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## Economy

### 1AC Economy

#### The economy is about to crumble – no resiliency

Christopher S. Rugaber, staff writer, Bloomberg, 6-1-2012, “US economy added 69K jobs in May, fewest in a year”, Bloomberg Businessweek, http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V4CNRO0.htm

The U.S. economy suddenly looks a lot weaker. U.S. employers created only 69,000 jobs in May, the fewest in a year, and the unemployment rate ticked up. The dismal jobs data will fan fears that the economy is sputtering. It could also damage President Barack Obama's re-election prospects. And it could lead the Federal Reserve to take further steps to help the economy. The Labor Department also said Friday that the economy created far fewer jobs in the previous two months than first thought. It revised those figures down to show 49,000 fewer jobs created. The unemployment rate rose to 8.2 percent from 8.1 percent in April, the first increase in 11 months. The Dow Jones industrial average fell more than 160 points in the first half hour of trading. The yield on the benchmark on the 10-year Treasury note plunged to 1.46 percent, the lowest on record. It suggested that investors are flocking to the safety of U.S. government bonds. The price of gold, which was trading at about $1,550 an ounce before the report, shot up $30. Investors have seen gold as a safe place to put their money during turbulent economic times. Josh Feinman, global chief economist with DB Advisors, said Friday's report raises the likelihood that the Federal Reserve will do more -- perhaps start another round of bond purchases to further lower long-term interest rates. Still, he noted that the rate on 10-year Treasury notes is already at a record low 1.46 percent. "How much lower can long-term rates go?" Feinman said. The economy is averaging just 73,000 jobs a month over the past two months -- roughly a third of 226,000 jobs created per month in the January-March quarter. Slower growth in the United States comes at a perilous time for the global economy.

#### Investment in HSR massively expands growth – multiple mechanism

Petra Todorovich, assistant visiting professor at the Pratt Institute Graduate Center for Planning and the Environment, 2011, “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers,” Policy Focus Report, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

E C O N O M I C B E N E F I T S

High-speed rail’s ability to promote economic growth is grounded in its capacity to increase access to markets and exert positive effects on the spatial distribution of economic activity (Redding and Sturm 2008). Transportation networks increase market access, and economic development is more likely to occur in places with more and better transportation infrastructure. In theory, by improving access to urban markets, highspeed rail increases employment, wages, and productivity; encourages agglomeration; and boosts regional and local economies. Empirical evidence of high-speed rail’s impact around the world tends to support the following theoretical arguments for high-speed rail’s economic beneﬁts. Higher wages and productivity: The time savings and increased mobility offered by high-speed rail enables workers in the service sector and in information- exchange industries to move about the megaregion more freely and reduces the costs of face-to-face communication. This enhanced connectivity boosts worker productivity and business competitiveness leading to higher wages (Greengauge 21 2010). Deeper labor and employment markets: By connecting more communities to other population and job centers, highspeed rail expands the overall commuter shed of the megaregion. The deepened labor markets give employers access to larger pools of skilled workers, employees access to more employment options, and workers access to more and cheaper housing options outside of expensive city centers (Stolarick, Swain, and Adleraim 2010). Expanded tourism and visitor spending: Just as airports bring visitors and their spending power into the local economy, high-speed rail stations attract new tourists and business travelers who might not have made the trip otherwise. A study by the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2010) concluded that building high-speed rail would increase visitor spending annually by roughly $225 million in the Orlando region, $360 million in metropolitan Los Angeles, $50 million in the Chicago area, and $100 million in Greater Albany, New York. Direct job creation: High-speed rail creates thousands of construction-related jobs in design, engineering, planning, and construction, as well as jobs in ongoing maintenance and operations. In Spain, the expansion of the high-speed AVE system from Malaga to Seville is predicted to create 30,000 construction jobs (Euro Weekly 2010). In China, over 100,000 construction workers were involved in building the high-speed rail line that connects Beijing and Shanghai (Bradsher 2010). Sustained investment could foster the development of new manufacturing industries for rail cars and other equipment, and generate large amounts of related employment. Urban regeneration and station area development: High-speed rail can generate growth in real estate markets and anchor investment in commercial and residential developments around train stations, especially when they are built in coordination with a broader set of public interventions and urban design strategies (see chapter 3). These interventions ensure that high-speed rail is integrated into the urban and regional fabric, which in turn ensures the highest level of ridership and economic activity. For example, the city of Lille, France, experienced greater than average growth and substantial ofﬁce and hotel development after its high-speed rail station was built at the crossroads of lines linking London, Paris, and Brussels (Nuworsoo and Deakin 2009). Spatial agglomeration: High-speed rail enhances agglomeration economies by creating greater proximity between business locations through shrinking time distances, especially when the locations are within the rail-friendly 100 to 600 mile range. Agglomeration economies occur when ﬁrms beneﬁt from locating close to other complementary ﬁrms and make use of the accessibility to varied activities and pools of skilled labor High-speed rail has also been described as altering the economic geography of megaregions. By effectively bringing economic agents closer together, high-speed rail creates new linkages among ﬁrms, suppliers, employees, and consumers that, over time, foster spatial concentration within regions (Ahlfeldt and Feddersen 2010). This interactive process creates net economic gains in addition to the other economic beneﬁts described here.

