to Tehran to defend nuclear sites; continued work to complete Iran's nuclear reactor at Bushehr and, more recently, the first deliveries of fuel so that Bushehr can commence operation this fall; dogged resistance to tough sanctions against Iran at the UN Security Council and a go-slow approach to adopting even mild ones. The widespread belief is that these actions are intended to undermine U.S. policy toward Iran and, more broadly, throughout the Middle East.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**The CP is a menial difference in day-to-day operations**

**Charap & Troitskiy ’11** – Director for the Russia and Eurasia Program at American Progress AND adjunct professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Samuel and Mikhail, “ U.S.-Russia Relations in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Transcending the Zero-Sum Game,” September 19th, 2011, Center for American Progress, <http://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/publications/us-russiafuture/us-russiafuture_working_group_paper_1_EN.pdf>)

The proposed terms of engagement do not imply veto rights for any one party over any other’s decision-making. All states and organizations would continue to enjoy the same freedom of maneuver they do today. Nor do these rules require dramatic changes in the alliance architecture in Europe and Eurasia, such as enlargement bans or far-reaching legally binding treaties. Instead, they connote a process of consultation and mutual reassurance that offers the best chance of finding win-win-win solutions in the short term. Rather than begin with formal negotiations to resolve all contradictions the, parties would through engagement find outcomes acceptable to all. If implemented, the proposed principles could defuse many of the tensions resulting from the existence of competing integration initiatives in post-Soviet Eurasia.

**Political factions should be able to compromise over Russia – best interest**

**Pifer ’12** – Director of Arms Control Initiative @ Brookings (Steven, The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship, Brookings, March 21st, http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2012/03/21-arms-control-pifer)

 Madame Chairman, the United States should continue to explore ways to work with Russia to advance American interests and to build a more positive, sustainable bilateral relationship. Doing so will increase American influence with and in Russia. It would be unwise for Washington, out of anger over differences over Syria or democratic backsliding within Russia, to hold back on working with Moscow on issues where cooperation can accomplish things of benefit to the United States. The U.S. government should be able to cooperate on issues where interests coincide while confronting Russia on other questions and making clear its democracy and human rights concerns—Washington should be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. Doing less would mean passing up opportunities to make Americans safer, more secure and more prosperous.

# Aff - Links to Politics

**Transparency with Russia is unpopular**

**Frommer ’08** – AP Writer (Frederic J, US-Russia pact faces opposition in Congress, USA Today, May 6th, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2008-05-06-3378031448_x.htm>)

WASHINGTON — A U.S.-Russia civilian nuclear power deal signed Tuesday ran into immediate trouble on Capitol Hill, where two senators said they would try to block the deal because it could hurt efforts to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons. Sen. Norm Coleman, R-Minn., along with Sen. Evan Bayh, D-Ind., are circulating a letter that will urge President Bush not to send the pact to Congress. Under the deal signed Tuesday by U.S. and Russian officials in Moscow, the United States would get access to Russian state-of-the art nuclear technology. The pact would help Russia establish an international nuclear fuel storage facility by importing and storing spent fuel. The U.S. controls the vast majority of the world's nuclear fuel. "I am very disappointed by the administration's insistence on moving forward to sign a nuclear cooperation arrangement with the Russians," Coleman said in a telephone interview. "Particularly at a time when Russia's actively undermining our foreign policy on various fronts, most importantly with respect to Iran." In a statement, Bayh added: "U.S.-Russian nuclear cooperation is important, but stopping Iran from gaining the capacity to make nuclear weapons is an even higher priority. Russia is not doing all it can to curb Tehran's nuclear ambitions, and we need to use all tools at our disposal to get more cooperation from Moscow." Coleman and Bayh say Russia's exports of nuclear fuel to Iran's Bushehr nuclear power plant and opposition to United Nations sanctions against Iran make the new deal suspect. In the letter, provided to The Associated Press, the senators say the deal "would pave the way for the increased commercialization of Russia's nuclear energy sector and could be construed as U.S. approval of its proliferation activities in Iran." But the Bush administration now views Russia as a partner in the effort to persuade Iran to abandon nuclear weapons ambitions. A State Department official said the U.S. did not view Russia's assistance to Iran's Bushehr nuclear power plant as a reason to not sign the new deal. "In fact, the president has made clear his support for Russia's supply of nuclear fuel to Bushehr because it demonstrates that Iran does not need to possess the complete nuclear fuel cycle with its proliferation risks to take advantage of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy," said the official, who asked not to be identified because he wasn't authorized to speak on the record. To get the deal in place, Bush must send it to Congress. It would become effective unless Congress passes legislation within 90 days to block it. A bill pending in the Senate would block a U.S.-Russia nuclear deal unless Russia has stopped cooperating with Iran's nuclear or advanced conventional and missile program, or Iran has stopped enriching uranium. That legislation, sponsored by Oregon Republican Gordon Smith, has 70 co-sponsors, but Coleman said it's no sure bet that it would be passed in time to block the deal. "Even if you have the votes, it doesn't mean you'll have time to take it up and debate it," he said. "There's no guarantee that leadership will schedule a vote." He called passage "a high bar." "There is a great deal of concern on the part of many members of Congress," Coleman added. "I disagree with the president, I think it's bad policy." He said that Bush could use congressional opposition as leverage in extracting conditions from the Russians for the deal -- "at a minimum, they have to stop with any advanced conventional weapon assistance to the Iranians."

**GOP opposition to cooperating with Russia**

**Baker ’10** – author and reporter for the NYT (Peter, G.O.P. Opposition Dims Hope for Arms Treaty With Russia, NYT, November 16th, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/world/europe/17start.html?pagewanted=all)

President Obama’s hopes of ratifying a new arms control treaty with Russia by the end of the year appeared to come undone on Tuesday as the chief Senate Republican negotiator moved to block a vote on the pact, one of the White House’s top foreign policy goals, in the lame-duck session of Congress. Post a Comment The announcement by the senator, Jon Kyl of Arizona, the Republican point man on the issue, blindsided and angered the White House, which vowed to keep pressing for approval of the so-called New Start treaty. But the White House strategy had hinged entirely on winning over Mr. Kyl, and Democrats, who began scrambling for a backup plan, said they considered the chances of success slim. Winning approval of the treaty will only become harder for the White House next year, when Democrats will have six fewer seats in the Senate, forcing the administration to rely on additional Republican votes to reach the 67 needed for ratification. The treaty, which would force both countries to pare back nuclear arsenals and resume mutual inspections that lapsed last year for the first time since the cold war, is the centerpiece of two of Mr. Obama’s signature goals: restoring friendly relations with Russia and putting the world on a path toward eventually eliminating nuclear arms. A failure to ratify the treaty could freeze both efforts and, some analysts said, undermine Mr. Obama’s credibility on the world stage. “Failure to pass the New Start treaty this year would endanger our national security,” Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., who has led negotiations with Mr. Kyl, said in a statement. It would mean “no verification regime to track Russia’s strategic nuclear arsenal,” Mr. Biden said, and would sour a relationship that has helped open a new supply route to troops in Afghanistan and increase pressure on Iran to halt its nuclear program.

# \*\*\*Shipbuilding

# 1NC Shell

**Counterplan Text: The United States Federal Government should develop and deploy a naval fleet of 313 ships by 2020.**

**That revitalizes the shipbuilding industry, solves naval heg, and avoids the link to politics**

**Hewitt 11** (Hugh, author, law professor at Chapman University School of Law, and broadcast journalist “A stimulus We all could (Or should) Support” http://townhall.com/columnists/hughhewitt/2011/09/29/a\_stimulus\_we\_all\_could\_or\_should\_support/page/full/ )

There's a stimulus plan that President Obama could put forward that would attract strong bipartisan support and which would also produce great jobs at great wages while strengthening the nation's defenses. He could propose to build the Navy the country needs. Five years ago the United States Navy put forward a plan to deploy a fleet of 313 ships by 2020. The Navy is presently at or around 280 ships in its ranks. A year ago the Congressional Research Service filed an assessment of the state of Navy shipbuilding which included these numbers: The Navy’s five-year (FY2011-FY2015) shipbuilding plan includes a total of 50 new battle force ships, or an average of 10 per year. Of the 50 ships in the plan, half are relatively inexpensive LCSs or JHSVs. The Navy’s FY2011 30-year (FY2011-FY2040) shipbuilding plan includes 276 ships. The plan does not include enough ships to fully support all elements of the 313-ship plan over the long run. The Navy projects that implementing the 30-year plan would result in a fleet that grows from 284 ships in FY2011 to 315 ships in FY2020, reaches a peak of 320 ships in FY2024, drops below 313 ships in FY2027, declines to 288 ships in FY2032-FY2033, and then increases to 301 ships in FY2039-FY2040. The Navy projects that the attack submarine and cruiser-destroyer forces will drop substantially below required levels in the latter years of the 30-year plan. The Navy estimates that executing the 30-year shipbuilding plan would require an average of $15.9 billion per year in constant FY2010 dollars. A May 2010 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report estimates that the plan would require an average of $19.0 billion per year in constant FY2010 dollars, or about 19% more than the Navy estimates. The CBO report states: “If the Navy receives the same amount of funding for ship construction in the next 30 years as it has over the past three decades—an average of about $15 billion a year in 2010 dollars—it will not be able to afford all of the purchases in the 2011 plan.” The Navy is short by more than 30 ships of its own admitted needs. That is the equivalent of just under three complete aircraft carrier strike force groups (each with 13 ships built around a carrier and each requiring about 8,000 sailors). Using the CRS numbers, a rough estimate of the cost of that entire additional ship-building program could not be more than an additional $25 billion dollars per year. How can the president propose blowing another $400 billion in Stimulus 2.0 without at the same time allocating the money needed to build the Navy required to maintain America's security and the world's sea lanes? Certainly many of the jobs that would be generated by a fleet build-out would be union jobs, checking off one of the president's needs. Shipbuilding would be disproportionately located in Virginia --a purple state-- but would also be located in and would inevitably assist the economies of all the deep blue west coast states, even if it did end up at least in part with some Mississippi jobs created as well. The politics work. There would be bipartisan support. No one doubts that the United States must have a Navy that is second to none and one that far outdistances its closest competitor. So if the president really and truly wants a stimulus proposal that will sail through the House and Senate (and please pardon the pun), let him ask for the money needed to return the navy to full strength, and to do so in the next three to five years, not the next ten to twenty or more

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**The navy revitalizes the industry**

**Jean 11** (Grace writer for the National Defense magazine “Navy’s shipbuilding challenges Loom Large 2020s” http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2011/June/Pages/Navy%E2%80%99sShipbuildingChallengesLoomLargeinthe2020s.aspx)

Shipyards lack programmatic vision to invest as heavily as they ought to in improving facilities, said Donald “Boysie” Bollinger, president and CEO of Bollinger Shipyards Inc., headquartered in Lockport, La. His ship construction facilities are small compared to other U.S. yards. But when he tours the “big boys,” he often finds that his modest-sized yard boasts automation that exceeds their capabilities. “Why? Because we invest in tooling for programmatic demands that we have,” he said. For example, in preparation to build the Coast Guard’s fast response cutter fleet of 33 ships, the yard planned accordingly with modernization efforts. “With that knowledge, we can invest in tooling that makes it a very efficient program,” he said. U.S. shipyards have the capability to produce quality products at competitive prices, he added. “We can be as efficient as any shipbuilder in the world. I know it. I compete every day in the world shipbuilding community,” he said. “If you do the discipline of engineering and if you do the discipline of scheduling and you have discipline on changes, we can be competitive. That’s what the rest of the world does, and does it in spades.” But experts often question why U.S. shipyards cannot build vessels as efficiently as Korean yards do. “The Koreans don’t start building a ship until they design it. And they don’t just build one. They follow the Henry Ford model: Any color you want, but nothing else will change,” said Bollinger. Shipyards all have strengths and weaknesses, and the Navy needs to leverage those unique strengths, said John F. “Dugan” Shipway, former president of Bath Iron Works in Maine. “Timely decisions over the next couple years of what we’ll build will provide ability to build ships affordably in the next decade,” he advised. As budgets flatten and shipyards learn to live within that situation, the Navy may want to look at making greater use of multi-year procurement or block buy contracts, said O’Rourke. Navy officials also have to learn to manage programs better, he added. As for industrial base issues, it is important to recognize that the shipbuilding base extends beyond the shipyards and includes combat system makers, components suppliers, research and development teams, designers and engineers, he said. “A shipyard can only control a certain fraction of a ship’s total cost. So as we try to work toward shipbuilding affordability and to constrain shipbuilding costs, we need to focus beyond yards,” said O’Rourke. He suggested that naval shipbuilders institute a method to maintain constant visibility on suppliers’ status. In many segments of the shipbuilding business, the industry is heading toward a monopoly of suppliers. “You need to find ways to use competition where you can, and smartly, in this industrial situation,” O’Rourke said. One way is to compete shipbuilding contracts at higher or lower levels than at the yard. At the mission level, for example, the Defense Department could pitch ships against other forms of military platforms for performing certain missions. Or the Navy could compete at the supplier level for components, he suggested. “Everybody knows where ships are going to go because there’s only enough [shipbuilding] capacity to absorb that load. So we need to ensure there’s slack in capacity to preserve that uncertainty in their contract award decisions,” said O’Rourke.

**The counterplan revitalizes the shipbuilding industry**

**Munoz 4/2/12 (**Carlo staff writer for the hill “Panetta: Reduced Navy fleet size won’t sink US shipbuilding, defense industries” http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/navy/219517-panetta-new-navy-ship-strategy-will-support-us-industrial-base)

The Navy's new five-year shipbuilding plan provides adequate support for U.S. defense industry firms, even if it calls for a smaller number of vessels, according to Defense Secretary Leon Panetta. The new plan, sent to Congress last Wednesday, is based on the goal of building a 300-ship fleet for the Navy. That plan falls short of the service's original 313-ship minimum it had set in previous years. It also falls well short of the 500-ship fleet service leaders say is required to meet the base demands of U.S. combat commanders around the globe. "There'll be some ups and downs and there are some ships that obviously we'll draw down that are outdated. But overall, we are going to . . . not only maintain, but increase our ships in the Navy," Panetta told reporters Sunday after a speech aboard the USS Peleliu. The ship strategy, he added, will generate enough work to keep U.S. shipbuilders afloat, according to Panetta. "I want to maintain our industrial base for the future so that we can produce the ships we need for the future. And I want to do it in American shipyards," he said.

**Increasing naval ships strengthens the shipbuilding industry**

**Wittman 8** ( Robert representative from Virginia “Working toward a 313-ship Navy at a minimum” http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/7742-working-toward-a-313-ship-navy-at-a-minimum)

Our investment in the future of our submarine force by further accelerating an increased build rate is a step that will further close the impending shortfall in the submarine force and strengthen our domestic industrial base, and the provision that continues to maintain our aircraft carrier fleet at 11 ships are essential aspects of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008 that will enable our nation to meet current and future national security needs and long-term challenges. Cost-effective shipbuilding is the foundation of our nation’s naval fleet. I look forward to the establishment of the 313-ship Navy in years to come. Maintaining the shipbuilding industry in America, maintaining the forward presence of our ships, and maintaining our safety and security at home are viable, essential goals that our nation must strive to meet now and for centuries to come.

# 2NC CP Popular (Politics NB)

**Bipartisan support for the 313 ship goal**

**Abott 10** (Stephen writer for the will and the wallet “The Navy’s Perennial Conundrum: Cost Overruns with Fleet Sizing” <http://thewillandthewallet.squarespace.com/blog/2010/3/18/the-navys-perennial-conundrum-cost-overruns-interfere-with-f.html>) JC

The campaign for a 313 ship battle fleet is one of Washington’s classic, bipartisan perennials – as is the failure to actually follow through. Whether we will ever reach this goal remains uncertain, in part, because ship cost overruns continually accelerate beyond each year’s funding. Increasing the size of the current 285 ship battle force is a stated goal of the Navy and leading members of Congress. On multiple occasions the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) has included a call for 313 hulls in congressional testimony, a position also used as “a reference point” in the 2010 version of the Navy’s 30 year plan. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) likewise sets the Navy’s size requirements near the 300+ ship level. Congress has been supportive of this goal. Soon after the President’s election, a bipartisan group of 18 senators wrote Obama to ask him to retain the 313 ship goal. House Armed Services Committee Chairman Ike Skelton (D-MO), along with his Rep. Gene Taylor (D-MS), likewise entered the FY2011 budget cycle pushing the Navy to slow down ship retirements in order to increase fleet numbers.

**Quadrennial defense review proves bipartisan support**

**Kaplan 11** ( Robert senior fellow at the center for a New American Security “The US navy fostered globalization: we still need it” <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/f9d59564-19b7-11e1-ba5d-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1zOpg7VI2>) JC

High quality global journalism requires investment. Please share this article with others using the link below, do not cut & paste the article. See our Ts&Cs and Copyright Policy for more detail. Email ftsales.support@ft.com to buy additional rights. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/f9d59564-19b7-11e1-ba5d-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz1zOprgv00 There is no guarantee that this situation will last, however. In the 1980s era of high Reaganism, the US navy boasted close to 600 warships. In the 1990s, following the collapse of the Berlin Wall, that number fell to about 350. The US navy’s current strength is 284 warships. In the short term that number may rise to 313 because of the introduction of littoral combat ships. Over time, however, it may fall to about 250, owing to cost overruns, the need to address domestic debt and the decommissioning of ageing warships in the 2020s. Meanwhile, the bipartisan quadrennial defence review last year recommended that the US move toward a 346-ship navy to fulfil its global responsibilities. Wen talks overshadowed by disputes China warns US on territory disputes Global Insight Risks in Australia-US pact There is a big difference between a 346-ship US navy and a 250-ship navy – the difference between one kind of world order and another. Armies respond to unexpected contingencies, but it is navies and air forces that project power. Power is relative. If other nations were not building up their own navies and air forces, these numbers would matter less than they do. In fact, the western Pacific is in the middle of an arms race. This is not a low-tech expansion of ground forces; but a high-tech acquisition of submarines, surface warships, fighter jets, missiles, and cyberwarfare capabilities. The US armed forces have rarely been needed more to preserve the balance of power, and so maintain a peaceful environment for economic interaction.

# Aff – Links to Ptx

**Military spending cuts has bipartisan support**

**Collender 12** (Stan expert on federal budget and worked in the staffs of the house and senate budget committees “Obama pentagon spending cuts will change the budget debate long before they reduce the budget” http://capitalgainsandgames.com/blog/stan-collender/2456/obama-pentagon-spending-cuts-will-change-budget-debate-long-they-reduce-bud)

The Pentagon Has Become Increasingly Unpopular. After foreign aid and NASA, military spending is the area of the federal budget that has the least amount of public support. Many national polls conducted over the past year show that more than half the country thinks that reductions in defense spending are warranted. The Obama administration could not possibly fail to notice that, while the generality of “a strong defense” continues to be popular, there is a growing feeling that it can be provided at a much lower cost. 2. The President’s Focus On The Deficit Made A Close Look At The Pentagon Impossible To Avoid. This is simple math more than complex politics. The political difficulties with reductions in Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid and increases in taxes, plus the limited amount of spending (at least by federal standards) in annual nondefense appropriations meant that there was no place else for the White House to turn for deficit reductions but to national security programs. 3. The GOP Is Already On Record In Favor Of Cutting Military Spending. No matter how often congressional Republicans now try to come up with alternatives that would eliminate or mitigate the national security “sequester” that was triggered when the anything-but-super committee failed in late November to agree on a deficit reduction plan, the fact remains that they first agreed to throw the Pentagon under the budget bus when they voted for the Budget Control Act in early August. That allows the White House to claim bi-partisan support for Pentagon reductions.

# Aff – Links to Elections

**Public hates defense spending**

**Smith 12** (Jeffery managing editor of national security at iwatch news “Public overwhelmingly supports large defense spending cuts” http://www.iwatchnews.org/2012/05/10/8856/public-overwhelmingly-supports-large-defense-spending-cuts)

While politicians, insiders and experts may be divided over how much the government should spend on the nation’s defense, there’s a surprising consensus among the public about what should be done: They want to cut spending far more deeply than either the Obama administration or the Republicans. That’s according to the results of an innovative, new, nationwide survey by three nonprofit groups, the Center for Public integrity, the Program for Public Consultation and the Stimson Center. Not only does the public want deep cuts, it wants those cuts to encompass spending in virtually every military domain — air power, sea power, ground forces, nuclear weapons, and missile defenses. According to the survey, in which respondents were told about the size of the budget as well as shown expert arguments for and against spending cuts, two-thirds of Republicans and nine in 10 Democrats supported making immediate cuts — a position at odds with the leaderships of both political parties. The average total cut was around $103 billion, a substantial portion of the current $562 billion base defense budget, while the majority supported cutting it at least $83 billion. These amounts both exceed a threatened cut of $55 billion at the end of this year under so-called “sequestration” legislation passed in 2011, which Pentagon officials and lawmakers alike have claimed would be devastating. “When Americans look at the amount of defense spending compared to spending on other programs, they see defense as the one that should take a substantial hit to reduce the deficit,” said Steven Kull, director of the Program for Public Consultation (PPC), and the lead developer of the survey. “Clearly the polarization that you are seeing on the floor of the Congress is not reflective of the American people.”

# \*\*\*Terrorism CPs

# ---Immigration/Border Security

# 1NC

Text: The United States federal government should:

* Increase funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service,
* Track immigrants on visa services,
* Enhance border security along Mexico through the United States Border Patrol, and
* augment console questioning powers.

The counterplan solves terrorism best – immigration policy is where the US is most vulnerable

Camarota 02, Steven Camarota, Director of Research at the Center for Immigration Studies, “The Open Door: How Militant Islamic Terrorists Entered and Remained in the United States: 1993-2001,” May 2002, from The Center for Immigration Studies, <http://cis.org/911-HowMilitantIslamicTerroristsEntered>//MC

Because virtually every type of immigration has been exploited by terrorists, focusing on just one category such as student visas, or even temporary visas in general, would be inadequate. All aspects of our immigration system, including the way visas are processed overseas, the handling of foreign citizens at ports of entry, policing the nation’s borders, and enforcement of immigration laws within the United States need to be reformed in order to reduce the terrorist threat. The fact that terrorists often disregard immigration laws means that strict enforcement of the law within the United States could significantly reduce the terrorist threat. If those who violate the law are identified and forced to leave the country, not only would it lower the risk of terrorism, it would also reduce illegal immigration, which is itself a desirable goal. The existence of a large illegal population (estimated at eight to nine million) creates a general contempt for the law among all parties involved, including those officials charged with enforcing it. With millions of illegal immigrants already in the country, and with immigration laws widely flouted, it is perhaps easy to understand why the immigration inspector at Miami’s airport allowed Mohammed Atta back into the country in January 2001 even though he had overstayed his visa on his last visit and had abandoned his change of status to vocational student by leaving the country. Given the large number of terrorists who have lived in the United States illegally by overstaying a temporary visa, enforcing visa time limits could disrupt or perhaps even uncover future terrorist plots. The first step to enforcing time limits is the establishment of an entry-exit system that would automatically record the entry and exit of all persons to and from the United States. Those who overstay should be barred from ever entering the country again. The system would also allow the INS to identify overstayers who are still in the country. Such a system is envisioned in current legislation, and it is up to elected officials to ensure that it is properly implemented. In addition to the creation of an entry-exit system, there needs to be a system to track temporary visa holders once they enter the country. Currently, a system that requires colleges and universities to inform the INS if a foreign student stops attending class or otherwise violates his visa is being implemented. This system should be expanded to include other temporary visa holders who are affiliated with American institutions such as guestworkers, intracompany transferees, and cultural exchange visitors. Because several terrorists worked in the country illegally, one area of interior enforcement that might help disrupt terrorism is to enforce the ban on hiring illegal aliens by punishing employers and forcing those found working illegally to leave the country. The key step in implementing worksite enforcement would be the creation of a national computer database against which the names of all new hires could be checked. Fraudulent marriages and other deceptions are also common among terrorists. The INS must do a much better job of investigating all applicants and force those who engage in fraud or deceptive behavior to leave the country. Although the amount of detention space has increased in recent years, enforcement of immigration laws within the United States will require significantly more detention space. This can be accomplished both by building more INS facilities and by contracting out to jails and prisons systems that have excess capacity. To make interior enforcement possible, there should be a dramatic increase in resources devoted to the enforcement of laws within the United States. At present there are only 2,000 INS agents devoted to worksite enforcement, anti-smuggling operations, and investigating fraud and document forgery. This number needs to be increased several-fold, along with administrative support staff. With many more agents the INS would be able to investigate irregularities uncovered by the employment database discussed above and allow it to investigate and expose fraudulent applicants. The student tracking system currently envisioned also requires significantly more investigators, otherwise it will not be possible to follow up reported violations. In addition to interior enforcement, there needs to be a significant increase in the nation’s efforts to control the border, including a dramatic increase in the size of the border patrol and the effective deployment of barriers and sensors along the border. Attempted Brooklyn subway bomber Gazi Ibrahim Abu Mezer, who was denied a visa by an American consulate, simply went to Canada and tried to cross the border illegally. Improving visa processing while leaving the borders largely undefended is an invitation for terrorists to do just as Mezer did. There must also be a dramatic increase in efforts to control the border with Mexico. While the southern border has not yet been used by terrorists, there is every reason to believe that if other means of entering the country become more difficult, and the Mexican border remains relatively easy to cross, then al Qaeda would begin to use it as an avenue to enter the United States. A large smuggling ring specializing in bringing Middle Easterners across the southern border was broken up in the late 1990s, which suggests that such a prospect is a very real possibility. For visa processing overseas, greater scrutiny is needed for all visa applicants, including in-person interviews — several 9/11 hijackers were issued visas without ever even being interviewed by a consular officer. As much information as possible needs to be gathered on all applicants, including fingerprints and photos. Skepticism should become the guiding principle of visa issuance. Consular officers must ask probing questions in an attempt to verify the applicant’s story, even at the risk of annoying the applicant. Top priority must be given to the protection of the American people and not the feelings of the applicant. Strict enforcement of Section 214(b) of the immigration law would likely have prevented a number of terrorists from getting temporary visas, because terrorists and those who are likely to overstay their visas have much in common. Both groups tend to be young and unattached, as were at least three of the 9/11 hijackers. Section 214(b) can also be a useful tool in keeping out more senior members of al Qaeda, such as Mohammed Atta, because governments in the Middle East have suppressed extremist movements, forcing terrorists like Atta to spend most of their time abroad. This means they often have little attachment to their current residence and should therefore not be issued visas. Updating the “watch list” against which the names of visa applicants are checked must be done in as timely a manner as possible, and maintaining the list must become a high priority for the State Department, INS, law enforcement, and the intelligence agencies. Current legislation mandates the integration of the watch list with other lists maintain by federal agencies, such as the FBI’s criminal database and this should be implemented as soon as possible. Because governments in the Middle East have largely suppressed Islamic extremist movements, Western Europe has now become home to a significant number of terrorist organizations. This fact coupled with the availability of phony passports, means that it may be necessary to discontinue the visa waiver program and instead require all individuals from Europe to obtain a visa before visiting the United States. For the Bureau of Consular Affairs, which issues visas, to perform its vital job of protecting the nation, more consular officers and support staff clearly are needed. At present there are only approximately 900 officers worldwide devoted to visa adjudication. This number must be increased dramatically so that all applicants can be carefully interviewed. Moreover, it might be necessary to separate visa adjudication from the State Department in order to insulate it from pressure to approve applicants in an effort not to alienate host governments. The names of all persons entering the country at a port of entry need to be checked against the watch list every time they enter the country, even those who have visas. Published reports indicate that Khalid al Midhar, who was on the plane that hit the Pentagon, was identified as a terrorist after he received his visa but before he entered the country for a second time. Recording the name of each person when he arrives and checking names against the watch list is therefore critically important. For the reforms suggested above to be possible, the overall level of immigration must be reduced for three reasons: Given limited governmental resources, issuing fewer permanent and temporary visas would mean greater resources could be devoted to more extensive background checks on each applicant; Fewer issuances would also mean fewer foreign-born individuals to keep track of within the United States in the future; and Reduction would give the State Department and the INS the breathing space they need to deal with their enormous processing backlogs, now over four million, as well as allow them to undertake the necessary reforms. The primary goal of this report is to determine how terrorists have entered and remained in the country over the last decade, and also to identify problems or outright failures in the nation’s immigration system so as to make policy recommendations to correct the problems. We examine terrorists associated with al Qaeda over a 10-year period in order to discern patterns in their operations. Of course, domestic terrorist threats exist, and changes in immigration policy will have no effect on homegrown terrorism, nor will it protect Americans abroad from foreign terrorists. The existence of other threats, however, is no reason not to make every effect to prevent foreign terrorists from entering or remaining in the country. Most importantly, because of its money, organization, international reach, training, fanaticism, desire to obtain weapons of mass destruction, and willingness to inflict maximum death and destruction on civilian and military targets alike, the threat posed by Osama bin Laden’s al Qaeda network is fundamentally different from that posed by any other terrorists. It is therefore critically important that we develop immigration policies to deal with this foreign terrorist threat.

# 2NC Solvency - Generic

Current policies are not enough – more regulation and patrol of the border is needed

Mora 11, Edwin Mora, senior reporter for CNS, “663 Illegal Aliens From Countries With Ties to Terrorism Arrested Along Southwest Border in 2010, Senator says,” March 18th, 2011, From Cybercast News Service, <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/663-illegal-aliens-countries-ties-terrorism-arrested-along-southwest-border-2010>//MC

Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas), speaking at a conference on border issues Thursday, said 663 individuals arrested along the southwest border in 2010 were from countries designated as “special interest” or from countries known to have ties with terrorism. “It’s not just that we’re seeing immigration across our southern border from countries like Mexico -- people seeking to work and provide for their families,” said Cornyn, a member of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on homeland security and terrorism. “Indeed in the last year alone -- where 445,000 individuals were detained at the southwest border -- 59,000 came from countries other than Mexico. “These included 663 individuals from special-interest countries like Afghanistan, Libya, Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen and four countries that have been designated by the U.S. Department of State as state-sponsors of terror – Cuba, Iran, Syria, and Sudan,” Cornyn said. Special interest countries are those whose citizens are subject to enhanced screening by the Transportation Security Administration on U.S.-bound flights as a result of the attempted Christmas Day bombing of Northwest Flight 253. The U.S. Border Patrol, which falls under the Homeland Security Department, is charged with apprehending aliens attempting to illegally cross U.S. borders. As CNSNews.com [previously reported](http://cnsnews.com/), in fiscal year 2010, around 84 percent of the approximately 448,000 illegal aliens arrested by the U.S. Border Patrol were not prosecuted. After delivering his remarks at the 15th annual U.S.-Mexico Congressional Border Issues Conference, Sen. Cornyn told reporters he asked the Director of National Intelligence whether the apprehension of the 663 individuals was national security vulnerability. “He said yes it was, so we need to do more,” Cornyn said. What the Obama administration is doing to secure the border more is “obviously not enough,” he added. During his speech, Cornyn criticized the Obama administration’s border security efforts, saying that Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano talks about the resources that have been devoted to border areas -- the so called ‘inputs’ – “where I’m really more interested in what the results, or the outputs, are.” Napolitano, who also spoke at the event, said “taken as whole, the manpower, the technology, the resources, represent the most serious and sustained action to secure the border in our nation’s history, and it’s clear from every statistical measure that the approach is working.” Napolitano called Border Patrol apprehensions a “key indicator of illegal traffic” along the U.S. borders, and she noted the apprehensions have decreased 36 percent in the past two years and are less than one half of what they were at their peak. Sen. Cornyn suggested that a border security strategy should have a coordinated “interagency approach,” where the various federal entities charged with security along the border are working together and complementing one another. He also said that a “good” border security strategy “should be resourced appropriately.” The annual border conference took place on Capitol Hill and was sponsored by the U.S.-Mexico Chamber of Commerce.

The CP solves terrorism best – all future attacks will be through Mexico unless the US enhances border security

McCaul 06, Michael McCaul, Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Subcommittee of Investigations, “A Line in the Sand: Confronting the Threat at the Southwest Border,” 2006, <http://usgovinfo.about.com/library/PDF/Border-Report.pdf>//MC

Statements made by high-ranking Mexican officials prior to and following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks indicate that one or more Islamic terrorist organizations has sought to establish a presence in Mexico. In May 2001, former Mexican National security adviser and ambassador to the United Nations, Adolfo Aguilar Zinser, reported, that “Spanish and Islamic terrorist groups are using Mexico as a refuge.”114 Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Robert Mueller has confirmed in testimony “that there are individuals from countries with known al-Qa’ida connections who are changing their Islamic surnames to Hispanic-sounding names and obtaining false Hispanic identities, learning to speak Spanish and pretending to be Hispanic immigrants.115 These examples highlight the dangerous intersection between traditional transnational criminal activities, such as human and drug smuggling, and more ominous threats to national security. Sheriff Sigifredo Gonzalez summed it up this way: “I dare to say that at any given time, daytime or nighttime, one can get on a boat and traverse back and forth between Texas and Mexico and not get caught. If smugglers can bring in tons of marijuana and cocaine at one time and can smuggle 20 to 30 persons at one time, one can just imagine how easy it would be to bring in 2 to 3 terrorists or their weapons of mass destruction across the river and not be detected. Chances of apprehension are very slim.”116 Furthermore, according to senior U.S. military and intelligence officials, Venezuela is emerging as a potential hub of terrorism in the Western Hemisphere, providing assistance to Islamic radicals from the Middle East and other terrorists.117 General James Hill, commander of U.S. Southern Command, has warned the United States faces a growing risk from both Middle Eastern terrorists relocating to Latin America and terror groups originating in the region. General Hill said groups such as Hezbollah had established bases in Latin America. These groups are taking advantage of smuggling hotspots, such as the tri-border area of Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay, and Venezuela’s Margarita Island, to channel funds to terrorist groups around the world.118 Venezuela is providing support—including identity documents—that could prove useful to radical Islamic groups, say some U.S. officials. The Venezuelan government has issued thousands of cedulas, the equivalent of Social Security cards, to people from places such as Cuba, Columbia, and Middle Eastern nations that host foreign terrorist organizations. The U.S. officials believe that the Venezuelan government is issuing the documents to people who should not be getting them and that some of these cedulas could be subsequently used to obtain Venezuelan passports and even American visas, which could allow the holder to elude immigration checks and enter the United States.119 Recently, several Pakistanis were apprehended at the U.S.-Mexican border with fraudulent Venezuelan documents.120 “Hugo Chavez, President of Venezuela, has been clearly talking to Iran about uranium,” said a senior administration official quoted by the Washington Times. Chavez has made several trips to Iran and voiced solidarity with the country's hard-line mullahs. He has hosted Iranian officials in Caracas, endorsed Tehran's nuclear ambitions and expressed support for the insurgency in Iraq. The Times reports Venezuela is also talking with Hamas about sending representatives to Venezuela to raise money for the militant group's newly elected Palestinian government as Chavez seeks to build an anti-U.S. axis that also includes Fidel Castro's Cuba. “I am on the offensive,” Chavez said on the al Jazeera television network, “because attack is the best form of defense. We are waging an offensive battle….”121

The border is the most vulnerable access point into the US and terrorists will exploit that – federal action increases national security and risk assessment addresses the issues of ports

McCaul 06, Michael McCaul, Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Subcommittee of Investigations, “A Line in the Sand: Confronting the Threat at the Southwest Border,” 2006, <http://usgovinfo.about.com/library/PDF/Border-Report.pdf//MC>

* + Risk assessment is where the US evaluates the threat level for the port and then enacts policies relevant to the threat level

The Federal government has taken positive steps to secure its borders, but much more is needed to combat an increasingly powerful, sophisticated, and violent criminal network which has been successful in smuggling illegal contraband, human or otherwise, into our country. The growth of these criminal groups, along the Southwest border, and the potential for terrorists to exploit the vulnerabilities which they create, represents a real threat to America’s national security. It is imperative that immediate action be taken to enhance security along our nation’s Southwest border. Greater control of the border can be achieved by: • enhancing Border Patrol resources, including expanding agent training capacity, and technical surveillance abilities; • constructing physical barriers in vulnerable and high-threat areas; • implementing state-of-the-art technology, cameras, sensors, radar, satellite, and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles to ensure maximum coverage of the Nation’s Southwest border; • making permanent the “catch and return” policy; • expanding the use of the expedited removal policy; • establishing additional detention bed space; • improving partnerships and information sharing among Federal, State, and local law enforcement; • building a secure interoperable communications network for Border Patrol and state and local law enforcement; • mandating a comprehensive risk assessment of all Southwest border Ports of Entry and international land borders to prevent the entry of terrorist and weapons of mass destruction; • promoting both international and domestic policies that will deter further illegal entry into the United States; and • enhancing intelligence capabilities and information sharing with our Mexican counterparts and improving cooperation with the Mexican government to eradicate the Cartels. The Subcommittee will continue its investigation of border security matters and plans to issue a more comprehensive report on the entire Southwest border. The Subcommittee will hold future hearings, as warranted, on border security.