### 1AC Economy

#### Plan immediately boosts the economy – creates millions of jobs

Joshua Rogers, J.D., University of Illinois College of Law, B.A., Economics, University of Utah, 2011, NOTE: THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY: HOW STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION MAY HAVE DERAILED AN AMERICAN HIGH SPEED RAIL SYSTEM, University of Illinois Journal of Law, Technology & Policy, Spring, 2011

High speed rail will also boost the economy immediately and help stabilize the economy in the future. The construction of high speed rail is estimated to create 1.6 million U.S. jobs. n68 Still, that number could grow significantly if, as has been proposed by some, the U.S. contracts with American companies to build the high speed rail trainsets. n69 Beyond the immediate creation of jobs, passenger rail is predicted to reduce America's dependence on foreign oil imports. n70 That reduction could also be augmented if the high speed rail system employs electric propulsion in lieu of the traditional diesel propulsion of passenger rail. n71 Thus, the U.S. would benefit from a viable high speed rail system through increased efficiency, reduced environmental impact, economic growth and stabilization.

#### Jobs key to sustained growth and recovery

Leo Hindery & Leo Gerard, co-chairs of The Task Force on Jobs Creation, 5-15-2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/leo-hindery-jr/job-creation\_b\_1517730.html

The big immediate opportunity, however, is the pending highway bill and the projected 2.9 million jobs it would almost immediately create before the summer and fall construction seasons bleed away. This bill is, in fact, such an obvious massive, immediate job creator that if the Republicans in Congress continue to stall it from passing out of conference, there can be no better example of just how extremist in their governance they have become Unless the real unemployment jobs crisis -- with 26.7 million women and men still unemployed in real terms and a real unemployment rate of 16.6% -- is frontally challenged by pursuing all of the low-hanging job-creating initiatives -- of which four has now become seven -- it's not possible to anticipate a sustained economic recovery that fully revitalizes the middle class. But when they are picked and enacted, then the engines of economic growth will start to turn over and really roar.

### 1AC Economy

#### The plan is a massive short term stimulus – creates a massive multiplier effect that ripples throughout the whole economy

Hunter Biden, Co-chairman Rosemont Seneca Partners LLC and Adviser to HNTB Corporation, summer 2010, “The Great Multiplier,” InTransit, Pg. 3-4