# 2NC CP Popular (politics net benefit)

Congress is warming up to talks about immigration and visa reform

Ziglar and Alden 11, James Ziglar, senior fellow at the Migration Policy Institute, and Edward Alden, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, “The Real Price of Sealing the Border,” April 8th, 2011, from the Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703806304576242660330969554.html//>MC

What's needed is to reform our immigration system so that it doesn't encourage illegal immigration. This requires reforming the laws on legal immigration rather than just the enforcement components. A realistic, flexible visa program that matched available workers to open jobs in both boom times and bust would reduce much of the pressure on limited enforcement resources at the border and in the workplace. What about legalizing those here illegally? Using and misusing the loaded term "amnesty," opponents have shut down consideration of any program that could deal with this question realistically. Such opposition has even blocked the Dream Act, which would have given legal status to about 800,000 children brought to this country by their parents, who few in Congress actually want to see deported. The Obama administration has been pilloried for focusing on the deportation of illegal immigrants with criminal records rather than indiscriminately hunting down every immigration violator. But a sensible legalization program would bring enforcement resources more in line with reality and restore integrity to the laws by increasing the odds that law-breakers will be identified, apprehended and deported. Few, if any, government agencies outside the immigration services have been allowed to operate for so long under legal mandates so utterly disconnected from their resources and capabilities. It's a good first step that members of Congress have begun sensible discussions over what types of enforcement measures may be most needed, and how much the country should be willing to spend. It's time for all sides to work together to figure out what measures will yield effective and cost-efficient solutions both to our immigration problem and to our needs for high-skilled and low-skilled labor.

Immigration reform is popular – shields the link

Alden 06, senior fellow at the Council of Foreign Relations, “Republican split bars way to immigration reform,” March 29th, 2006, from The Financial Times, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/640c6c62-bf52-11da-9de7-0000779e2340.html//>MC

The Senate launched a debate on Wednesday on the most sweeping proposals to reform US immigration laws in two decades, but divisions within the majority Republican party pose a huge obstacle to approval of the legislation in an election year. Immigration reform, which President George W. Bush has been seeking for more than two years, has exposed disagreements among conservatives over whether low-wage immigrants should be seen as a boon to the economy or a threat to American workers and a drain on government coffers. In an unusual procedural move, the Senate will debate two different bills that reflect both sides of that debate. Bill Frist, the Senate Republican leader who is trying to position himself for a presidential run in 2008, has offered legislation that would tighten border security and increase penalties on US employers who hire illegal immigrants but would not increase the annual quota of legal migrants. That approach is popular in the US, and among Republicans. Recent polls have found that as many as 70 per cent of voters say they favour candidates who pledge to get tougher on illegal immigration. But Mr Frist has tried at the same time not to alienate Hispanic voters, who are an increasingly important Republican constituency, telling a group of Hispanic educators this week that "this nation was made great by men and women who longed for a better life and came to America to find it". As a result, he has pledged to allow a vote that could replace his bill with radically different legislation that is favoured by many Democrats and by Senator John McCain, who is likely to be one of Mr Frist's chief rivals in the 2008 Republican presidential primary.

# ---Intel Gathering

# 1NC Shell

Text: The United States federal government should develop and fully integrate information systems that aid in combating terrorism.

Only the CP solves - There are many ways to crack the system and only one successful crack is needed to break the network

Garreau 05, Joel Garreau, staff writer for the Washington Post, “Intelligence Gathering Is the Best Way to Reduce Terrorism,” *Are Efforts to Reduce Terrorism Successful?,* published by Lauri Friedman, pg 60-63//MC

Another tactic: advancing the cause of the weakest link. “Suppose I’ve got a really powerful pulsetaker,” says Stephenson, “vying for a position of dominance. But I also know that a member of the blood kin group is moving forward who is weaker. If you arrange an accident to eliminate the pulsetaker, and let the weaker family member come in, you’ve helped corrupt the network.” The beauty of seeding weakness into an organization is that you can degrade its effectiveness while still monitoring it, and not causing a new and potentially more efficient organization to replace it. “You don’t want to blow away the organization. You want to keep some fraudulent activity going on so you can monitor it. If you blow them away, you lose your leads,” says Stephenson. “Better the devil you know. Like [Libyan dictator] [Moammar] Gaddafi. Keep him alive, because you know him. Who knows what sort of clever mastermind might replace him.” Intelligence is crucial to analyze the network’s weak links so you can destroy it. In a war between human networks, the side with superior intelligence wins. “You’re talking about what amounts to a clan or a tribe or brotherhood of blood and spilled blood. That is really tough to crack. Trying to infiltrate it—we’re talking years,” says David Ronfeldt, a senior social scientist at Rand. However, from outside the network you can also look for patterns that stand out from the norm, like who talks to whom, e-mail exchanges, telephone records, bank records and who uses whose credit cards, says Ronfeldt. “I would attack on the basis of their trust in the command and control structures by which they operate,” says Arquilla. “If they believe they are being listened to, they will be inhibited. If we were to reduce their trust in their infrastructure, it would drive them to non-technical means—force them to keep their heads down more. A courier carrying a disk has a hell of a long way to go to communicate worldwide. If you slow them down, interception is more likely.” Human networks are distinct from electronic networks. But technology is the sea in which they swim. “What made [networks] vulnerable historically is their inability to coordinate their purpose,” says Manuel Castells, author of “The Rise of the Network Society,” the first volume of his trilogy, “The Information Age.” “But at this point,” he says, “they have this ability to be both decentralized and highly focused. That’s what’s new. And that’s technology. Not just electronic. It’s their ability to travel everywhere. Their ability to be informed everywhere. Their ability to receive money from everywhere.” This is why Arquilla is dubious about some traditional intelligence gathering techniques, and enthusiastic about new ones. For instance: You can talk about turning one of the network members over to your side, but “that’s problematic,” he says. “You don’t know if they’re playing you as a double agent or are simply psychotic.” He is also dubious about the value of satellite reconnaissance in determining what we need to know about these networks. Find a member of the enemy group who is clearly a harmless idiot; treat him as if he were the most important figure and the only one worthy of being taken seriously. However, Arquilla likes the idea of understanding how the network works by using clandestine technical collection [using technology to spy]. For instance, he says, when any computer user surfs on the Web—looking for travel tickets, say—more often than not a piece of software, called a cookie, is transmitted to his computer. The device monitors his every move and reports back to some database what he’s done. Now, Arquilla says, “think of something much more powerful than cookies.” They exist, he says. One way to use them is by creating “honey pots.” This involves identifying Web sites used by activists or setting up a Web site that will attract them, and seeding [the honey pots] with these intelligent software agents. When the activists check in, they can’t leave without taking with them a piece of software that allows you to backtrack, getting into at least one part of the enemy network. “That likely gives you his/her all-channel connections, and maybe even some hints about hubs or the direction of some links,” says Arquilla. There are other possibilities. “You know those little cameras that some people have on top of their monitors? Let me just say that it is entirely possible to activate those and operate them and look through them without the machine being turned on,” he says. Software also exists that “allows you to reconstruct every single keystroke. One after the other. Why is that important? If you do find the right machine, you can reconstruct everything that [was typed]. Even with unbreakable encryption, you have all the keystrokes.” Much of this is hardly new, of course, divide and conquer has worked for a long time. Whenever the police got a Mafia wiseguy—Joe Valachi, for instance—to betray the others, no Mafiosi could trust another one as much anymore. Machiavelli, in “The Prince” of 1505, wrote about the strategic deployment of betrayal to undermine trust. What’s different is our technological ability to track groups in real time and see patterns that may be invisible on the surface. “Our technology is sufficient that you can now handle radicalized groups. We can deal with 30 to several thousand,” says Carley. “You couldn’t do that before.” In 1996, Arquilla and Ronfeldt wrote a slim but highly prescient volume called “The Advent of Netwar” for the National Defense Research Institute, a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the defense agencies. It predicts that in a war between human networks, the side with superior intelligence wins. It also makes some tactical suggestions about countering human networks with counter-networks that actually have been used to combat computer hackers. They include: • Find a member of the enemy group who is clearly a harmless idiot; treat him as if he were the most important figure and the only one worthy of being taken seriously. • Single out competent and genuinely dangerous figures; write them off or call their loyalty to the cause into question. • Control the stories people tell each other to define their reason for living and acting as they do. The terrorist story, says Ronfeldt, “gives these people common cause—us versus them. Right now the U.S. would seem to have the edge at the worldwide level. But within the region, there was the dancing in the streets in Palestine. Part of the story is that America’s evil, and that America’s presence is to blame for so many of the problems in the Middle East. We have to attack that part.” • Find the list of demands extorted by the network; grant some that make no sense and/or disturb and divide their political aims. • Paint the enemy with PR ugly paint [public relations slander] so that they seem beyond the pale, ridiculous, alien, maniacal, inexplicable. • Destroy their social support networks by using “helpful” but differently valued groups that are not perceived as aggressive. • Divide and conquer; identify parts of the network that can be pacified and play them against former allies. • Intensify the human counter-networks in one’s own civil society. Adds Manuel Castells: “We should be organizing our own networks, posing as Islamic terrorist networks. We should then demand to join one of these networks and then destroy the trust structures. Only way to infiltrate. Oldest technique in the world.” Few of these ideas involve flattening Kabul [Afghanistan], all of these analysts note. Stephenson worries that massing the Navy near Afghanistan is “a symbolic show of old-fashioned strength. It’s not about that anymore. This whole playing ground has shifted.” “In order to do anything, you cannot be blind,” says Castells. “The most extraordinary vulnerability of the American military is it looks like they do not have many informants inside Afghanistan. It also looks like the majority of the components of this network do not relate directly or essentially to nation-states. That is new. Unless we have a fundamental rethinking of strategic matters, it’s going to be literally, literally exhausting and impossible. It will be desperate missile attacks at the wrong targets with a lot of suffering.

# 2NC Solvency - Generic

Information systems let us get at the core of terrorist organizations – we only need to get a few “key nodes”

Garreau 05, Joel Garreau, staff writer for the Washington Post, “Intelligence Gathering Is the Best Way to Reduce Terrorism,” *Are Efforts to Reduce Terrorism Successful?,* published by Lauri Friedman, pg 59-60//MC

In the case of terror networks, people are linked by family ties, marriage ties and shared principles, interests and goals. They thus can be all of one mind, even though they are dispersed and devoted to different tasks. They “know what they have to do” without needing a single-central leadership, command or headquarters. There is no precise heart or head that can be targeted, Arquilla says. Even if you take out an Osama bin Laden [that is, a terrorist] his organization, al Qaeda (“The Base”), still has the resilience of a classic human network. Bin Laden’s, for instance, is made up of an estimated two dozen separate militant Islamic groups in the Philippines, Lebanon, Egypt, Kashmir, Algeria, Indonesia and elsewhere, with hundreds of cells, some of them located in Western Europe and even the United States, as we’ve now discovered. On the other hand, depending on the structure of the network, removing a few key nodes can sometimes do a lot of good, says Frank Fukuyama, author of the seminal work “Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity” and now a professor at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University. “Some are so tightly bound to each other that they are not embedded in other networks. Kill a few nodes, and the whole thing collapses. Take the case of the [terrorist group] Sendero Luminoso [Shining Path] in Peru. It couldn’t have been that hierarchical. It was designed for the mountains of Peru. It couldn’t have been terribly centralized. It had a scattered cell structure. It was hard to infiltrate. It was dispersed. And yet when you got [Shining Path founder and leader Abimael] Guzman and a few top aides, the entire thing fell apart. “The idea that there is no end of terrorists, no way to stamp them all out, that if you kill a hundred, another hundred will spring up—I would be very careful of that assumption. The network of people who are willing to blow themselves up has to be limited. Sure, there are sympathizers and bagmen and drivers. But the actual core network of suicide bombers is probably a much smaller population. It is also tight-knit and hard to infiltrate. But it is limited. It is not obvious to me that there is an endless supply.”

Only the CP solves – information systems and networks are the only ways to challenge asymmetric war fighting and terrorism

Garreau 05, Joel Garreau, staff writer for the Washington Post, “Intelligence Gathering Is the Best Way to Reduce Terrorism,” *Are Efforts to Reduce Terrorism Successful?,* published by Lauri Friedman, pg 57-58//MC

Terrorist organizations are human networks, not armies. They rely on trust, relationships, and communication to operate. Military operations and bombing campaigns will be ineffective against such groups because they will not destroy the trust and connections those networks are built upon. Therefore, the most effective way to reduce terrorism is to wage a war of wits. With good intelligence gathering techniques, authorities can learn who the key terrorists are and either eliminate them or tarnish their reputations in the eyes of others in the network. Unraveling the ties that bind terrorists will win the war on terrorism. The essence of this first war of the 21st century is that it’s not like the old ones. That’s why, as $40 billion is voted for the new war on terrorism, 35,000 reservists are called up and two aircraft carrier battle groups hover near Afghanistan,1 some warriors and analysts have questions: In the Information Age, they ask, how do you attack, degrade or destroy a small, shadowy, globally distributed, stateless network of intensely loyal partisans with few fixed assets or addresses? If bombers are not the right hammer for this nail, what is? Bombers worked well in wars in which one Industrial Age military threw steel at another. World War II, for instance, was a matchup of roughly symmetrical forces. This is not true today. That’s why people who think about these things call this new conflict “asymmetric warfare.” The terrorist side is different: different organization, different methods of attack—and of defense. “It takes a tank to fight a tank. It takes a network to fight a network,” says John Arquilla, senior consultant to the international security group Rand and co-author of the forthcoming “Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime and Militancy.” He asks: “How do you attack a trust structure—which is what a network is? You’re not going to do this with Tomahawk missiles or strategic bombardment.” “It’s a whole new playing field. You’re not attacking a nation, but a network,” says Karen Stephenson, who studies everything from corporations to the U.S. Navy as if they were tribes. Trained as a chemist and anthropologist, she now teaches at Harvard and the University of London. “You have to understand what holds those networks in place, what makes them strong and where the leverage points are. They’re not random connections,” she says. Human networks are distinct from electronic ones. They are not the Internet. They are political and emotional connections among people who must trust each other in order to function, like Colombian drug cartels and [Spanish] Basque separatists and the Irish Republican Army. Not to mention high-seas pirates, smugglers of illegal immigrants, and rogue brokers of weapons of mass destruction. But how to [destroy] a network? The good news is that in the last decade we have developed a whole new set of weapons to figure that out.

# ---NPT

# 1NC Shell

Text: The United States federal government should begin disarmament in accordance to the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 2010.

The counterplan solves – other states will model after the United States and it is the only way to ensure the threats of nuclear terrorism and rouge states goes away. It is also gaining domestic and international support

Burt 5/1, Alistair Burt, Parlimentary Under Secretary of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the United Kingdom, “The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty – At the Heart of the Global Nuclear Debate,” May 1st, 2012, from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/2012/05/01/nuclear-non-proliferation-treaty-at-heart-of-global-nuclear-debate/b0ns//MC>

The word “nuclear” is often on the front pages of the press, whether you’re in Tehran, Tokyo or Tunis. In the last few weeks alone, we’ve seen international talks about Iran’s nuclear programme and united international concern that it is developing a nuclear weapon. We have also seen the DPRK rocket launch—ostensibly a failed satellite launch, but widely suspected to be part of a nuclear weapons programme. Yet at the same time we’ve seen unprecedented agreement by world leaders at the Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul to work together to tackle the threat of nuclear terrorism. The issue of nuclear safety was thrust onto the front pages last year during the massive emergency response to the accident at the Fukushima nuclear plant, following the tragic earthquake and tsunami in Japan. Given our expectation that world-wide energy demand is set to double by 2050, and the stark reality that we must reduce global greenhouse gas emissions if we are to avoid catastrophic climate change, then it is clear that the debate about the peaceful uses of nuclear power and the risks of the spread of nuclear weapons is set to continue. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is at the heart of our approach to this debate. The Treaty, borne out of fear that the Cold War era would lead to a nuclear arms race, has in many ways surpassed expectations in terms of longevity, participation and meeting its counter proliferation objectives. Today, with 189 States Parties to the Treaty, it has more signatories than any other treaty of its kind. The three non-signatories India, Israel, and Pakistan, are the only additional states believed to have gained possession of nuclear weapons since the Treaty’s inception in 1968. We have left the Cold War era long behind us, and while the Treaty continues to be a considerable deterrent to the spread of nuclear weapons, we must all work to ensure that it evolves and adapts to counter current and future threats to international peace and security. We took a big step towards achieving this in 2010. As my first overseas duty as a UK Foreign Office Minister I attended the NPT Review Conference at the UN in New York. The outcome was a significant boost to multilateralism. All States Parties agreed to support the Treaty to meet new and existing threats. A five year action plan was agreed by consensus, spanning the three so-called “pillars” of the NPT – progress toward disarmament by existing nuclear weapon states, measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to others and, a crucial part of the bargain struck in 1968, supporting the peaceful use of nuclear energy for those that want it. Agreement to the action plan represented the start of a process. The real test will be through delivery of the action plan to meet our commitments by the next Review Conference in 2015. The 2012 NPT Preparatory Committee starting this week in Vienna will be the first meeting of States Parties to assess our progress and build on the success of 2010. I hope that all states will come ready to discuss the progress they have made and plans for implementation of the NPT action plan. I am pleased that the UK will have an excellent story to tell. Since 2010 the UK has set out our plans for the reduction of our nuclear warheads, missiles and overall nuclear weapons stockpile. Amongst the nuclear weapons states (China, France, Russia, the UK and the US), all members of the NPT, stockpiles already stand at their lowest since the Cold War, and we meet regularly to discuss how we will work together to make further progress towards our long-term goal of a world without nuclear weapons. The UK has also been conducting groundbreaking work with Norway on the verification of nuclear warhead dismantlement, a crucial aspect of any future disarmament regime, and [this month] hosted the first ever meeting of the five nuclear weapon states on this issue. We have also taken important steps towards preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We continue to support a universal, strengthened system of safeguards to verify that States comply with their international obligations to uphold the non-proliferation regime. The regime is also strengthened by Nuclear Weapons Free Zones which enhance regional and international security. In support of this, the UK, together with the other nuclear weapons states recognised under the NPT, reached an agreement with the Association of South East Asian Nations, underscoring that we will not to use, or threaten to use, nuclear weapons against the 10 states party to the South East Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. Credible, internationally binding commitments are vital to building the climate of trust between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons states. With this latest addition, such arrangements now cover almost 100 countries. Furthermore, since 2010 the UK has worked to support the safe expansion of civil-nuclear energy—and has recently completed agreements to share nuclear energy knowledge and capabilities with the UAE and Kuwait. Following the tragic events at Fukushima, the UK undertook comprehensive nuclear safety checks and reviewed our own nuclear energy future, including identifying eight potential sites for new nuclear power stations. At the Review Conference in 2010 I was struck by the positive approach of all towards strengthening the NPT. This reflects the widespread belief that the NPT offers the best chance we have of getting the balance right on nuclear issues: with progress towards the long term goal of a world free of the threat of nuclear weapons, while allowing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is a goal to which I am personally committed. If we fail, we risk the uncontrolled spread of nuclear weapons to rogue states and terrorist groups. It is a shared responsibility of us all to ensure we do not fail.

# 2NC Solvency – Spill Over

US key to solve the NPT.

Curtis, ‘8 – Charles B. Curtis, president of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, “Reducing the Global Nuclear Danger: International Cooperation – the Indispensable Security Imperative;” Published 2008, speech given November 1st, 2007, From the Commission of the Better World Foundation, <http://www.nti.org/c_press/speech_curtis_reducing1107.pdf>

To do this, the United States must abandon its policy of disdain for international treaty regimes and institutions, and work instead to strengthen them. Underlying this effort must be a restored U.S. commitment to work through the United Nations and the structure of international regimes for counter-proliferation, counter-terrorism, arms reduction and control, and the instruments for promoting global economic wellbeing that the United States helped create but has recently failed to adequately support. Where international organizations and regimes have been weakened by our lack of support or by their own internal flaws, these weaknesses must be eliminated, and both political and financial support restored. Working through international institutions is critical to restoring faith in the United States as a global partner. That restored faith will allow more effective leadership. Central to gaining international cooperation from non-nuclear weapons states on nuclear proliferation matters would be a clear and unambiguous commitment by the U.S. and other weapons states to act purposefully to meet their responsibilities under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). This point was made in an opinion piece written in January in the Wall Street Journal by former U.S. Secretaries of State George Shultz and Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry, and former Senator Sam Nunn. In their essay, “A World Free of Nuclear Weapons,” they argue that we are on the precipice of a new and dangerous nuclear era, with more nuclear-armed states and a real risk of nuclear terrorism. In such a world, the four warn that continued reliance on nuclear deterrence for maintaining international security “is becoming increasingly hazardous and decreasingly effective,” and that none of the nonproliferation steps being taken now “are adequate to the danger.” The veteran statesmen argue that the United States and other nations must both embrace the vision of a world free from the threat of nuclear weapons and pursue a balanced program of practical measures toward achieving that goal: “Without the bold vision, the actions will not be perceived as fair or urgent. Without the actions, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible.” As former Secretary General Kofi Annan noted as he left office, the world risks becoming mired in a sterile stand-off between those who care most about disarmament and those who care most about proliferation. Continued paralysis is a danger to us all. On our current path, in Annan’s words, the “world is sleepwalking toward nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism.” The United States has an opportunity to break this stalemate and re-establish its essential leadership in non-proliferation in a single, dramatic stroke. Selecting the forum of the United Nations annual meeting of the General Assembly attended by all world leaders, the United States should expressly and explicitly renew its NPT vows. The President should state the U.S. intention to engage all nuclear weapons states in a joint enterprise to work toward a safer world free from the threat of nuclear weapons and toward the establishment of a more secure global political context that would make that goal possible. The President should acknowledge that the requisite security context for achieving that goal does not exist today – and admit that we are headed in the wrong direction and must change course. The President could emphasize this commitment by announcing a number of steps that would reduce the nuclear danger and underscore America’s bona fides.

# 2NC Prolif Bad– Stability

Proliferation destabilizes the globe

Clinton 10, Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State, “No Greater Danger: Protecting our Nation and Allies from Nuclear Terrorism and Nuclear Proliferation;” April 9th, 2010, from the State Department, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/139958.htm>//MC

Secretary Clinton delivers remarks entitled “No Greater Danger: Protecting our Nation and Allies from Nuclear Terrorism and Nuclear Proliferation” at the University of Louisville as part of the McConnell Center's Spring Lecture Series. Secretary Clinton said: "I want to speak about why nuclear arms control, nonproliferation, and nuclear security matter to each of us, and how the initiatives and the acronyms that make up our bipartisan work on these issues are coming together to make our nation safer. "There is a reason that presidents and foreign policy leaders in both parties are determined to address this danger. A nuclear attack anywhere could destroy the foundations of global order. While the United States and old Soviet Union are no longer locked in a nuclear standoff, nuclear proliferation is a leading source of insecurity in our world today. "And the United States benefits when the world is stable: our troops can spend more time at home, our companies can make better long-term investments, our allies are free to work with us to address long-term challenges like poverty and disease. But nuclear proliferation, including the nuclear programs being pursued by North Korea and Iran, are in exact opposition to those goals. Proliferation endangers our forces, our allies, and our broader global interests. And to the extent it pushes other countries to develop nuclear weapons in response, it can threaten the entire international order."

North Korean proliferation causes nuclear war

CNN 03, CNN, “N K. Warns of nuclear conflict,” February 26th, 2003, from CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/asiapcf/east/02/25/nkorea.missile/index.html//MC

Pyongyang cites upcoming U.S.-South Korean joint military exercises scheduled to begin on March 4, as "reckless war moves" designed to "unleash a total war on the Korean peninsula with a pre-emptive nuclear strike". "The situation of the Korean Peninsula is reaching the brink of a nuclear war," the statement, issued by the official Korean Central News Agency, says. The North also called on South Koreans to "wage a nationwide anti-U.S. and anti-war struggle to frustrate the U.S. moves for a nuclear war." The United States denies it has any plans to attack North Korea, consistently saying it is seeking a diplomatic and political solution to the increasing tensions sparked by Pyongyang's decision to reactivate its nuclear program. U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell on Tuesday wrapped up a four-day tour of Japan, China and South Korea during which he lobbied Asian leaders to support a multi-lateral approach to pressure North Korea to abandon its nuclear ambitions. Powell repeated the U.S. position that it had no intention of invading North Korea and had no plans to impose fresh economic sanctions on the impoverished communist nation. While Japan and South Korea indicated they might support a regional initiative to sway Pyongyang, China -- a key ally and aid donor to the North -- appeared to remain unconvinced. China says the United States must deal with Pyongyang equally on a one-to-one basis. "We believe diplomatic, political pressure still has a role to play. And there are countries who have considerable influence with the North Koreans who will continue to apply pressure," Powell said Tuesday. "We also made it clear that if they begin reprocessing (nuclear material), it changes the entire political landscape. And we're making sure that is communicated to them in a number of channels." Powell would not be drawn on how would Washington react if Pyongyang did begin reprocessing but did say that the U.S. had "no intention of invading" North Korea. Tensions on the peninsula have been ratcheting up over the past few weeks with North Korea becoming increasingly provocative. On Monday, the North fired a short-range missile into the Sea of Japan, or East Sea, an act many believe was designed to upstage the inauguration of new South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun. ([Roh sworn in](http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/asiapcf/east/02/24/skorea.inauguration.reut/index.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)) Last week, a North Korean MiG-19 fighter briefly flew into South Korean air space. ([MiG incursion](http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/asiapcf/east/02/20/skorea.mig/index.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)) The North has also threatened to abandon the 1953 armistice that ended the fighting of the Korean War.

Iranian proliferation causes war

Gold, 07 [Thomas J., Masters in Strategic Intelligence, Joint Military Intelligence College, Nuclear Conflict in the Middle East: An Analysis of Future Events, p. 53-55]

If the political, ethnic, and military policies, and future nuclear weapons development in the Middle East continue in their present directions, Iran or Iraq will eventually initiate a nuclear conflict, probably in the 2005-2015 time frame. Major focal events such as total arms control (resulting in a regional NWFZ), individual acceptance of the NPT, or changes in Middle East leadership will ultimately determine which future happens. FUTURE INDICATORS A constant watch is needed to assess the actions, intentions, and progress of the Middle East countries with their nuclear programs. As well as the status of each country’s nuclear program, its military capability and intentions must also be monitored to determine which future direction is most likely and if the first use of nuclear weapons is likely. ‘Future Indicators” verify the progress of each country toward the most likely “Alternate Future”. Future No. 23 (most likely,): Israel, Iran, and Iraq have developed nuclear weapons. Israel and Iran have kept their weapons as a deterrent. Iraq is the first to use nuclear weapons, probably for aggression. Depending on which Middle East country is attacked by Iraq, either Israel or Iran will retaliate with a secondary nuclear strike. Actions by the U.S., Russia, or other countries will have little effect in deterring this retaliation. This future scenario also carries the risk of escalation into a regional or global nuclear conflict if the major nuclear powers become involved. This scenario can only take place if Iran chooses to retain its nuclear weapons for deterrence rather than be aggressive. Note that Iran has developed weapons approximately three years earlier than Iraq. Israel must also be complacent about Iraq’s program and not destroy the Iraqi reactors as it did in 1981. Transposition to Future No. 20: Iran becomes democratic and does not develop nuclear weapons. However, without the appearance of having a potential nuclear capability, Iran will surely become the most probable target of Iraq’s attack. Transposition to Future No. 14: Israel or one of the major nuclear powers takes a major action which deters Iraq from nuclear aggression. This scenario would result in a very unstable situation when all three countries have nuclear weapons. The potential would then exist for a regional dispute to escalate into nuclear conflict. Transposition to Future No. I: Prior to any conflict, all Middle East countries have agreed to a NWFZ, abandoned their nuclear development programs, and destroyed all nuclear weapons and related materials. Indicators for Future Scenario No. 23: A tier the development and assembly of a nuclear device, Iraq may test the weapon within Iraqi territory to verify its design, or politically move Iraq into being a nuclear power: this action would be a major step toward regional hegemony. After testing this weapon, Iraq may also begin a buildup of its nuclear capability for future deterrence or aggression. Future No. 17 (second most likely): Israel and Iran have developed nuclear weapons. Iraq program is not complete, and Israel has kept its weapons as a deterrent. Iran is the first to use nuclear weapons, probably for aggression. As the status of the Iraqi program is uncertain, the most probable target for an Iranian first strike using nuclear weapons is Israel. A nuclear retaliation by Israel would be certain. The potential now exists for the involvement of the major nuclear powers, the U.S. siding with Israel, and Russia siding with Iran. Escalation to regional or global nuclear war is now a possibility.

# 2NC Prolif Bad– Miscalc

Proliferation increases the risk of miscalculation – it’s also a better internal link to nuclear terror

ICNND 09, – International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, from Gareth Evans and Yoriko Kawaguchi, Co-Chairs of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament; “Eliminating Nuclear Threats: A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers;” published 2009; <http://www.icnnd.org/reference/reports/ent/pdf/ICNND_Report-EliminatingNuclearThreats.pdf>//MC

3.1 Ensuring that no new states join the ranks of those already nuclear armed must continue to be one of the world’s top international security priorities. Every new nuclear-armed state will add significantly to the inherent risks – of accident or miscalculation as well as deliberate use – involved in any possession of these weapons, and potentially encourage more states to acquire nuclear weapons to avoid being left behind. Any scramble for nuclear capabilities is bound to generate severe instability in bilateral, regional and international relations. The carefully worked checks and balances of interstate relations will come under severe stress. There will be enhanced fears of nuclear blackmail, and of irresponsible and unpredictable leadership behaviour. 3.2 In conditions of inadequate command and control systems, absence of confidence building measures and multiple agencies in the nuclear weapons chain of authority, the possibility of an accidental or maverick usage of nuclear weapons will remain high. Unpredictable elements of risk and reward will impact on decision making processes. The dangers are compounded if the new and aspiring nuclear weapons states have, as is likely to be the case, ongoing inter-state disputes with ideological, territorial, historical – and for all those reasons, strongly emotive – dimensions. 3.3 The transitional period is likely to be most dangerous of all, with the arrival of nuclear weapons tending to be accompanied by sabre rattling and competitive nuclear chauvinism. For example, as between Pakistan and India a degree of stability might have now evolved, but 1998–2002 was a period of disturbingly fragile interstate relations. Command and control and risk management of nuclear weapons takes time to evolve. Military and political leadership in new nuclear-armed states need time to learn and implement credible safety and security systems. The risks of nuclear accidents and the possibility of nuclear action through inadequate crisis control mechanisms are very high in such circumstances. If this is coupled with political instability in such states, the risks escalate again. Where such countries are beset with internal stresses and fundamentalist groups with trans-national agendas, the risk of nuclear weapons or fissile material coming into possession of non‑state actors cannot be ignored. 3.4 The action–reaction cycle of nations on high alerts, of military deployments, threats and counter threats of military action, have all been witnessed in the Korean peninsula with unpredictable behavioural patterns driving interstate relations. The impact of a proliferation breakout in the Middle East would be much wider in scope and make stability management extraordinarily difficult. Whatever the chances of “stable deterrence” prevailing in a Cold War or India–Pakistan setting, the prospects are significantly less in a regional setting with multiple nuclear power centres divided by multiple and cross-cutting sources of conflict.

Middle Eastern conflict would go nuclear

Primakov 09, Yevgeny Primakov, President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation and Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; member of the Editorial Board of *Russia in Global Affairs*, “The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations,” September 5, 2009, from the scientific report for which the author was awarded the Lomonosov Gold Medal of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 2008, eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/n\_13593//MC

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposing superpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS *Liberty* was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict. The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusion no longer conforms to the reality. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect of a nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched *Yevgeny Primakov* 1 3 2 RUSSIA IN GLOBAL AFFAIRS VOL. 7 • No. 3 • JULY – SEPTEMBER• 2009 by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

# Aff – NPT Fails

The NPT has structural flaws that states can take advantage of – North Korean proves

Claussen 08, Bjørn Ragnar Claussen, fellow at the Folke Bernadotte Academy for Peace Studies, Masters from the Centre for Peace Studies at the University of Tromsø, “The Future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy,” Autumn 2008, From the Centre for Peace Studies, <http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/bitstream/handle/10037/2062/thesis.pdf?sequence=1>//MC

Moreover, if states withdraw from the NPT, their number would arguably add to the “pressure from outside.” Although many states consider the right to withdraw from a treaty as a norm of international law, the abrupt termination of a multilateral arms control treaty such as the NPT may directly affect the security of many or all parties.134 As noted in the previous chapter section (2.4.2), the NPT has structural flaws, which means that a state can move to the brink of nuclear weapons capacity, thereby giving it the option to develop nuclear weapons quickly if it should decide to withdraw, without violating the treaty. Although its formal nuclear status is still unclear, the utilisation of the withdrawal provision of Article X by the DPRK illustrates this point. This has led several scholars to argue that in order to ensure the survival of the NPT, no state should be allowed to withdraw from the treaty.135 The case of the DPRK also illustrates that different types of pressure can form clusters. The DPRK constitutes both “pressure from within,” by having acquired nuclear weapons despite its obligation as a NNWS not to do so, and arguably “pressure from outside,” by utilising the withdrawal provision of the NPT.