The U.S. national high-speed rail program, the largest infrastructure investment since the Interstate Highway System, will have a multiplying effect that goes beyond job creation to produce a host of economic benefits, rivaling or surpassing those generated by President Eisenhower’s vision. Inspired by Germany’s autobahn, Eisenhower’s idea of a nationwide network of highways strengthened our country and turbocharged our economy, forging greater connectivity among our far-flung states and regions and promoting the faster movement of goods, military personnel and equipment. A national high-speed rail network could be to our 21st century economy what the Interstate Highway System was to the 20th century economy. Everyone talks about growing the economy. What we really need is to create an economic system in which the middle class has the opportunity to have a sustainable future. High-speed rail is the key to such a system. At The Local Level Jobs are the most important and immediate concern. A high-speed rail system will bring high-paying, labor- and environmentally friendly jobs to the inner cities and markets where there is a huge need for jobs in the skilled labor department. Many of those jobs will not be limited to the tasks of building the actual network, either. They will be permanent jobs, providing employees with the wherewithal to purchase homes, buy cars, take vacations, educate their children, etc. For example, a study by the nine states participating in the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative shows the 3,000-mile Chicagohubbed system will generate more than 57,000 new jobs, generate $1.09 billion in household income and increase property values by $4.9 billion near stations. The economic impacts of high-speed rail stops in Orange County, Calif., include growth of its tourism industry, increased density around train stations that shrinks the region’s developed footprint — and a gain of nearly 23,000 jobs by 2030.1 In California’s Sacramento/Central Valley area, high-speed rail will trigger jobs in the service, transportation, communications, utilities, finance, insurance and real estate sectors.2 All total, California’s statewide high-speed rail project will create nearly 160,000 construction-related jobs and an additional 450,000 permanent jobs by 2035.3 Looking beyond jobs, U.S. cities will benefit from transit-oriented communities. An economic certainty in Europe for decades, new stations here will be magnets for commercial and residential development, as the land becomes prime real estate. In Boston, family residences near commuter rail stations enjoy a 6.7 percent premium over homes located elsewhere. After new transit stations were announced in Los Angeles, values of commercial property surrounding proposed station areas grew 78 percent, compared with 38 percent for other properties.4 However, interconnectivity may be the most valuable benefit at the local level. By achieving economic integration into, and parity with, the rest of California, the Sacramento/Central Valley area could see potential taxable income gains of nearly $48 billion per year, state income tax revenues of more than $2 billion and a total sales/use taxes increase of approximately $333 million per year; of which, nearly $46 million would flow directly to counties and cities within the Central Valley.5 At The Regional Level Because of the United States’ vast land mass, we have to implement high-speed rail in pieces. One piece or region where I see the most potential is the Midwest. Led by eight governors and the Mayor of Chicago under the heading of the Midwest High-Speed Rail Steering Group, this region has been more effective than any other multistate rail corridor in bringing together all of the political forces necessary to achieve high-speed rail. High-speed rail development can allow Midwest cities and towns to function as an efficient economic unit. A Chicago hubbed high-speed rail network can transform the Upper Midwest into a single, mega-region economy. To realize that vision, people in the Midwest must have the ability to visit a distant city and return the same day — much like commuters currently do in the Northeast Corridor. High-speed trains will make it possible to spend a fully productive day in another city and still make it home for dinner. As a megalopolis, the Midwest could offer its residents never-before-considered job opportunities and give its cities the ability to tap into new labor pools and skill sets. According to the steering committee, developing the Midwest Regional Rail System will produce construction jobs for a generation. High-speed rail is expected to create an average of 15,200 jobs annually during the construction period, of which 6,000 are construction jobs. Florida also is moving forward aggressively to develop high-speed rail. The first leg of Florida’s very high-speed system would bring Tampa and Orlando closer together figuratively with a nonstop trip of less than one hour, also making it possible to commute for work.6 Ohio’s proposed 860-mile, high-speed rail network would link the state’s major commercial centers with the Chicago-hubbed Midwest Regional Rail System, southern Ontario and other smaller cities. Some expect the new region to attract “new economy” industries, such as high-tech and telecommunications.7 According to Richard Florida, an American urban studies theorist, a new period of geographic expansion is necessary to spur a renewed era of economic growth and development. In an article that appeared in The Atlantic, Florida wrote: “The rise of the mega-region is the cornerstone of a new, more intensive and also more expansive use of space. Mega-regions, if they are to function as integrated economic units, require better, more effective and faster ways to move goods, people and ideas. High-speed rail accomplishes that, and it also provides a framework for future in-fill development along its corridors.” At The National Level The Chinese have invested an enormous amount of money in developing high-speed rail corridors. Not only have these corridors given the Chinese people the ability to move freely within their country at speeds greater than air travel, they have created an entirely new manufacturing and assembly base. In Europe, Alstom, the continent’s largest high-speed train manufacturer, employs more people than Airbus, a global commercial aircraft manufacturer. High-speed rail can create a new manufacturing industry here in the United States, too. In fact, we are seeing the first development of such an industry in Wisconsin. Last year, Gov. Jim Doyle announced a groundbreaking agreement with the Spanish train maker Talgo that will put two train sets into service in Wisconsin and establish new assembly and maintenance facilities. Both facilities will be in southeastern Wisconsin, an area hit hard by the recession and job losses. Together, they are expected to create about 80 jobs initially with the potential for many more.8 The Wisconsin assembly plant will support the delivery of these trains throughout the Midwest and the country. The economic ripple effect will benefit U.S. supply firms and create even more jobs. The Wisconsin-Talgo model is what we should be using to attract more international high-speed rail manufacturers. Several European countries — Spain, France, Germany — have developed real technical expertise in building and manufacturing high-speed rail cars and train sets. We should not be afraid to adopt that technology and bring those manufacturing bases to the United States. We can’t predict all of the positive economic effects of high-speed rail, but we do know they will be great. The more you connect people and their ideas, the more we can achieve as a country. The Interstate Highway System taught us that. Our nation’s aviation system soon followed, and we grew even closer. For the past 50-plus years, we have enjoyed a quality of life that only one of the world’s best economies could offer. We led the world through innovation and hard work in the 20th century, and we have every reason to believe we can do the same in the 21st century. Indeed, high-speed rail is one of the keys to realizing that goal.

#### Infrastructure Investments sustain and save the economy

Joseph E. Stiglitz, University Professor at Columbia University, and a Nobel laureate in Economics, March 2012, Stimulating the Economy in an Era of Debt and Deficit, The Economists’ Voice http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/ev