The NPT is lame – states can just say it’s for civilian use

Claussen 08, Bjørn Ragnar Claussen, fellow at the Folke Bernadotte Academy for Peace Studies, Masters from the Centre for Peace Studies at the University of Tromsø, “The Future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy,” Autumn 2008, From the Centre for Peace Studies, <http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/bitstream/handle/10037/2062/thesis.pdf?sequence=1>//MC

“Pressure from within” refers to NNWSs parties to the NPT which deliberately violate their treaty obligation to forsake nuclear weapons. States parties which have yet not concluded safeguards agreements also belong to this type of pressure.111 “Pressure from within” stems in part from a paradox embedded in the NPT: Under the NPT, the NNWSs agreed to give up their pursuit of nuclear weapons, but not their pursuit of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. According to Article IV, it is the inalienable right of all states parties to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Moreover, Article IV guarantees NNWSs the right to full access to nuclear power technology, on condition that they submit their nuclear activities to international inspections. According to Jonathan Schell, this bargain was a “Trojan horse” written into the text of the NPT.112 Nuclear technology is a dual-use technology with both civilian and military applications. Education, experience, materials and technology involved in making nuclear weapons can be drawn in large part by peaceful applications of nuclear energy.113 The NPT clearly prohibits NNWSs from using nuclear technology to make nuclear weapons, but once they have it, they have taken a major step towards the development of nuclear weapons.114 For NNWSs which desire nuclear weapons, Article IV thus assures that they are be able to acquire most of the wherewithal to fulfill their ambitions without violating the NPT.115 Hence, the number of states capable of building nuclear weapons has paradoxically increased due to the NPT. According to David Santoro, this paradox can prove to be the Achilles heel of the NPT.116 NNWSs which work within the NPT, but deliberately manipulate or violate the provisions of the treaty, such as Iran is suspected to do, may cause states parties, both NWSs and NNWSs, to loose confidence in the credibility of the NPT, and opt for other means to prevent proliferation.117

No risk of modeling – the US continually backs out of NPT commitments and the authority of the treaty regime is in decline

Wesley 05, Michael Wesley, Executive Director of the Lowy Institute for International Policy, professor at the University of Hong Kong, and PhD from the University of St Andrews, “It's time to scrap the NPT,” From the Australian Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 59, Issue 3, 2005//MC

Many countries regard the NPT as deeply unfair, because it effectively solidifies an inequality in international relations that accords some states the (albeit questionable) status and security conferred by nuclear weapons while denying it to others.[1](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#NOTE0001) Although the NPT commits nuclear weapons states to eradicating their nuclear arsenals, after over a quarter of a century they have made only partial moves towards fulfilling this undertaking.[2](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#NOTE0002) Some commentators have argued that the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 further underlined this breach of trust by depriving non-nuclear weapons states of the opportunities provided by periodic renewal (rather than just review) conferences to press the nuclear weapons states on nuclear disarmament or to pressure Israel over its covert nuclear weapons program (Ogilvie-White and Simpson [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0019): 42). With little prospect of securing the nuclear disarmament of the nuclear weapons states, the continuation of the NPT has become farcical.[3](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#NOTE0003) Commenting on the 2000 NPT Review Conference, two observers noted that ‘agreement on the Final Document had been possible only because many of the provisions were capable of varying interpretations, and thus unlikely to be implemented in full’ (Ogilvie-White and Simpson [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0019): 43). They also noted that evidence of backsliding on commitments, particularly by the US, was ‘greeted by most delegations with resignation and quiet cynicism, rather than forthright and persistent criticism’ (Ogilvie-White and Simpson [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0019): 45). The unwillingness of states to expend diplomatic capital in taking on the US over its commitments indicates that fewer and fewer states continue to regard the integrity of the NPT as a foreign policy priority. The unfairness of the NPT risks generating cynicism among states about their obligations under the treaty, and therefore impacts directly on its effectiveness. Friedrich Kratochwil ([1989](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0015)) has argued convincingly that states do not follow rules out of a sense of unreflective obligation or blind habit, but on the basis of explicitly developed justifications derived from socially shared conceptions of rationality and justice. Because the NPT effectively enshrines an unequal distribution of the security and status conferred by nuclear weapons, it contravenes the principles of natural justice. This in turn detracts from its legitimacy and ultimately from its effectiveness. As Abram Chayes and Antonia Chayes have argued, ‘a system in which only the weak can be made to comply with their undertakings will not achieve the legitimacy needed for reliable enforcement of treaty obligations’ ([1998](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0004): 3). Furthermore, by effectively making the prohibition of the spread of nuclear weapons a higher priority than the eradication of the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear weapons states, the NPT regime implies that some states, and not others, can be trusted with nuclear weapons. The implicit judgement the regime makes about competence and trustworthiness only further aggravates the status inequality issues that plague the NPT. By arguing that the NPT enshrines a system of ‘nuclear apartheid’, Indian leaders and diplomats rehearsed many of these issues in their defence of India's nuclear tests in 1998. The effectiveness of this line of argument, plus the fact that interests deemed more important than non-proliferation soon brought an end to most states’ sanctions against India and Pakistan, have done a great deal of damage to the moral authority of the NPT.

Lack of enforcement and structural flaws make NPT collapse inevitable

Council on Foreign Relations 05, The Council on Foreign Relations, “Nonproliferation: Proliferation Threats;” April 27th, 2005, <http://www.cfr.org/weapons-of-mass-destruction/nonproliferation-proliferation-threats/p7834?breadcrumb=%2Fpublication%2Fpublication_list%3Ftype%3Dbackgrounder%26page%3D30>//MC

Does the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty need an overhaul? Many experts say it does. They concede that the, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) which went into effect in 1970, has helped limit the number of nuclear-armed countries. But they say the NPT has structural flaws that undermine its effectiveness against states determined to acquire nuclear weapons or terrorist groups bent on using them. Critics of the treaty and supporters alike will get a chance to air their views at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) NPT review conference in New York, May 2-27. There, the 189 signatories to the NPT--and observers, including India and Pakistan--will meet to discuss treaty reforms. Which articles do critics object to in the NPT? The main criticisms from member countries deal with the following articles: Article 4, which gives all parties to the treaty the "inalienable right" to the "research, production, and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes." This was intended to allow all countries to share the benefits of nuclear power. But critics say Article 4 grants countries too much leeway to convert a lawful nuclear program into an illegal weapons program. The problem, says Jon Wolfstahl, a nuclear expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, is that some countries now interpret Article 4 to mean they can legally build a civilian nuclear program and gain the knowledge they need to make nuclear weapons, then renounce the treaty to construct them. Article 2, which states that all non-nuclear weapons states that sign the NPT agree not to receive, manufacture, or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons. In addition, they agree "not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices." The United States claims that Iran has already violated this article by acquiring nuclear technology from other countries, including Pakistan, and will push for it to be interpreted more strictly. Article 6, which states that all parties to the NPT will pursue negotiations and other measures in good faith to stop the nuclear-arms race and seek nuclear disarmament "at an early date." Because the treaty does not specify a date, however, the goal of nuclear disarmament has not been reached nearly 40 years after the treaty's creation. Experts say many non-nuclear countries around the world accuse the nuclear-weapons states of dragging their feet on complete disarmament. Non-nuclear countries may lobby to add a fixed deadline, perhaps 10 or 15 years from now, by which disarmament must be completed. Article 10, which gives each member state the right to withdraw from the treaty with only 90 days notice if its "supreme interests" are jeopardized. What's the treaty's biggest flaw? That there is limited power to enforce it, experts say. Most international inspections mandated by the NPT are voluntary, and countries largely control inspectors' movements. There are no penalties for breaking the terms of the NPT--as North Korea did when it developed an illicit nuclear-weapons program--except being reported to the U.N. Security Council. Thus far, the Security Council has taken no punitive action against North Korea. "The nonproliferation regime is like a pyramid scheme," says Joseph Cirincione, director of the Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "It works as long as everyone believes in it. As soon as they stop doing that, it collapses."

# Aff – No Impact

Proliferation doesn’t provide strategic benefits to states and the costs vastly outweigh the benefits. If anything, it makes conflict escalation less like and only encourages countries to foster their conventional forces in combat.

Wesley 05, Michael Wesley, Executive Director of the Lowy Institute for International Policy, professor at the University of Hong Kong, and PhD from the University of St Andrews, “It's time to scrap the NPT,” From the Australian Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 59, Issue 3, 2005//MC

In considering whether states should scrap the NPT, two prominent questions need to be answered: what are the dangers associated with ending the NPT? And what would a new regime that confronts contemporary proliferation realities, while more effectively ensuring the prevention of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, look like? The major concern of those who oppose scrapping the NPT is that it would result in a ‘proliferation break-out’. This suggests that without the constraints of the NPT, the number of nuclear weapons states would rise from the current nine acknowledged and non-acknowledged holders of nuclear weapons to dozens. However, this assumes that the NPT has been the main reason for the limited spread of nuclear weapons over the past 60 years, an unlikely proposition for a regime whose shortcomings have been acknowledged since its inception. A more likely explanation for the relative lack of proliferation is that most states have experienced insufficient demand-side pressures to overcome the costs of acquiring nuclear arsenals. For most states, this is a condition that will persist past the ending of the NPT. Even though states have grown wealthier and proliferation costs have fallen, it is important to recognise that developing a nuclear arsenal is not cost-free. Nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles programs are expensive, meaning that most states will need to divert substantial resources from their conventional armed forces or other policy programs during the weapons development phase.[6](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#NOTE0006) Costs can also be incurred through the international opprobrium that will likely attend proliferation, from diplomatic boycotts to cancellation of aid funding to sanctions by states such as Japan. And a nuclear program brings risks, both the danger of catastrophic environmental and social damage from accidents, as well as arising from the strategic uncertainties generated among neighbouring states (Erickson [2001](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0010): 43). Potential proliferators must also confront the power of the nuclear taboo—which long pre-dates the NPT—and shoulder the burden of justifying to domestic and international public opinion why they need the bomb. These factors will persist past the demise of the NPT, and in the absence of a sudden decline in the security of a large number of states, fears of a proliferation break-out are unfounded. Another concern is that by making it easier for some states to acquire nuclear weapons, scrapping the NPT will result in several states being willing to take greater risks in advancing their strategic interests. This would work either by emboldening aggressive states by reassuring them that they are able to deter retaliatory action or through a version of extended deterrence, in keeping outside powers out of regional conflicts (Dunn [1991](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0008): 26). Such misgivings, however, ignore past evidence of the effect of nuclear weapons on their possessors’ behaviour, and misunderstand the nature of nuclear weapons. In effect, they assume that nuclear weapons imbue their holders with ‘super-strategic’ properties. It has long been widely acknowledged that nuclear weapons have no rational offensive value; by threatening a prospective opponent with catastrophic destruction, their only logical use is to deter others’ attacks (Schelling [1963](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0027)). In using nuclear threats offensively or as an explicit adjunct to a conventional attack, a state would incur unacceptable risks ‘because no state can expect to execute the threat without danger to [itself]’ (Waltz [1981](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0029): 13). As Saunders observes, ‘There is little empirical evidence to support claims that developing countries that acquire WMD and delivery systems will behave less cautiously than other nuclear weapons states’ (2001: 133). And there is little reason for nuclear-armed regional powers to believe with any certainty that extended deterrence will work to keep the US out of a regional conflict. Since experiencing the frustration of being unable to use its nuclear arsenal to prevail in limited conflicts in Korea and Vietnam, the US has developed a truly awesome conventional military capability that provides it with the capacity to prevail decisively in limited wars. In Iraq, it has also demonstrated its willingness to intervene and defeat an opponent armed with weapons of mass destruction with the relative confidence that if such an opponent were to use WMD against its forces or its allies, the US would retaliate with overwhelming force. William Perry, then US Secretary of Defence, said in 1996 that if the US was attacked by chemical weapons, ‘We could have a devastating response without the use of nuclear weapons, but we would not forswear that possibility’ (quoted in Feiveson and Hogendoorn [2003](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0011): 90). A third concern is that by making it easier to acquire nuclear weapons, the end of the NPT will give certain disgruntled states the confidence to defy global and regional norms of behaviour. However, this concern assumes that such states only comply with such norms due to a persisting sense of insecurity that possession of nuclear weapons would remove. As Chayes and Chayes have convincingly argued, states follow norms and agreements in international relations not out of the fear of coercion but due to a general ‘propensity to comply’ with agreements they have made or joined (1998). Even disgruntled states exhibit great concern for their international reputation, especially in an era of globalisation, where general reputation and confidence in a government is necessary to secure the requirements for economic development. Colonel Muammar Ghaddafi's extraordinary about-face in compensating the victims of Libyan-backed terrorist attacks and abandoning well-developed plans to develop a nuclear arsenal have only underlined the importance of reputation and co-operativeness in the age of globalisation. A fourth concern is that scrapping the NPT will make it easier for extremist regimes to gain the ultimate guarantee that others will not intervene to topple them. There are certainly merits to this anxiety: it would be very difficult to justify and mount an intervention to topple a regime that possessed nuclear weapons. This in turn would take off the table the ultimate sanction against a genocidal government. But there are reasons to question the international dangers posed by nuclear-armed ‘rogue states’. By enormously increasing the stakes involved in military adventures, possession of nuclear weapons is likely to strengthen the hand of moderates in any regime. And by ruling out the option of forceful intervention, a nuclear arsenal will probably, on balance, reduce the paranoid perceptions of a regime labelled a rogue state. In many ways, the case of Pakistan provides some evidence of these tendencies. As Gaurav Kampani observes, Pakistan fits the label of a rogue state better than most others: a state sponsor of terrorism with an active nuclear weapons program; a military dictatorship faced with an economy in terminal decline and a shrinking strategic space; and a set of societal, government and military institutions increasingly populated by extremist Islam (Kampani [2002](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0014): 107). Yet Pakistan has proved remarkably susceptible to international pressure to moderate its internal and foreign policies.[7](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#NOTE0007) A fifth concern is that conflicts between regional powers will become more likely as the demise of the NPT results in more states with nuclear weapons. An increase in regional conflict in Asia may well be coming, mainly as a result of the newly intense patterns of competition among that continent's new great powers. But possession of nuclear weapons will more likely have a positive (containing, de-escalating) effect on such conflicts, rather than a negative (escalating, broadening) effect. The most dangerous strategy one can choose in a war is to make a nuclear-armed state feel desperate; as a result, conflicts involving nuclear-armed states are more likely to be carefully limited and confined to stakes that are calculated to be well below the nuclear threshold of all parties (Waltz [1981](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#CIT0029): 20). Moreover, history shows that nuclear weapons have only been used or threatened to de-escalate or bring an end to conventional conflicts: the experience or prospect of catastrophic damage has tended to be a powerful motive forcing belligerents to modify their objectives. Further, the costs of nuclear war would be proportionately greater for new as opposed to the older nuclear states: the smallness of the territory and high rates of urbanisation of most aspiring nuclear states would ensure that a nuclear exchange would devastate a greater percentage of their populations and industry than projected exchanges between the superpowers were estimated to imperil during the height of the Cold War. The case of India and Pakistan offers some cautious hope that in some cases, after an unstable and dangerous period, acquisition of nuclear weapons will cause opponents to begin to address the root causes of their antagonism and delimit spheres of interest. A final concern is that by allowing nuclear weapons to spread to more states, the end of the NPT raises the chances that nuclear or radiological materials will pass into the hands of terrorist groups. Once again, we need to be cautious about such doomsday scenarios. Despite intense scrutiny, there is no evidence that even the most determined state sponsors of terrorism, such as Syria and Iran, have passed chemical or biological weapons to their terrorist clients. Having refused to pass on lower-stakes chemical and biological weapons, there is little reason to fear that they would hand over nuclear or radiological materials. Also, international advances in tracing the responsibility for terrorist attacks will have badly eroded such regimes’ confidence that they could allow a client group to carry out a nuclear or radiological attack and escape major retaliation. Such concerns have over time seen such regimes exercise tighter control over the groups they support, and to use such groups more as a deterrent than an offensive foreign policy option.[8](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10357710500231230#NOTE0008) Further, if regimes such as Iran and Syria had decided to rely on terrorist groups to deliver their WMD threats against their targets, they would not have spent millions acquiring ballistic missile technology. Thus there seems to be little reason to believe that ending the NPT will increase the chance that nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists. Indeed as I have argued above, the NPT's side effects of opaque and transnational proliferation represent a much more dangerous set of conditions for diagonal proliferation.

# ---Russia Coop

# Note

The Elbe group was created after the Second World War to enhance the security relations between Russia and the United States. They mostly deal with nuclear issues such as proliferation, miscalculation, and terrorism.

Also, for impact stuff, there is a lot in the Bering Strait aff that I either didn’t include or didn’t cut. So, if you want to read a bunch of external impacts for the CP, go there.

# 1NC Shell

Text: The United States should cooperate with the Russian Federation in the fight against nuclear terrorism and articulate support of the Elbe Group.

The counterplan solves – coordinated efforts combat security threats

The Elbe Group 3/20, The Elbe Group, providing a forum for Russian collaboration, General Eugene Habiger USAF (ret), former Commander in Chief of Strategic Command; General of the Army (ret) Anatoliy S. Kulikov, former Minister of Interior Affairs; LTG Franklin Hagenbeck USA (ret), former Superintendent US Military Academy; General of the Army (ret) Valentin V. Korabelnikov, former Head of General Staff Main Intelligence Directorate, Russian Federation; LTG Michael Maples USA (ret), former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency; General Colonel (ret) Anatoliy E. Safonov, former First Deputy Director of FSB and former Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Robert Dannenberg, former Chief of Operations for Counterterrorism, CIA; General Colonel (ret) Vladimir N. Verkhovtsev, former Head of 12th GUMO Nuclear Directorate; Mr. Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, former Director of Intelligence and Counterintelligence at DOE; Colonel (ret) Vladimir Y. Goltsov, former Ministry of Interior and MinAtom; Brigadier General Kevin Ryan USA (ret), former Defense Attache to Moscow, “US and Russia work together against threat of nuclear terrorism,” March 20th, 2012, from Global Post, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/commentary/us-and-russia-work-together-against-threat-nuclear-terrorism>//MC

Ideas and trust are lacking. This is why in October 2010 a small group of senior, retired general officers from US and Russian military and intelligence agencies formed the Elbe Group. The purpose of the Elbe Group, named after the river where American and Russian forces met at the end of World War II, is to establish an open and continuous channel of communication on sensitive issues. The group is unique in that it brings together former leaders and members of the CIA and FSB, DIA and GRU (the military intelligence services), and the military and internal security forces. The first major issue tackled by the group has been preventing nuclear terrorism — a threat that combines the Cold War peril of nuclear holocaust and the 21st century danger of international terrorism. In May 2011, the Elbe Group participated in creating a first-of-its-kind US-Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism. The unclassified report, published by Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center and the Russian Academy of Science’s Institute for US and Canadian Studies, details the growth of the threat that terrorist groups could obtain nuclear materials. The report is important because it is so far the only joint assessment of the threat from nuclear terrorism compiled by experts from the two leading nuclear powers. It represents a consensus among intelligence officers, scientists, and military leaders about how terrorists could obtain nuclear materials and use them. As the report concludes, “If current approaches toward eliminating the threat are not replaced with a sense of urgency and resolve, the question will become not if, but when, and on what scale the first act of nuclear terrorism occurs.” In the opinion of the Elbe Group, the nuclear security summit in Seoul provides an important opportunity to reaffirm US and Russian leadership against the deadly menace of nuclear terrorism. We believe that, as the two leading nuclear powers in the world, Russia and the United States have a special responsibility to do everything in their power to deny weapons-useable nuclear materials to terrorists. Specifically, the governments of our countries should jointly take the following steps in cooperation with other responsible nations: • We encourage our governments to develop an assessment of the threat from nuclear terrorism to provide a basis for a common understanding of the threat and its component parts. • Our governments should establish a “domain” for combating nuclear terrorism — recognizing that nuclear terrorism, like nuclear security, should be understood as a cross-cutting issue requiring clearly responsible leaders in the government. Government efforts to prevent nuclear terrorism would benefit from clarification of the architectures for addressing this domain. • We suggest that the US and Russia increase coordination between special services in the interest of providing better warning about terrorist threats, with priority given to preventing nuclear terrorism. • The catastrophe at Fukushima, which was the result of an accident, could happen again as the result of intentional actions by terrorists. US and Russian relevant government agencies should lead international preparation for interdiction and consequence management of such acts. • US and Russian governments should continue to allocate resources to sustain and strengthen efforts to combat all forms of terrorism, in particular nuclear terrorism.

It bolsters sour relations and help prevents nuclear terrorism – modeling is key

The Elbe Group 3/20, The Elbe Group, providing a forum for Russian collaboration, General Eugene Habiger USAF (ret), former Commander in Chief of Strategic Command; General of the Army (ret) Anatoliy S. Kulikov, former Minister of Interior Affairs; LTG Franklin Hagenbeck USA (ret), former Superintendent US Military Academy; General of the Army (ret) Valentin V. Korabelnikov, former Head of General Staff Main Intelligence Directorate, Russian Federation; LTG Michael Maples USA (ret), former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency; General Colonel (ret) Anatoliy E. Safonov, former First Deputy Director of FSB and former Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Robert Dannenberg, former Chief of Operations for Counterterrorism, CIA; General Colonel (ret) Vladimir N. Verkhovtsev, former Head of 12th GUMO Nuclear Directorate; Mr. Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, former Director of Intelligence and Counterintelligence at DOE; Colonel (ret) Vladimir Y. Goltsov, former Ministry of Interior and MinAtom; Brigadier General Kevin Ryan USA (ret), former Defense Attache to Moscow, “US and Russia work together against threat of nuclear terrorism,” March 20th, 2012, from Global Post, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/commentary/us-and-russia-work-together-against-threat-nuclear-terrorism>//MC

It would seem that the relationship between the United States and Russia has once again settled into a sour state. Disagreements over missile defense in Europe are creating additional obstacles to a Russia-NATO summit planned for May. Russia and the US continue to disagree over policy toward Iran and Syria. But behind the front pages, there is significant cooperation happening between the US and Russia over an issue that both countries consider among the most serious facing them — nuclear terrorism. Next week, on March 26, Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev will meet in Seoul along with 50 other heads of state attending the second Nuclear Security Summit. One of the topics they will discuss is combating the threat from nuclear terrorism, a threat that Obama and Medvedev, and their predecessors, Presidents Bush and Putin, have called one of the most dangerous of our time. Russia and the US have done much to raise awareness of the threat including forming a Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. But identifying the next steps that countries can take against this new threat has been difficult.

Relations solve conflict and opposition to U.S. hegemony

Levgold 03 (Robert, National Interest, Winter 02/03)

Moving the U.S.-Russian relationship to the level of a true alliance will not be easy, considering that the two countries have only allied three times in a century and a half, and then only briefly during wartime. Nor should the idea be embraced without eyes wide-open, weighing fully its implications and recognizing its requirements. The changes under way in Russian foreign policy, however, make such a relationship thinkable, and think we should, for the stakes are high. Consider how different the world would be in twenty years if a democratic and economically revitalized Russia is a genuine partner of the United States, addressing side by side fundamental threats to international comity and welfare. Consider how much safer the world would be if no great power is locked in strategic rivalry with another, and no combination of them is lined up against one or more others. And consider how much more successful the United States would be if its ends and methods are increasingly seen by other major players as wise and fair. Whether any or some of this comes to pass will depend in no small measure on what is made of the current historic opportunity in U.S.-Russian relations. So, we are brought back to the fundamental choices facing Russia and the United States. We are about to see how far Russia is prepared to go toward a deep and lasting partnership with the United States, and how much the United States is prepared to do to make it possible.

Heg solves all conflict

Kagan 12 2/11, \*Robert Kagan: Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe for The New Republic, “Why the World Needs America,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html>,

History shows that world orders, including our own, are transient. They rise and fall, and the institutions they erect, the beliefs and "norms" that guide them, the economic systems they support—they rise and fall, too. The downfall of the Roman Empire brought an end not just to Roman rule but a and law and to an entire economic system stretching from Northern Europe to North Africa. Culture, the arts, even progress in science and technology, were set back for centuries. Many of us take for granted how the world looks today. But it might look a lot different without America at the top. The Brookings Institution's Robert Kagan talks with Washington bureau chief Jerry Seib about his new book, "The World America Made," and whether a U.S. decline is inevitable. Modern history has followed a similar pattern. After the Napoleonic Wars of the early 19th century, British control of the seas and the balance of great powers on the European continent provided relative security and stability. Prosperity grew, personal freedoms expanded, and the world was knit more closely together by revolutions in commerce and communication. With the outbreak of World War I, the age of settled peace and advancing liberalism—of European civilization approaching its pinnacle—collapsed into an age of hyper-nationalism, despotism and economic calamity. The once-promising spread of democracy and liberalism halted and then reversed course, leaving a handful of outnumbered and besieged democracies living nervously in the shadow of fascist and totalitarian neighbors. The collapse of the British and European orders in the 20th century did not produce a new dark age—though if Nazi Germany and imperial Japan had prevailed, it might have—but the horrific conflict that it produced was, in its own way, just as devastating. Would the end of the present American-dominated order have less dire consequences? A surprising number of American intellectuals, politicians and policy makers greet the prospect with equanimity. There is a general sense that the end of the era of American pre-eminence, if and when it comes, need not mean the end of the present international order, with its widespread freedom, unprecedented global prosperity (even amid the current economic crisis) and absence of war among the great powers. American power may diminish, the political scientist G. John Ikenberry argues, but "the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive." The commentator Fareed Zakaria believes that even as the balance shifts against the U.S., rising powers like China "will continue to live within the framework of the current international system." And there are elements across the political spectrum—Republicans who call for retrenchment, Democrats who put their faith in international law and institutions—who don't imagine that a "post-American world" would look very different from the American world. If all of this sounds too good to be true, it is. The present world order was largely shaped by American power and reflects American interests and preferences. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other nations, the world order will change to suit their interests and preferences. Nor can we assume that all the great powers in a post-American world would agree on the benefits of preserving the present order, or have the capacity to preserve it, even if they wanted to. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great-power autocracies. Both Beijing and Moscow already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. The balance in a new, multipolar world might be more favorable to democracy if some of the rising democracies—Brazil, India, Turkey, South Africa—picked up the slack from a declining U.S. Yet not all of them have the desire or the capacity to do it. What about the economic order of free markets and free trade? People assume that China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. A Romney Adviser Read by Democrats Robert Kagan's new book, "The World America Made," is finding an eager readership in the nation's capital, among prominent members of both political parties. Around the time of President Barack Obama's Jan. 24 State of the Union Address, Washington was abuzz with reports that the president had discussed a portion of the book with a group of news anchors. Mr. Kagan serves on the Foreign Policy Advisory Board of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, but more notably, in this election season, he is a foreign policy adviser to the presidential campaign of Mitt Romney. The president's speech touched upon the debate over whether America is in decline, a central theme of Mr. Kagan's book. "America is back," he declared, referring to a range of recent U.S. actions on the world stage. "Anyone who tells you otherwise, anyone who tells you that America is in decline or that our influence has waned, doesn't know what they're talking about," he continued. "America remains the one indispensable nation in world affairs—and as long as I'm president, I intend to keep it that way." Says Mr. Kagan: "No president wants to preside over American decline, and it's good to see him repudiate the idea that his policy is built on the idea that American influence must fade." Unfortunately, they might not be able to help themselves. The creation and survival of a liberal economic order has depended, historically, on great powers that are both willing and able to support open trade and free markets, often with naval power. If a declining America is unable to maintain its long-standing hegemony on the high seas, would other nations take on the burdens and the expense of sustaining navies to fill in the gaps? Even if they did, would this produce an open global commons—or rising tension? China and India are building bigger navies, but the result so far has been greater competition, not greater security. As Mohan Malik has noted in this newspaper, their "maritime rivalry could spill into the open in a decade or two," when India deploys an aircraft carrier in the Pacific Ocean and China deploys one in the Indian Ocean. The move from American-dominated oceans to collective policing by several great powers could be a recipe for competition and conflict rather than for a liberal economic order. And do the Chinese really value an open economic system? The Chinese economy soon may become the largest in the world, but it will be far from the richest. Its size is a product of the country's enormous population, but in per capita terms, China remains relatively poor. The U.S., Germany and Japan have a per capita GDP of over $40,000. China's is a little over $4,000, putting it at the same level as Angola, Algeria and Belize. Even if optimistic forecasts are correct, China's per capita GDP by 2030 would still only be half that of the U.S., putting it roughly where Slovenia and Greece are today. As Arvind Subramanian and other economists have pointed out, this will make for a historically unique situation. In the past, the largest and most dominant economies in the world have also been the richest. Nations whose peoples are such obvious winners in a relatively unfettered economic system have less temptation to pursue protectionist measures and have more of an incentive to keep the system open. China's leaders, presiding over a poorer and still developing country, may prove less willing to open their economy. They have already begun closing some sectors to foreign competition and are likely to close others in the future. Even optimists like Mr. Subramanian believe that the liberal economic order will require "some insurance" against a scenario in which "China exercises its dominance by either reversing its previous policies or failing to open areas of the economy that are now highly protected." American economic dominance has been welcomed by much of the world because, like the mobster Hyman Roth in "The Godfather," the U.S. has always made money for its partners. Chinese economic dominance may get a different reception. Another problem is that China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, [is] with the ultimate goal of preserving the rule of the Communist Party. Unlike the eras of British and American pre-eminence, when the leading economic powers were dominated largely by private individuals or companies, China's system is more like the mercantilist arrangements of previous centuries. The government amasses wealth in order to secure its continued rule and to pay for armies and navies to compete with other great powers. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power that it brings. They might kill the goose that lays the golden eggs because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers for the better part of six decades? Would it survive in a post-American world? Most commentators who welcome this scenario imagine that American predominance would be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But multipolar systems have historically been neither particularly stable nor particularly peaceful. Rough parity among powerful nations is a source of uncertainty that leads to miscalculation. Conflicts erupt as a result of fluctuations in the delicate power equation. War among the great powers was a common, if not constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity from the 16th to the 18th centuries, culminating in the series of enormously destructive Europe-wide wars that followed the French Revolution and ended with Napoleon's defeat in 1815. The 19th century was notable for two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated by major conflicts. The Crimean War (1853-1856) was a mini-world war involving well over a million Russian, French, British and Turkish troops, as well as forces from nine other nations; it produced almost a half-million dead combatants and many more wounded. In the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), the two nations together fielded close to two million troops, of whom nearly a half-million were killed or wounded. The peace that followed these conflicts was characterized by increasing tension and competition, numerous war scares and massive increases in armaments on both land and sea. Its climax was World War I, the most destructive and deadly conflict that mankind had known up to that point. As the political scientist Robert W. Tucker has observed, "Such stability and moderation as the balance brought rested ultimately on the threat or use of force. War remained the essential means for maintaining the balance of power." There is little reason to believe that a return to multipolarity in the 21st century would bring greater peace and stability than it has in the past. The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand. President Bill Clinton left office believing that the key task for America was to "create the world we would like to live in when we are no longer the world's only superpower," to prepare for "a time when we would have to share the stage." It is an eminently sensible-sounding proposal. But can it be done? For particularly in matters of security, the rules and institutions of international order rarely survive the decline of the nations that erected them. They are like scaffolding around a building: They don't hold the building up; the building holds them up. It will last only as long as those who favor it retain the will and capacity to defend it. Many foreign-policy experts see the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government—forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. Americans certainly like to believe that our preferred order survives because it is right and just—not only for us but for everyone. We assume that the triumph of democracy is the triumph of a better idea, and the victory of market capitalism is the victory of a better system, and that both are irreversible. That is why Francis Fukuyama's thesis about "the end of history" was so attractive at the end of the Cold War and retains its appeal even now, after it has been discredited by events. The idea of inevitable evolution means that there is no requirement to impose a decent order. It will merely happen. But international order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others—in America's case, the domination of free-market and democratic principles, together with an international system that supports them. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. There was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. No divine providence or unfolding Hegelian dialectic required the triumph of democracy and capitalism, and there is no guarantee that their success will outlast the powerful nations that have fought for them. Democratic progress and liberal economics have been and can be reversed and undone. The ancient democracies of Greece and the republics of Rome and Venice all fell to more powerful forces or through their own failings. The evolving liberal economic order of Europe collapsed in the 1920s and 1930s. The better idea doesn't have to win just because it is a better idea. It requires great powers to champion it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms that American power has supported will decline, too. Or more likely, if history is a guide, they may collapse altogether as we make a transition to another kind of world order, or to disorder. We may discover then that the U.S. was essential to keeping the present world order together and that the alternative to American power was not peace and harmony but chaos and catastrophe—which is what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.

# 2NC Solvency - Relations

Nuclear terrorism is key to relations

ACA 11, Arms Control Association, “Missile Defense Cooperation: Seizing the Opportunity,” May 24th, 2011, volume 2, issue 5, <http://www.armscontrol.org/issuebriefs/MissileDefenseCooperation//MC>

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev will meet at the G8 Summit in Deauville, France later this week, where they are expected to talk about cooperation on ballistic missile defense. Cooperation with Russia would strengthen U.S. security by enhancing our capabilities to detect a potential missile launch from Iran. This issue is central to the future of U.S.-Russian relations and the prospects for another round of nuclear arms reductions after New START, including tactical weapons, and continued cooperation on Iran's nuclear program and preventing nuclear terrorism. The timing is critical; presidential elections are looming in both nations, and the window of opportunity is rapidly closing. Now is the time for an agreement on U.S.-Russian missile defense cooperation, and a bipartisan solution is in the offing. It is in the national security interests of both countries to transform strategic missile defense from a topic of confrontation to cooperation. Doing so requires reinforcing existing assurances that future U.S. missile interceptor systems to be[deployed in Europe](http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/Phasedadaptiveapproach) will not undermine Russia's security. Although the Cold War has been "over" for 20 years, the two sides have so far been unable to build the trust necessary to move beyond this challenge.

# 2NC Coop Good

Collaboration is essential to prevent nuclear terror

Cohen 01, Stephen Cohen, Professor of Russian Studies at NYU, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, November 11th, 2001, lexis//MC

President Bush's meetings with Russian President Vladimir Putin next week, in Washington and Texas, give the United States a second historic chance, after the squandered opportunity of the 1990s, to establish a truly cooperative relationship with post-communist Russia. Such a relationship is essential for coping with today's real security dangers, which exceed those of the Cold War and make the United States so vulnerable that even it can no longer meaningfully be considered a "superpower." Indeed, both the decay of Moscow's systems of nuclear control and maintenance since 1992 and the "low-tech, high-concept" attacks on America on Sept. 11 may be omens of an unprecedented dark age of international security. None of its dangers can be dealt with effectively without Russia, the world's only other fully nuclearized country and its largest crossroad of civilizations.