Any diagnosis of the current economic situation should focus on the fact that the shortfall between actual and potential unemployment is huge and that monetary policy has proven ineffective, at least in restoring the economy to anything near full employment. Under these circumstances, the traditional economists’ solution has been to advocate the use of fiscal policy—tax cuts and/or spending increases. There is an especially compelling case for increasing public investments because they would increase GDP and employment today as well as increase output in the future. Given low interest rates, the enhanced growth in GDP would more than offset the increased cost of government spending, reducing national debt in the medium term. Moreover, the ratio of debt to GDP would decrease and the ability of the U.S. economy to sustain debt (debt sustainability) would improve. This happy state of affairs is especially likely given the ample supply of high-return investment opportunities in infrastructure, technology, and education resulting from underinvestment in these areas over the past quarter century. Moreover, well-designed public investments would raise the return on private investments, “crowding in” this additional source of spending. Together, increased public and private investment would raise output and employment in the short run, and increase growth and debt sustainability in the medium and long run. Such spending would reduce (not increase) the ratio of debt to GDP. Thus, the objection that the U.S. should not engage in such fiscal policies because of the high ratio of debt to GDP is simply wrong; even those who suffer from deficit fetishism should support such measures. Critics of this standard Keynesian prescription raise two objections: (a) government is not likely to spend the money on high return investments, so that the promised gains will prove elusive and (b) the fiscal multipliers are small (perhaps negative), suggesting that the shortrun gains from fiscal policy are minimal at best. Both of these objections are easily dismissed in the current economic environment. First, the assertion that government is incapable of making high return investments is just wrong. Studies of the average returns on government spending on investments in technology show extraordinarily high returns, with returns on investments in infrastructure and education returns well above the cost of borrowing. Thus, from a national point of view, investments in these areas make sense, even if the government fails to make the investments with the absolute highest returns. Second, the many variants of the argument that the fiscal multiplier is small typically rest on the assumption that as government spending increases, some category of private expenditure will decline to offset this increase. 1 Certainly, when the economy is at full employment and capital is being fully utilized, GDP cannot increase. Hence, under the circumstances, the multiplier must be zero. But today’s economic conditions of significant and persistent resource underutilization have not been experienced since the Great Depression. As a result, it is simply meaningless to rely on empirical estimates of multipliers based on post-World War II data. Contractionary monetary policy is another reason why multipliers may be markedly larger now than they were in some earlier situations of excess capacity. In these cases, monetary authorities, excessively fearful of inflation, responded to deficit spending by raising interest rates and constraining credit availability, thus dampening private spending. But such an outcome is not inevitable; it is a result of policies, often guided by mistaken economic theories. In any case, such an outcome is irrelevant today. This is because the Federal Reserve is committed to an unprecedented policy of maintaining near-zero interest rates through at least the end of 2014, while at the same time encouraging government spending. With interest rates at record lows and the Federal Reserve committed to keeping them there, crowding out of private investment simply will not occur. On the contrary, as I have noted, public investment— for instance, in better infrastructure—is more likely to increase the returns to private investment. Such public spending crowds in private investment, increasing the multiplier. Sometimes economists claim that consumers, worried about future tax liabilities in the wake of government spending, would contract their spending. However, the applicability of this notion (referred to as Ricardian equivalence) is contradicted by the fact that when George W. Bush lowered taxes and massively increased the deficit, savings plummeted to zero. But even if one believed in the applicability of Ricardian equivalence in today’s economy, government spending on investments that increase future growth and improve the debt-toGDP ratio would induce rational to spend more today. Consumption would also be crowded in by such government expenditures, not crowded out. Indeed, if consumers had rational expectations, the multiplier would increase even more in a long-lived downturn like the current one. The reason is that some of the money that is saved this year will be spent next year, or the year after, or the year after that—periods in which the economy is still well-below capacity. This increased spending will lead to higher employment and incomes in these later years. But if individuals are rational, the realization that their future incomes will be higher will lead them to spend more today. Deficit spending today crowds in not just investment, but also consumption. Thus, a careful look at the current situation suggests that the impact of well-designed government programs will be to stimulate the economy more than is assumed to be the case in standard Keynesian models (which typically assume a short-lived downturn and yield a shor run fiscal multiplier of around 1.5). Even in the current period, fiscal policy results in greater output increases because investment and consumption is crowded in, because: (a) the Federal Reserve is unlikely either to increase interest rates or reduce credit availability; (b) public investments are likely to increase the returns to private investments; and (c) rational consumers/ taxpayers may recognize that future tax liabilities will decline and that future incomes will rise as a result of these measures.

### 1AC Economy

#### Econ decline causes great power wars

Zalmay Khalilzad, was the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, 2-8-2011, "The Econom and National Security" www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers. The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years. Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments. We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression. Given the risks, the United States must focus on restoring its economic and fiscal condition while checking and managing the rise of potential adversarial regional powers such as China. While we face significant challenges, the U.S. economy still accounts for over 20 percent of the world’s GDP. American institutions — particularly those providing enforceable rule of law — set it apart from all the rising powers. Social cohesion underwrites political stability. U.S. demographic trends are healthier than those of any other developed country. A culture of innovation, excellent institutions of higher education, and a vital sector of small and medium-sized enterprises propel the U.S. economy in ways difficult to quantify. Historically, Americans have responded pragmatically, and sometimes through trial and error, to work our way through the kind of crisis that we face today. The policy question is how to enhance economic growth and employment while cutting discretionary spending in the near term and curbing the growth of entitlement spending in the out years. Republican members of Congress have outlined a plan. Several think tanks and commissions, including President Obama’s debt commission, have done so as well. Some consensus exists on measures to pare back the recent increases in domestic spending, restrain future growth in defense spending, and reform the tax code (by reducing tax expenditures while lowering individual and corporate rates). These are promising options. The key remaining question is whether the president and leaders of both parties on Capitol Hill have the will to act and the skill to fashion bipartisan solutions. Whether we take the needed actions is a choice, however difficult it might be. It is clearly within our capacity to put our economy on a better trajectory. In garnering political support for cutbacks, the president and members of Congress should point not only to the domestic consequences of inaction — but also to the geopolitical implications. As the United States gets its economic and fiscal house in order, it should take steps to prevent a flare-up in Asia. The United States can do so by signaling that its domestic challenges will not impede its intentions to check Chinese expansionism. This can be done in cost-efficient ways. While China’s economic rise enables its military modernization and international assertiveness, it also frightens rival powers. The Obama administration has wisely moved to strengthen relations with allies and potential partners in the region but more can be done. Some Chinese policies encourage other parties to join with the United States, and the U.S. should not let these opportunities pass. China’s military assertiveness should enable security cooperation with countries on China’s periphery — particularly Japan, India, and Vietnam — in ways that complicate Beijing’s strategic calculus. China’s mercantilist policies and currency manipulation — which harm developing states both in East Asia and elsewhere — should be used to fashion a coalition in favor of a more balanced trade system. Since Beijing’s over-the-top reaction to the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to a Chinese democracy activist alienated European leaders, highlighting human-rights questions would not only draw supporters from nearby countries but also embolden reformers within China. Since the end of the Cold War, a stable economic and financial condition at home has enabled America to have an expansive role in the world. Today we can no longer take this for granted. Unless we get our economic house in order, there is a risk that domestic stagnation in combination with the rise of rival powers will undermine our ability to deal with growing international problems. Regional hegemons in Asia could seize the moment, leading the world toward a new, dangerous era of multi-polarity.