Relations are key to prevent nuclear terror – loose nukes

Allison 99, Graham T. Allison, Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, "Russia's Domestic Political Future and U.S. National Interests," August 1999, Discussion Paper 99-15, http://bcsia.ksg.harvard.edu/publication.cfm?ctype=paper&item\_id=52//MC

Why is Russia not like Indonesia, or Brazil, or Nigeria? In former Prime Minister Stepashin''s quip: why is it not a banana republic--without bananas? Just the day before his dismissal as Prime Minister, on August 9, Sergei Stepashin noted that the government should obey the Constitution or face the prospect that Russia become "the world''s largest banana republic, only without bananas." In a sentence: because history has left a superpower arsenal of nuclear weapons, biological weapons, chemical weapons, missiles, and know-how in the midst of a revolution that is deconstructing every sinew of the totalitarian Soviet state. Why does Russia matter? Start with 7,000 active nuclear warheads: armed, mounted on missiles, capable of arriving at targets in the United States less than an hour after the decision to launch. Were a dozen or hundred of these weapons to be triggered--accidentally in a Y2K failure, by some unauthorized agent, as a consequence of misperception, or whatever--the United States would disappear from the map. Incredible, unimaginable, and a Cold War anachronism, yes--but a brute fact, hard to ignore. As surely as during the Cold War, this superpower arsenal creates for the U.S. a highest-priority, enduring interest in Russia: namely, that these weapons are not used against America or our allies. Add 5,000 tactical nuclear weapons, many lacking any locking device to prevent their unauthorized use, some stored at bases where a colonel with the cooperation of two lieutenants could "privatize" a dozen warheads and take them to world markets to monetize their value. Finally, remember an additional 12,000 nuclear weapons in various storage facilities in Russia, many with no mechanical protection beyond that of guards whose salaries are frequently delayed for months. One backpack nuclear weapon at Oklahoma City would have caused not just the Federal Office Building, but Oklahoma City itself, to disappear. One such nuclear device in the minivan that was used by terrorists to attack the World Trade Center would have caused lower Manhattan to disappear, including all of Wall Street up to Gramercy Park. Beyond assembled weapons, there are approximately 70,000 nuclear weapons-equivalents in stockpiles of highly enriched uranium and plutonium, a softball-sized chunk of which, if it found its way to Iran or to one of bin Laden''s terrorist groups, would provide the critical ingredient from which a crude nuclear device could be assembled. Beyond all this, there are biological weapons, chemical weapons, thousands of ICBM''s, and, beyond physical items, know-how for producing additional missiles and other weapons without limit. In sum: the overriding reason Russia must matter for Americans appears vividly as one considers the clear and present danger of "loose nukes": the theft of one or a dozen weapons, sale to a rogue state or terrorist group, and use of these weapons to attack American soldiers abroad or civilians at home. Nothing in the international arena poses so sure a threat to Americans'' survival and well-being for the next generation as the threat of theft of nuclear, biological, and other weapons from a collapsing Russia.

# 2NC Coop Good - AIDs

Relations solves the AIDS epidemic and saves millions of lives

Vershbow 04, Alexander Vershbow, US Ambassador to Russia, April 22nd, 2004, from the State Department, lexis//MC

Without intervention researchers predict that over 75 million people will be affected worldwide by the year 2010, with a loss of human life to AIDS totaling 100 million by the year 2020. Scientists predict that more than 2 million Russians could be infected by 2005, next year, and millions more by 2010. In fact, the HIV virus is spreading more rapidly here than in almost any country on the planet. Unless decisive action is taken, and soon, Russia faces a humanitarian catastrophe rivaling that of World War II. Unfortunately, this represents an area that's tailor-made for bilateral cooperation as the AIDS epidemic began in the United States years before it struck Russia. We have considerable experience in treating the disease and controlling its spread. Russia has an educated population and an expanding sector of dedicated NGOs that provide hope that concerted efforts at prevention can succeed here. What these organizations lack is resources and, most crucially, high-level political support. In addition, Russia is blessed with the large and talented medical and scientific community that can play an important role in international efforts to find a cure and develop a vaccine. Given our complementary resources and our mutual interest in staving off disaster, the AIDS crisis provides an ideal opportunity to demonstrate the potential of our partnership for the betterment of Russia's own people and all of humanity.

AIDs will kill us all!

Kerns 99, Tom Kerns, professor of philosophy and the University of Washington, “AIDS and Apocalyptics for Questioning Millennium Madness,” November 23rd, 1999, from his lectures on bioethics, http://bioethicscourse.info/aidsite/lec-millemad.html//MC

The worst threat to humankind AIDS is "the number one health problem on this planet." (C. Everett Koop, former US Surgeon General) "AIDS is the single greatest threat to well-being facing the world's population today." (Marc Lappé) AIDS is "a messenger of apocalyptic change," as it is spread through "one of the most biologically urgent of human behaviors." - Dr June Osborn (former member of the US Presidential Commission on HIV/AIDS, & professor in U Mich SPH) Economic costs are high "Although it is less than a decade since the virus that causes AIDS was discovered, it has become increasingly evident that this pandemic will have profound economic and social implications for both developed and developing countries. The importance of health as an input to the economic development and growth of a country is well established - a healthier population is more productive and has an increased capacity for learning. The adverse impacts of the HIV/AIDS pandemic will undermine improvements in health status and, in turn, reduce the potential for economic growth. AIDS is distinct from other diseases, and its impact can be expected to be quite severe.... Its most critical feature, distinguishing AIDS from other life-threatening and fatal illnesses, such as diarrhea (among children in developing countries) or cancer (among the elderly in developed countries), is that it selectively affects adults in their sexually most active ages, which coincide with their prime productive and reproductive years." - in AIDS in the World, 1992, p 195 (Jill Armstrong is an economist in the Eastern Africa Dept of the World Bank, Washington, DC. Eduard Bos is a demographer in the Population, Health, and Nutrition Division of the World Bank's Population and Human Resources Department.) E. "Whatever else AIDS is, it's not just another disease." (Dr June Osborne, former member of the US Presidential Commission on HIV/AIDS) Features that make AIDS unique: High morbidity & mortality Lifelong infectiousness lengthy asymptomatic stage highly mutable virus Joshua Lederberg considers the possibility of HIV "learning the tricks of airborne transmission:" "We know that HIV is still evolving. Its global spread has meant there is far more HIV on earth today than ever before in history. What are the odds of its learning the tricks of airborne transmission? The short answer is "No one can be sure." ... [A]s time passes, and HIV seems settled in a certain groove, that is momentary reassurance in itself. However, given its other ugly attributes, it is hard to imagine a worse threat to humanity than an airborne variant of AIDS. No rule of nature contradicts such a possibility; the proliferation of AIDS cases with secondary pneumonia [and TB] multiplies the odds of such a mutant, as an analog to the emergence of pneumonic plague." effective modes of transmission destroys the immune system viral reservoir expanding

# 2NC Coop Good - Sino-Russia War

US-Russian relations prevent Russia-China war

Newsweek 95, (5/15, lexis accessed 8/11/11)

"Russia," says Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "is a big country." That it is; lop off the newly independent states born within the old Soviet husk and you've still got a lot left -- a highly educated work force sitting on top of some of the globe's most valuable resources. True, much of that vast territory has an awful climate (climate matters-for different reasons than Russia's, it explains why Australia will never be a great power). But unlike India and China, two other "giant" states, Russia will be able to husband its vast resources without the additional strain of feeding -- and employing-more than a billion souls. It also, of course, is the only country that can launch a devastating nuclear attack on the United States. That kind of power demands respect. And sensitive handling. Stephen Sestanovich, head Russia watcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, argues that present U.S. policy is geared too much to "dismantling Russian military might" -- a policy that, since it breeds Russian resentment of Western meddling, is self-defeating. "We have to reorient Russian power," says Sestanovich, "not eliminate it. Because we can't eliminate it." Indeed, Washington should prefer a strong Russia. A Russia so weak, for example, that it could not resist a Chinese land grab of its Far East without resorting to nuclear weapons is a 21st-century nightmare. All this implies a close U.S. -- Russian relationship stretching into the future. American officials say it will be a "pragmatic" one, recognizing that Russian and U.S. national interests will sometimes collide. The danger, for the United States, is that a pragmatic relationship could be dominated by security issues. In Western Europe, some futurists say that in the coming decades Russia will talk to the United States about nuclear weapons but to the European Union about everything else-trade, economic development and the rest.

That conflict would kill hundreds of millions without escalation, and risks extinction

Sharavin 01, (Alexander, Director of the Institute for Military and Political Analysis, “What the Papers Say”, October, accessed 8/11/11)

Chinese propaganda has constantly been showing us skyscrapers in free trade zones in southeastern China. It should not be forgotten, however, that some 250 to 300 million people live there, i.e. at most a quarter of China's population. A billion Chinese people are still living in misery. For them, even the living standards of a backwater Russian town remain inaccessibly high. They have absolutely nothing to lose. There is every prerequisite for "the final throw to the north." The strength of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (CPLA) has been growing quicker than the Chinese economy. A decade ago the CPLA was equipped with inferior copies of Russian arms from late 1950s to the early 1960s. However, through its own efforts Russia has nearly managed to liquidate its most significant technological advantage. Thanks to our zeal, from antique MiG-21 fighters of the earliest modifications and S-75 air defense missile systems the Chinese antiaircraft defense forces have adopted Su-27 fighters and S-300 air defense missile systems. China's air defense forces have received Tor systems instead of anti-aircraft guns which could have been used during World War II. The shock air force of our "eastern brethren" will in the near future replace antique Tu-16 and Il-28 airplanes with Su-30 fighters, which are not yet available to the Russian Armed Forces! Russia may face the "wonderful" prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia's entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such "trifles" like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia's armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the "Chechen" and the "Balkan" variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

# \*\*\*Warming CPs

# ---Sunshades CP

# 1NC Shell

**The United States federal government should develop and deploy sunshades beyond the Earth’s mesosphere.**

**Solves warming**

**Victor et al 2009** – a Professor at Stanford Law School, Director of Stanford's Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, and an Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. M. Granger Morgan is Head of Carnegie Mellon University's Department of Engineering and Public Policy and Director of the Climate Decision Making Center. Jay Apt is Professor of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University. John Steinbruner is Professor of Public Policy and Director of the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland. Katharine Ricke is a doctoral student at Carnegie Mellon University (David G., March/April 2009 “The geoengineering option” http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/22456/The\_Geoengineering\_Option.pdf )

Each year, the effects of climate change are coming into sharper focus. Barely a month goes by without some fresh bad news: ice sheets and glaciers are melting faster than expected, sea levels are rising more rapidly than ever in recorded history, plants are blooming earlier in the spring, water supplies and habitats are in danger, birds are being forced to find new migratory patterns. The odds that the global climate will reach a dangerous tipping point are increasing. Over the course of the twenty-first century, key ocean currents, such as the Gulf Stream, could shift radically, and thawing permafrost could release huge amounts of additional greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Such scenarios, although still remote, would dramatically accelerate and compound the consequences of global warming. Scientists are taking these doomsday scenarios seriously because the steady accumulation of warming gases in the atmosphere is forcing change in the climate system at rates so rapid that the outcomes are extremely difficult to predict. Eliminating all the risks of climate change is impossible because carbon dioxide emissions, the chief human contribution to global warming, are unlike conventional air pollutants, which stay in the atmosphere for only hours or days. Once carbon dioxide enters the atmosphere, much of it remains for over a hundred years. Emissions from anywhere on the planet contribute to the global problem, and once headed in the wrong direction, the climate system is slow to respond to attempts at reversal. As with a bathtub that has a large faucet and a small drain, the only practical way to lower the level is by dramatically cutting the inflow. Holding global warming steady at its current rate would require a worldwide 60-80 percent cut in emissions, and it would still take decades for the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide to stabilize. Most human emissions of carbon dioxide come from burning fossil fuels, and most governments have been reluctant to force the radical changes necessary to reduce those emissions. Economic growth tends to trump vague and elusive global aspirations. The United States has yet to impose even a cap on its emissions, let alone a reduction. The European Union has adopted an emissions-trading scheme that, although promising in theory, has not yet had much real effect because carbon prices are still too low to cause any significant change in behavior. Even Norway, which in 1991 became one of the first nations to impose a stiff tax on emissions, has seen a net increase in its carbon dioxide emissions. Japan, too, has professed its commitment to taming global warming. Nevertheless, Tokyo is struggling to square the need for economic growth with continued dependence on an energy system powered mainly by conventional fossil fuels. And China's emissions recently surpassed those of the United States, thanks to coal-fueled industrialization and a staggering pace of economic growth. The global economic crisis is stanching emissions a bit, but it will not come close to shutting off the faucet. The world's slow progress in cutting carbon dioxide emissions and the looming danger that the climate could take a sudden turn for the worse require policymakers to take a closer look at emergency strategies for curbing the effects of global warming. These strategies, often called "geoengineering," envision deploying systems on a planetary scale, such as launching reflective particles into the atmosphere or positioning sunshades to cool the earth. These strategies could cool the planet, but they would not stop the buildup of carbon dioxide or lessen all its harmful impacts. For this reason, geoengineering has been widely shunned by those committed to reducing emissions. Serious research on geoengineering is still in its infancy, and it has not received the attention it deserves from politicians. The time has come to take it seriously. Geoengineering could provide a useful defense for the planet -- an emergency shield that could be deployed if surprisingly nasty climatic shifts put vital ecosystems and billions of people at risk. Actually raising the shield, however, would be a political choice. One nation's emergency can be another's opportunity, and it is unlikely that all countries will have similar assessments of how to balance the ills of unchecked climate change with the risk that geoengineering could do more harm than good. Governments should immediately begin to undertake serious research on geoengineering and help create international norms governing its use. THE RAINMAKERS Geoengineering is not a new idea. In 1965, when President Lyndon Johnson received the first-ever U.S. presidential briefing on the dangers of climate change, the only remedy prescribed to counter the effects of global warming was geoengineering. That advice reflected the scientific culture of the time, which imagined that engineering could fix almost any problem. By the late 1940s, both the United States and the Soviet Union had begun exploring strategies for modifying the weather to gain battlefield advantage. Many schemes focused on "seeding" clouds with substances that would coax them to drop more rain. Despite offering no clear advantage to the military, "weather makers" were routinely employed (rarely with much effect) to squeeze more rain from clouds for thirsty crops. Starting in 1962, U.S. government researchers for Project Stormfury tried to make tropical hurricanes less intense through cloud seeding, but with no clear success. Military experts also dreamed of using nuclear explosions and other interventions to create a more advantageous climate. These applications were frightening enough that in 1976 the United Nations adopted the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques to bar such projects. By the 1970s, after a string of failures, the idea of weather modification for war and farming had largely faded away. Today's proposals for geoengineering are more likely to have an impact because the interventions needed for global-scale geoengineering are much less subtle than those that sought to influence local weather patterns. The earth's climate is largely driven by the fine balance between the light energy with which the sun bathes the earth and the heat that the earth radiates back to space. On average, about 70 percent of the earth's incoming sunlight is absorbed by the atmosphere and the planet's surface; the remainder is reflected back into space. Increasing the reflectivity of the planet (known as the albedo) by about one percentage point could have an effect on the climate system large enough to offset the gross increase in warming that is likely over the next century as a result of a doubling of the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Making such tweaks is much more straightforward than causing rain or fog at a particular location in the ways that the weather makers of the late 1940s and 1950s dreamed of doing.

# 2NC Solvency – Generic

**Only the cp solves warming**

**ANI** 3/20/**2010** (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists” <http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html>)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green. "Society should significantly expand research into geoengineering solutions that remove and sequester greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere," he said. "Geoengineering solutions must be in addition to, not replace, dramatic emission reductions if society is to avoid the most dangerous impacts from climate change," he added. (ANI)

**Reversing the impact to the CO2 solves their offense**

**Angel 2006** - an astronomer and optics expert at the University of Arizona (Roger, “Feasibility of cooling the Earth with a cloud of small spacecraft near the inner Lagrange point (L1)” <http://www.pnas.org/content/103/46/17184.full.pdf>)

Projections by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are for global temperature to rise between 1.5 and 4.5°C by 2100 (1), but recent studies suggest a larger range of uncertainty. Increases as high as 11°C might be possible given CO2 stabilizing at twice preindustrial content (2). Holding to even this level of CO2 will require major use of alternative energy sources and improvements in efficiency (3). Unfortunately, global warming reasonably could be expected to take the form of abrupt and unpredictable changes, rather than a gradual increase (4). If it were to become apparent over the next decade or two that disastrous climate change driven by warming was in fact likely or even in progress, then a method to reduce the sun’s heat input would become an emergency priority. A 1.8% reduction is projected to fully reverse the warming effect of a doubling of CO2 (5), although not the chemical effects. One way known to reduce heat input, observed after volcanic eruptions, is to increase aerosol scattering in the stratosphere (6). Deployment of 3 to 5 million tonsyear of sulfur would be needed to mitigate a doubling of CO2. This amount is not incompatible with a major reduction in the current atmospheric sulfur pollution of 55 million tonsyear that goes mostly into the troposphere. The approach we examine here to reduce solar warming is to scatter away sunlight in space before it enters the Earth’s atmosphere. The preferred location is near the Earth–sun inner Lagrange point (L1) in an orbit with the same 1-year period as the Earth, in-line with the sun at a distance 1.5 million km (Gm) (Fig. 1). From this distance, the penumbra shadow covers and thus cools the entire planet.

# 2NC Solvency – Plant Growth

**Sunshades is the best of both worlds – solves the impact to warming while gaining the benefits of CO2**

**Knovel 1/27**/12 (“Scientists Studying Whether Geoengineering Could Offset Global Climate Change” <http://why.knovel.com/all-engineering-news/1232-scientists-studying-whether-geoengineering-could-offset-global-climate-change.html>)

With global temperatures and population rising, scientists are increasingly studying how [geoengineering](http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2012/01/20/145535536/geoengineered-food-climate-fix-could-boost-crop-yields-but-with-risks?ft=1&f=1001&sc=tw&utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter) could potentially allay food shortages, among other concerns. A shifting global climate is worrying lawmakers throughout the world, as higher temperatures and a dearth of precipitation in many regions have eroded crop yields. With total global population projected to [continue](http://why.knovel.com/all-engineering-news/1232-scientists-studying-whether-geoengineering-could-offset-global-climate-change.html) to climb at a rapid clip over the next century, scientists are working to develop geoengineering schemes that could combat such negative effects. Some parts of the world are already feeling the effects of a simultaneous uptick in temperatures and drop in precipitation. Farmers in areas in the Middle East and Africa, among other locations, are struggling to cultivate crops amid current environmental conditions. If the problems are left untreated, they could wreak havoc on future food supplies, sending prices soaring. Over the past few years, [the prices](http://why.knovel.com/all-engineering-news/1232-scientists-studying-whether-geoengineering-could-offset-global-climate-change.html) of many commodities have surged. Inclement weather in Australia, Russia, China and North America hurt grain production, for example. For nations that rely on others for such critical food staples, the jump in prices was particularly worrying. Researchers contend that [geoengineering technologies](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/research/2008-02-29-china-weather_N.htm) could be used to fight global climate change. Stanford University[environmental scientist](http://why.knovel.com/all-engineering-news/1232-scientists-studying-whether-geoengineering-could-offset-global-climate-change.html) Ken Caldeira noted that governments could decide to employ geoengineering as they "do something desperate to protect our food and our people." China has famously employed geoengineering technology for the better part of the past decade. Prior to the start of the 2008 Olympics, officials said they were working to prevent rain from affecting opening ceremonies through a geoengineering scheme. Scientists have posited a slew of geoengineering theories, with some more plausible than others, NPR reports. One such scheme involves the blasting of tiny particles into the upper atmosphere that could disperse sunlight before it reaches Earth's surface. Geoengineering enthusiasts assert that such a system would mimic the effects of volcanic ash clouds, whose sulfate droplets naturally do so. The Carnegie Institution for Science recently championed such an approach. Carnegie researcher Julia Pongratz said that by using high-flying airplanes to constantly replenish a layer of small particles in the stratosphere, governments could cultivate food growth. Pongratz and her colleagues argued in their findings, published online in Nature Climate Change, that so-called "sunshade geoengineering" could spur the growth of crops in many regions of the world. The team of scientists concluded, moreover, that sunshade geoengineering was beneficial when compared both with current atmospheric conditions and with the future projection of doubled carbon dioxide. This, according to the researchers, is because deflecting sunlight lowers global temperatures but does not affect carbon dioxide concentrations. "In many regions, future climate change is predicted to put crops under temperature stress, reducing yields," Pongratz said. "At the same time, the beneficial effects that a higher CO2 concentration has on plant productivity remain active."

**Sunshades solve plant growth**

**Parker 1/24**/12 – economist (Randall, “High CO2 Sunshade Geoengeneering would Increase crops” <http://www.futurepundit.com/archives/008489.html>)

Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide might cause so much heating that some countries will respond by releasing sulfate aerosols to reflect sunlight and cool the planet. If that happens the question arises: Will the net effect of less sunlight (which would reduce energy flowing to plants) be outweighed by the plant-boosting effects of lower temperatures and higher CO2? Some climate scientists did modeling that suggests globally crop yields would rise overall but fall in some areas. Although scientists know that climate change in recent decades has negatively impacted crop yields in many regions, the study by Pongratz and colleagues is the first to examine the potential effect of geoengineering on food security. Pongratz's team, which included Carnegie's Ken Caldeira and Long Cao, as well as Stanford University's David Lobell, used models to assess the impact of sunshade geoengineering on crop yields. Using two different climate models, they simulated climates with carbon dioxide levels similar to what exists today. A second set of simulations doubled carbon-dioxide levels – levels that could be reached in several decades if current trends in fossil-fuel burning continue unabated. A third set of simulations posited doubled carbon dioxide, but with a layer of sulfate aerosols in the stratosphere deflecting about 2% of incoming sunlight away from the Earth. The simulated climate changes were then applied to crop models that are commonly used to project future yields. The team found that, in the model, sunshade geoengineering leads to increased crop yields in most regions, both compared with current conditions and with the future projection of doubled carbon dioxide on its own. This is because deflecting sunlight back to space reduces temperatures, but not CO2. "In many regions, future climate change is predicted to put crops under temperature stress, reducing yields. This stress is alleviated by geoengineering," Pongratz said. "At the same time, the beneficial effects that a higher CO2 concentration has on plant productivity remain active."

# 2NC Solvency – Feasibility

**no tech barriers**
**Astrobiology Magazine 2007** (David Tenebaum, “Pies in the Sky: A solution to global warming” <http://www.astrobio.net/exclusive/2309/pies-in-the-sky-a-solution-to-global-warming>)

Much more speculative are some ambitious plans for high-tech parasols to block sunlight before it reaches this planet. At the NASA Institute for Advanced Concepts (NIAC) meeting last fall, Roger Angel, an astronomer and optics expert at the University of Arizona, produced a highly detailed – and highly futuristic -- proposal for a sunshade huge enough to cut incoming sunlight by 1.8 percent. That, he says, should counteract the warming expected from a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Angel’s plan builds on an early design by James Early of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, but it slims the mass down from 100 million tons to 20 million tons – something that, he says, conceivably could be launched from Earth. Angel does not consider solar sunblock the optimum choice in the struggle against global warming, but rather a fallback position “if things get seriously bad.” If, for example, ice starts sliding faster from Greenland than expected, sun shields “may be a useful idea” to prevent vast coastal flooding. The Early concept calls for a giant sun-shield near the L1 Lagrange point, about 1.8 million kilometers (about 1.2 million miles) above Earth. Here, the gravity of Earth and sun balance, enabling a shield to remain stationary for years. A collection of observations by the Earth Observing System flagship Terra were stitched together into a seamless true-color mosaic of every square kilometer (.386 square mile) of our planet. Angel suggests that the shield, covering an area of 4.7 million square kilometers (slightly smaller than the area of the continental United States west of the Mississippi River), would be best made as a cloud of 16 trillion free-flying circular refractors, each 0.6 meter (2 feet) in diameter. . Each refractor would be about 5 microns thick and weigh 1.2 grams. The refractors would be launched in stacks and then deployed upon reaching the target zone. At every stage, Angel has proposed high-technology solutions to staggering challenges. He would launch the refractors to escape velocity with an electromagnetic coil gun, which propels a missile based on electromagnetic repulsion, then propel them to L1 with ion thrusters using argon as fuel. Once in place, each disk would sense its position using hyper-miniature cameras that detect sun and Earth. Adjustable trim tabs (tiny mirrors) catch solar radiation pressure as needed to maintain the disk’s correct orientation and position in space. If the disks had reflective mirror surfaces, they would quickly be pushed toward Earth by solar radiation pressure, so they will be designed to refract (bend) sunlight, not reflect it. Since they would make only a small deflection, the disks would evade most of the radiation pressure, Angel says. He estimates the disks could remain in orbit for at least 50 years, until their solar cells degraded and they could no longer position themselves. With money from NIAC, Angel says, “we have built a prototype optical element, a micron-thick [refractive] hologram on glass.. When you hold it up and look directly at the moon, the moonlight disappears off the axis and is spread away into radial spectra.”

**Sunshades are a feasible alternative that solves warming**

**Stiles 06** - Professor at the University of Arizona (Lori, Back to Eurek Alert, "Space Sunshade might be feasible in global warming emergency", http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\_releases/2006-11/uoa-ssm110306.php)

The possibility that global warming will trigger abrupt climate change is something people might not want to think about. But University of Arizona astronomer Roger Angel thinks about it. Angel, a University of Arizona Regents' Professor and one of the world's foremost minds in modern optics, directs the Steward Observatory Mirror Laboratory and the Center for Astronomical Adaptive Optics. He has won top honors for his many extraordinary conceptual ideas that have become practical engineering solutions for astronomy. For the past year, Angel has been looking at ways to cool the Earth in an emergency. He's been studying the practicality of deploying a space sunshade in a global warming crisis, a crisis where it becomes clear that Earth is unmistakably headed for disastrous climate change within a decade or two. Angel presented the idea at the National Academy of Sciences in April and won a NASA Institute for Advanced Concepts grant for further research in July. His collaborators on the grant are David Miller of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Nick Woolf of UA's Steward Observatory, and NASA Ames Research Center Director S. Pete Worden. Angel is now publishing a first detailed, scholarly paper, "Feasibility of cooling the Earth with a cloud of small spacecraft near L1," in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. The plan would be to launch a constellation of trillions of small free-flying spacecraft a million miles above Earth into an orbit aligned with the sun, called the L-1 orbit. The spacecraft would form a long, cylindrical cloud with a diameter about half that of Earth, and about 10 times longer. About 10 percent of the sunlight passing through the 60,000-mile length of the cloud, pointing lengthwise between the Earth and the sun would be diverted away from our planet. The effect would be to uniformly reduce sunlight by about 2 percent over the entire planet, enough to balance the heating of a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide in Earth's atmosphere. Researchers have proposed various alternatives for cooling the planet, including aerosol scatterers in the Earth's atmosphere. The idea for a space shade at L1 to deflect sunlight from Earth was first proposed by James Early of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in 1989. "The earlier ideas were for bigger, heavier structures that would have needed manufacture and launch from the moon, which is pretty futuristic," Angel said. "I wanted to make the sunshade from small 'flyers,' small, light and extremely thin spacecraft that could be completely assembled and launched from Earth, in stacks of a million at a time. When they reached L1, they would be dealt off the stack into a cloud. There's nothing to assemble in space." The lightweight flyers designed by Angel would be made of a transparent film pierced with small holes. Each flyer would be two feet in diameter, 1/5000 of an inch thick and weigh about a gram, the same as a large butterfly. It would use "MEMS" technology mirrors as tiny sails that tilt to hold the flyers position in the orbiting constellation. The flyer's transparency and steering mechanism prevent it from being blown away by radiation pressure. Radiation pressure is the pressure from the sun's light itself. The total mass of all the fliers making up the space sunshade structure would be 20 million tons. At $10,000 a pound, conventional chemical rocket launch is prohibitively expensive. Angel proposes using a cheaper way developed by Sandia National Laboratories for electromagnetic space launches, which could bring cost down to as little as $20 a pound. A total 20 electromagnetic launchers launching a stack of flyers every 5 minutes for 10 years could deploy the sunshade. The electromagnetic launchers would ideally run on hydroelectric power, but even in the worst-case environmental scenario with coal-generated electricity, each ton of carbon used to make electricity would mitigate the effect of 1000 tons of atmospheric carbon. Once propelled beyond Earth's atmosphere and gravity with electromagnetic launchers, the flyer stacks would be steered to L-1 orbit by solar-powered ion propulsion, a new method proven in space by the European Space Agency's SMART-1 moon orbiter and NASA's Deep Space 1 probe. "The concept builds on existing technologies," Angel said. "It seems feasible that it could be developed and deployed in about 25 years at a cost of a few trillion dollars. With care, the solar shade should last about 50 years. So the average cost is about $100 billion a year, or about two-tenths of one percent of the global domestic product." He added, "The sunshade is no substitute for developing renewable energy, the only permanent solution. A similar massive level of technological innovation and financial investment could ensure that. "But if the planet gets into an abrupt climate crisis that can only be fixed by cooling, it would be good to be ready with some shading solutions that have been worked out."

# 2NC CO2 DA NB

(this is kind of obvious but just in case…)

**Sunshades wont reduce CO2**

**Quick 1/26**/12 (Darren, “Study finds sunshade engineering could improve crop yields” <http://www.gizmag.com/sunshade-geoengineering-study/21225/>)

In the face of potentially catastrophic effects on global food production, some have proposed drastic solutions to counteract climate change such as reflecting sunlight away from the Earth. A new study from the Carnegie Institution for Science examining the effects of sunshade geoengineering has concluded that such an approach would be more likely to improve food security than threaten it. Just as large volcanoes cool the planet by ejecting massive amounts of small particles into the stratosphere, one sunshade geoengineering proposal would involve using high-flying airplanes to release small particles in the stratosphere that would scatter sunlight back into space. Just like the volcanic particles, these would fall back to Earth within a year so they would have to be constantly replenished to stop the planet heating back up. The fear is that such an approach could have unintended consequences for the climate, particularly in terms of its effect of precipitation. While climate change in recent decades has been found to negatively affect crop yields in many regions, a new study led by Carnegie's Julia Pongratz is the first to examine the potential effect of geoengineering on food security. To assess the impact of sunshade geoengineering on crop yields, Pongratz's team, which included Carnegie's Ken Caldeira and Long Cao, as well as Stanford University's David Lobell, used two different climate models. The team first simulated climates with CO2 levels similar to what exists today. A second set doubled CO2 levels to simulate levels that could be reached in several decades if current trends in fossil-fuel burning continued unabated. A third set doubled the levels of CO2, but with a layer of sulfate aerosols in the stratosphere deflecting about two percent on incoming sunlight away from Earth. The team then applied the simulated changes to crop models that are commonly used to project future yields. They found that for both current and doubled CO2 levels, sunshade geoengineering would lead to increased crop yields in most regions. This because while such an approach would reduce temperatures by deflecting sunlight back into space, it wouldn't affect the levels of CO2. "In many regions, future climate change is predicted to put crops under temperature stress, reducing yields. This stress is alleviated by geoengineering," Pongratz said. "At the same time, the beneficial effects that a higher CO2 concentration has on plant productivity remain active."

**cp backed by geo-engineering lobby – doesn’t drain capital**

**Phantom Report 2/6**/12 (“Bill Gates backs climate scientists lobbying for large scale geoengineering” <http://www.phantomreport.com/bill-gates-backs-climate-scientists-lobbying-for-large-scale-geoengineering>)

A small group of leading climate scientists, financially supported by billionaires including Bill Gates, are lobbying governments and international bodies to back experiments into manipulating the climate on a global scale to avoid catastrophic climate change. The scientists, who advocate geoengineering methods such as spraying millions of tonnes of reflective particles of sulphur dioxide 30 miles above earth, argue that a “plan B” for climate change will be needed if the UN and politicians cannot agree to making the necessary cuts in greenhouse gases, and say the US government and others should pay for a major programme of international research…. Concern is now growing that the small but influential group of scientists, and their backers, may have a disproportionate effect on major decisions about geoengineering research and policy… “We will need to protect ourselves from vested interests [and] be sure that choices are not influenced by parties who might make significant amounts of money through a choice to modify climate, especially using proprietary intellectual property,” said Jane Long, director at large for the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in the US, in a paper delivered to a recent geoengineering conference on ethics. “The eco-clique are lobbying for a huge injection of public funds into geoengineering research. They dominate virtually every inquiry into geoengineering…. “Every scientist has some conflict of interest, because we would all like to see more resources going to study things that we find interesting,” said Caldeira. “Do I have too much influence? I feel like I have too little. I have been calling for making CO2 emissions illegal for many years, but no one is listening to me. People who disagree with me might feel I have too much influence. The best way to reduce my influence is to have more public research funds available, so that our funds are in the noise. If the federal government played the role it should in this area, there would be no need for money from Gates.

# Aff – Cant Solve Warming

**Doesn’t solve for ocean acidification or other effects of warming**

**Nicholson 1/23**/12 - has spoken at MIT/Stanford VLAB, SXSW Interactive, the National Science Foundation, the National Research Council, the Space Studies Board and Brookhaven National Laboratory (Christie, “Blocking the sun to save the planet” <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/thinking-tech/blocking-the-sun-to-save-the-planet/10004>)

To be sure, however, the models also predict that some areas might be harmed by the slightly darker days. Some experts also worry that such a drastic measure doesn’t solve the issue of ocean acidification, which is causing massive deterioration of coral reefs and basically impacting every corner of sea life. Plus there are plenty of political issues regarding high-flying planes traversing the Earth spewing aerosols. “The climate system is not well enough understood to exclude the risks of severe unanticipated climate changes, whether due to our fossil-fuel emissions or due to intentional intervention in the climate system,” said Julie Pongratz of Department of Global Ecology at the Carnegie Institution, in a press release. “Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is therefore likely a safer option than geoengineering to avert risks to global food security.”

# Aff – Warming Turns

**Cp can’t solve warming and it will cause food crisis and ozone destruction**

**Ovitz 1/29**/12 - is a Collegian columnist (Kimberly, “Sci-Fi Fix for carbon emissions” <http://dailycollegian.com/2012/01/29/sci-fi-fix-for-carbon-emissions/>)

Though sunshade and other geo-engineering processes attempt to alleviate anthropogenic effects on the environment, they also pose serious consequences. Reducing the sunlight that reaches the earth’s surface could impact agricultural yields and reduce precipitation rates, threatening food security and causing hunger and famine. Another likely consequence is ozone destruction. This would result in an increase in ultraviolet radiation into the atmosphere; a phenomenon which occurs via large volcanic eruptions, on occasion, yet not constantly over a span of 20 years by which this programs proposes. Simultaneously, sunshade geo-engineering doesn’t account for the non atmospheric impacts of carbon emissions, like that of ocean acidification. A program such as this — which masks takes the impacts of human error into account — would likely avert political and scientific focus on reducing the entirety of carbon impacts in favor of a low cost, high risk, quick fix of geo-engineering. By attempting to regulate one aspect of carbon emissions through geo-engineering, the uncertainty of the process creates many more uncertainties. Balancing budgets on a variety of scales is part of our daily lives, and carbon emission is one of them. Further carbon emissions with initiatives to dissipate increasing amounts of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere, appears counterintuitive to the matter of reducing an abundance of emissions. The geo-engineering process provides a cover up of carbon emissions issue without actually reducing the amount carbon in the atmosphere.

**Sunshades wont solve warming and will actually hurt the environment**

**Vergano** 2/25/**11** – science reporter (Dan, “Can Geo-engineering put the freeze on global warming” <http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/environment/2011-02-25-geoengineering25_CV_N.htm>)

•Space mirrors. Hundreds of thousands of thin reflective yard-long disks fired into a gravitational balance point between the sun and Earth could dim sunlight. Cost aside, rocket failures or collisions might lead to a tremendous orbital debris cloud circling the Earth. And a recent Geophysical Research Letters space tourism report suggests the rocket fuel burned to launch the needed number of shades would dump enough black soot — which absorbs sunlight and heats the atmosphere — to increase average global temperatures about 1.4 degrees. Leaving aside the environmental risks each one carries, the estimated costs tend to increase with how quickly each method removes carbon or deflects sunlight. The space reflectors would top the bill at a cost of several trillion dollars over 25 years. "Geoengineering technologies, once developed, may enable short-sighted and unwise deployment, with potentially serious unforeseen consequences," said a 2009 American Meteorological Society statement. Turning over weather management to human beings raises, "legal, ethical, diplomatic, and even national security concerns," the statement added. Deflected storm tracks could result in floods such as the ones hitting Australia last month or Pakistan last year. And simply cutting temperatures won't stop the rise in ocean acidification arising from increased carbon dioxide levels in the air, which may affect marine life underlying the ocean food web.