#### Our theoretical models trump – transitions, future expectations, and diversionary war theory all confirm econ decline causes war

Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises, in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent stales. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level. Pollins (20081 advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 19SJ) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fcaron. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately. Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level. Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Mom berg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write. The linkage, between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict lends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other (Hlomhen? & Hess. 2(102. p. X9> Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blombcrg. Hess. & Wee ra pan a, 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DcRoucn (1995), and Blombcrg. Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force arc at least indirecti) correlated. Gelpi (1997). Miller (1999). and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that Ihe tendency towards diversionary tactics arc greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, rcccni economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict al systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### Econ Down

#### Unemployment and slow growth mean no recovery in the status quo

The Economist, 6-1-2012, The Economist offers authoritative insight and opinion on international news, politics, business, finance, science and technology, “Third time unlucky”, http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2012/06/americas-flagging-recovery

America's economy added just 69,000 jobs in May, according to a report released this morning by the Bureau of Labour Statistics. The BLS also revised down job gains in March and April; all told payrolls rose just by just 289,000 in the three months to May—the worst performance since August of last year. The slowdown is broad-based. Manufacturers added just 12,000 jobs in May, and construction employment tumbled by 28,000. Retail employment was virtually flat, and the government, once again, shed jobs for the month. Government employment dropped by 161,000 in the year to May, 50,000 of which loss came at the federal level. News from the household side of the survey was brighter for the month of May. Employment and participation in the labour force both jumped (labour-force growth led the unemployment rate a shade higher, from 8.1% to 8.2%). Yet the smaller survey size and the volatility of the household data suggest one shouldn't take much comfort from the result. And elsewhere the news is bleak. Long-term unemployment rose after falling in recent months. Hours worked edged down slightly. The rum employment figure came in below expectations, but it wasn't entirely out of line with recent data points, which have signalled a slowdown in hiring and slower growth in the economy. Moreover, the news is in keeping with a general turn in global economic sentiment, helped along by troubles in emerging markets but driven largely by chaos and recession in the euro zone. Manufacturing activity in the euro zone sank to a three-year low according to data released this morning and euro-zone unemployment reached a new record high at 11%. Similar data point to accelerating contraction in Chinese manufacturing activity, as well.

#### No recovery

The Economist, 6-1-2012, The Economist offers authoritative insight and opinion on international news, politics, business, finance, science and technology, “Third time unlucky”, http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2012/06/americas-flagging-recovery

The now obvious turn for the worse for the American recovery will place strong pressure on the Fed to intervene once again at its June meeting, taking place in just over two weeks. Intervention had not been expected, but falling inflation expectations, loss of momentum in labour-market recovery, and worsening financial conditions associated with the euro-zone crisis may make additional steps unavoidable. The unsteadiness of the global economy has led to plummeting commodity prices, which could well send headline inflation falling in coming months, potentially giving inflation hawks on the Federal Open Market Committee assurance that more aggressive easing wouldn't be damagingly inflationary. It is worth recalling, however, that during the swoons of 2010 and 2011, the Fed oversaw months of deteriorating conditions before finally and reluctantly opting to act. Public debate over the numbers will be set firmly in the context of the ongoing presidential campaign. For the first time in Mr Obama's tenure, nonfarm employment is above 133m. But the paltry growth in payrolls in May—too slow to keep up with long-term labour force growth—will provide plenty of ammunition to a Mitt Romney campaign eager to make hay over the economy. At the May hiring pace, a Romney election would seem to be more likely than not. Mr Obama will no doubt protest that things would have been worse without his efforts, that additional fiscal stimulus is impossible thanks to Republican opposition, and that trouble abroad, over which he has no control, is largely to blame. On the merits, he'll be mostly right. Voters are unlikely to feel much sympathy, however. Their attention will be overwhelmingly focused on a recovery that has, for a third year running, left the country saddled with far too much unemployment and far too little job growth.

### HSR Key

#### Plan is key to sustainable growth

Petra Todorovich, assistant visiting professor at the Pratt Institute Graduate Center for Planning and the Environment, 2011, “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers,” Policy Focus Report, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

In 2002 a new dedicated high-speed rail line in Germany between Frankfurt and Cologne connected the country’s two largest regional economies and its busiest airport. Trains on the line travel at speeds over 185 mph, reducing the travel time between the two cities by 74 minutes and bringing total travel time to less than an hour along the 110-mile route. The new line has five stations, including those in the rural towns of Montabaur and Limburg (figure 7). Locating stations in these towns was controversial, due to their small potential markets. The towns have 12,500 and 34,000 residents, respectively, and are only about 12 miles apart, limiting the trains’ ability to maintain maximum speeds. A study by Ahlfeldt and Feddersen (2010) was able to isolate the effect of the rail stations on the two small cities because they are in peripheral locations and had negligible economic growth prior to the construction of the stations. Any increase in economic development could be measured easily and could be assumed to be exogenous to the towns’ natural growth paths. Furthermore, the decision to locate the stations in these two towns was driven mainly by politics; in other words, it was a discretionary decision and the situation is replicable. The researchers found that the areas surrounding the new stations experienced a 2.7 percent annual increase in overall economic activity compared with the rest of the region, and that this growth was persistent. They concluded that the economic gains experienced in these two towns were due to the introduction of the high-speed rail service, which increased accessibility to the regional markets of Frankfurt and Cologne. The service helped Montabaur and Limburg attract new residents, which increased the local employment pools and consumer markets, and eventually attracted new businesses that helped to drive the towns’ growth. The study notes that the political leadership of these towns helped to ensure this growth by securing developable land close to the new high-speed rail stations.

### AT: Resiliency

#### Resiliency arguments don’t assume new double dip risk

CNN Money, 8-10-2011, http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/10/news/economy/double\_dip\_recession\_economy/index.htm

Another recession could be even worse than the last one for a few reasons.

For starters, the economy is more vulnerable than it was in 2007 when the Great Recession began. In fact, the economy would enter the new recession much weaker than the start of any other downturn since the end of World War II. Unemployment currently stands at 9.1%. In November 2007, the month before the start of the Great Recession, it was just 4.7%. And the large number of Americans who have stopped looking for work in the last few years has left the percentage of the population with a job at a 28-year low. Various parts of the economy also have yet to recover from the last recession and would be at serious risk of lasting damage in a new downturn. Home values continue to lose ground and are projected to continue their fall. While manufacturing has had a nice rebound in the last two years, industrial production is still 18% below pre-recession levels. There are nearly 900 banks on the FDIC's list of troubled institutions, the highest number since 1993. Only 76 banks were at risk as the Great Recession took hold. But what has economists particularly worried is that the tools generally used to try to jumpstart an economy teetering on the edge of recession aren't available this time around. "The reason we didn't go into a depression three years ago is the policy response by Congress and the Fed," said Dan Seiver, a finance professor at San Diego State University. "We won't see that this time." Three times between 2008 and 2010, Congress approved massive spending or temporary tax cuts to try to stimulate the economy. But fresh from the bruising debt ceiling battle and credit rating downgrade, and with elections looming, the federal government has shown little inclination to move in that direction. So this new recession would likely have virtually no policy effort to counteract it.

#### Economy not resilient – no consumer spending ensures downward spiral

Jon Nadler, senior market analyst, 2-13-2009, “Easy Money. Who Needs It?” IBT Commodities, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/20090213/easy-money-who-needs-it\_2.htm

The first line of defense is gone. The economy is not resilient and is not stable. And the second line of defense is eroding. The Fed already has taken interest rates to zero, and lent out nearly $2 trillion in fruitless attempts to revive demand. In his speech, Bernanke proposed that the central bank "can always generate higher spending and hence positive inflation" by simply printing money as fast as possible. We're nowhere near that point yet. But the Fed hasn't demonstrated convincingly that lowering rates to zero and lending out trillions of dollars has had any impact on increasing final demand. It turns out that the Fed can print all the money it wants, but it can't make anyone spend it." Therein lies the rub. Consumer have shifted towards savings. Consumers are avoiding borrowing. Banks will eventually turn to making more credit available than they now are, but if there are no takers for their loans, well, you know the rest. It's called the waiting game. Waiting for prices to fall, and watching employers not hiring. And thus, the spiral whirls until it becomes a hypnotizing, self-perpetuating fall into an abyss. Once again, we are hearing the desirability of 'positive inflation' - what a label.

### AT: Resiliency

#### US economy could collapse – money is running out

Maryann Tobin, associated content economic analyst, 1-5-2010, “Economists warn: Another great depression is likely,” Examiner, http://www.examiner.com/x-33986-Political-Spin-Examiner~y2010m1d5-Economists-warn-Another-great-depression-is-likely

It is being dubbed as the Great Depression 2 and all fingers are pointing toward Wall Street as the ultimate culprit of our impending total meltdown. Former IMF chief economist, Simon Johnson said, the “financial industry has effectively captured our government and is blocking essential reform.” He adds that if we cannot break its suffocating grip on Washington, we will not be able to stop the Great Depression 2. Johnson is not alone in his prediction. Phrases like; "capitalism-without-morals” are being recited by other economic guru’s who are frustrated by what they see as imminent. Columbia University Professor and Nobel Prize economist, Joseph Stiglitz, is among them. Stiglitz said, "the financial sector will only try to circumvent whatever new regulations we put in place. We will simply have a short respite before the next crisis." What we are experiencing now is only a small taste of what is on the horizon, and it is only the arrogance of the American attitude that prevents so many from seeing it. The United States is not above the greater cycle of history. Powerful empires have fallen in the past: the former Soviet Union for one. It is the destruction of wealth at its worst, driven by corruption and greed. The quintessential get rich quick scheme fueled by the ever-growing virus of debt is destined to over take us. Other predictions by economists warn of more trouble when the stimulus money and other government incentives that have artificially propped up our economy run out. And run out – they will. The seemingly endless supply of dollars and their influence is all an illusion. Money manager Jeremy Grantham said we came “dangerously to the Great Depression 2," a year ago. Then admits that we have learned nothing from our mistakes. We are “condemning ourselves to another serious financial crisis in the not too-distant future." Author and MarketWatch columnists, Paul B. Farrell said, “In his 2008 bestseller "Wealth, War and Wisdom" former Morgan Stanley research guru Barton Biggs warns us to prepare for a "breakdown of civilization ... Your safe haven must be self-sufficient and capable of growing some kind of food ... It should be well-stocked with seed, fertilizer, canned food, wine, medicine, clothes, etc ... A few rounds over the approaching brigands' heads would probably be a compelling persuader that there are easier farms to pillage." “The end will be swift. In our age of short-term consumerism and instant gratification, few hear the warnings of our favorite evolutionary biologist, Jared Diamond. Societies fail because they're unprepared, and will be in denial till it's too late”

### US Econ Key

#### No decoupling – US key to global demand and US protectionism kills the global economy

Desmond Lachman, resident fellow at AEI, 11-1-2007, “The Global Economic Decoupling Myth,” AEI, http://www.aei.org/article/27052

Not so long ago, the conventional wisdom was that if the U.S. economy were to sneeze, the rest of the world would contract pneumonia. My, how much the world has changed over the past ten years. Now the prevailing view on Wall Street and at the IMF is that the global economy has "decoupled" from the United States. And this decoupling supposedly would make one expect that any weakness in the U.S. economy would be largely offset by resilience in the rest of the global economy. It would be wonderful if one could truly believe the decoupling paradigm. One would then have much less reason to be concerned about any U.S. economic hard landing since any such hard landing would be largely confined to the United States. It would also be less severe than otherwise would be the case since it would be cushioned by economic strength abroad. Sadly, much like the story of the tooth fairy, the decoupling thesis has little support either in theory or in practice. At the most basic level, the proponents of the decoupling thesis choose to overlook the fact that during the past five years, the U.S. economy was the fastest growing among the G-7 economies. Also overlooked is the fact that the U.S. economy remained the major generator of aggregate demand to the rest of the world, still accounting for around 20 percent of total world imports. The decoupling advocates also turn a blind eye to the fact that a number of the shocks presently impacting the U.S. economy are global in nature. To be sure, as U.S. housing construction activity began to swoon earlier this year, U.S. imports were not much impacted, since U.S. housing activity is primarily domestic in nature. However, as the weakness in the housing sector spreads to the rest of the U.S. economy through the deleterious effect of falling home prices and reduced construction sector employment, one has to expect reduced U.S. imports to seriously impact the rest of the world economy. More telling still for the rest of the world economy has to be the prospective large further depreciation of the U.S. dollar, which will both encourage U.S. exports abroad and will discourage U.S. imports at home. During the course of 2007, the U.S. dollar has already fallen on an effective basis by over 7 percent to its lowest level since floating began in 1973. And one must expect the dollar to fall a lot further as the Federal Reserve continues to reduce interest rates to support the weakening of the U.S. economy at a time when the U.S. external imbalance remains large. This will almost certainly deal a hard blow to the European and Japanese economies, whose growth is already stuttering and whose currencies bear the brunt of U.S. dollar depreciation in a world where many non-Japanese Asian countries manipulate their currencies for competitive advantage. The decoupling advocates also turn a blind eye to the fact that a number of the shocks presently impacting the U.S. economy are global in nature. This would certainly be true of the "credit crunch" flowing from the U.S. sub-prime mortgage market's troubles, which is causing a global increase in market interest rate spreads and a global tightening in bank lending standards. Reflecting the wide distribution of U.S. sub-prime U.S. mortgage market debt around the globe, the sub-prime debacle has already caused a couple of German banks to fail and a few French proprietary bank funds to fold. The recent spectacular run-up in international oil prices is also a global rather than simply a U.S. supply-side economic shock. While it is true that the depreciation of the U.S. dollar makes this shock more sorely felt in the U.S. than it is abroad, that does not mean that the oil price shock will not have global reverberations. After all, while the dollar has depreciated by less than 10 percent since the beginning of the year, international oil prices have approximately doubled. This leaves oil prices still very high even in non-dollar terms. The decoupling optimists are ever hopeful that China's continued very rapid economic growth will offset any US economic slowdown. They forget, however, how export-led is China's economic miracle and how vulnerable China's economy is to any increase in protectionism that might be spawned by any significant US or European economic slowdown. They also forget how China increasingly subtracts from global aggregate demand by insisting on running ever larger external trade surpluses. Those who peddle the global decoupling myth do us a gross disservice by detracting attention from the still very strong global economic linkages. By so doing, they undermine the case for a much-needed coordinated policy approach to today's many global economic challenges, which very much threaten the global, as distinct from simply the U.S., economic recovery.

#### Global economy suffers concertina effect – export strategy of the rest means US decline causes ripple effect

Thomas Palley, PHD in Econ from Yale, was Chief Economist with the US â€“ China Economic and Security Review Commission, 9-8-2008, “Decoupling vs. the Concertina Effect,” http://www.thomaspalley.com/?p=125

Over the last year, as the U.S. economy has slipped toward (and likely into) recession, there has been much talk of decoupling. According to this idea the global economy has decoupled from the U.S. economy and can continue growing even if the U.S. goes into recession. That idea is now proving fragile. Instead of decoupling, the global economy is showing signs of a concertina effect. Thus, as the U.S. economy grinds to a halt, much of the rest of the world seems to be also slowing and bumping in behind. Ever since the East Asian financial crisis of 1997 the U.S. has served as the locomotive of the global economy. This locomotive role has had U.S. consumers engage in a ten year consumption binge financed by debt and rising house prices. That binge pushed the household saving rate to record lows, and it also resulted in record U.S. trade deficits. Trade data show the U.S. has run large trade deficits with every major industrial region of the global economy – Europe, Japan, China, East Asia, Canada and Mexico. That pumped spending into these regions, fuelling their growth. This economic arrangement has created a dependence on the U.S. market, and that dependence has been further deepened by policies of export-led growth. Unable or unwilling to grow their own domestic markets, countries have relied on policies that explicitly promote exports. In many developing countries these policies have had the added benefit of attracting foreign direct investment (FDI). Thus, exports have kept factories busy, while the prospect of future exports has tempted companies to relocate production facilities to developing economies. In effect, developing countries have gotten a twofer – export led growth plus FDI. Meanwhile, the U.S. economy has benefitted from cheap imports, but its manufacturing sector has been eroded and consumers have loaded up on debt in an unsustainable fashion. The bursting of the U.S. house price bubble has shifted this process into reverse, slowing U.S. import growth and replacing financial exuberance with financial fear. But rather than global decoupling, there are signs of a shared global slowdown. The NAFTA economies of Canada and Mexico are clearly vulnerable because of their large trade dependence on the U.S. and their tight integration into the U.S. supply chain. In Europe, Ireland, Spain and Italy are either in recession or on the cusp of recession. Growth has also slowed sharply in the U.K. and France, and Japan has also lowered its growth outlook. Germany, which is Europe’s largest economy, was supposed to replace the U.S. locomotive. However, it is one of the world’s most export dependent economies. German growth has kept going longer than other European economies because of low consumer debt and export growth to OPEC economies, but Germany is now also slowing. Moreover, its policies of wage restraint and hyper-export competitiveness pose a menace rather than a help to the overall European economy. The hope that China could pull East Asia through a U.S. slowdown was always a fiction. A quick inspection of China’s trade shows that its trade deficits with other East Asian economies are derived from its trade surpluses with the U.S. China assembles imported parts from the rest of East Asia and sells the assembled product in U.S. markets. That means when the U.S. slows, the slowdown ripples back via China into the broader East Asian economy.

### US Econ Key

#### Decoupling advocates bullish analysts – ignore reality.

Michael Panzner, staff writer, 3-22-2009, “Global Economy - What's Happening Is Anything But Decoupling,” SeekingAlpha, http://seekingalpha.com/article/127212-global-economy-what-s-happening-is-anything-but-decoupling

To this day, I still look back and shake my head in disbelief at the prognostications of the Wall Street charlatans -- the so-called "strategists" and the clueless "chief" economists -- who not only missed the boat on Great Depression 2.0, but who also argued that even if the U.S. economy headed south, the rest of the world would somehow keep chugging along. Is it any wonder that the firms that employed these highly paid idiots are up a creek without a paddle (aside from the "help" they are getting from their friends in Washington, that is)? Anyway, as anyone with only half a brain could have easily predicted, what we are seeing across the globe right now is anything but "decoupling," as BBC News reports in "World Economy 'to Shrink in 2009.'"

### AT: BRICs Prevent Collapse

#### BRICs won’t solve US decline—no interest and won’t maintain institutions

Robert J. Lieber, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University, 2011, “Can the US Retain Primacy?”, Israel Journal of foreign Affairs V : 3, http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-3/5-3-4-RobertJLieber.pdf

Notwithstanding the belief that “… [T]he continuing rise of economic and security interdependence is creating new incentives for the expansion of institutionalized cooperation,”21 the actual performance of the BRICs suggests not a benign, cooperative orientation toward strengthening global governance, but a far more self-interested and less collaborative set of attitudes and policies across a wide range of economic, political, and security issues. The US position thus remains unique. It has been the world’s principal provider of collective goods and has played a crucial role in promoting a liberal trading and monetary order, in upholding freedom of the seas, in creating and maintaining institutions, and in sustaining regional security. 22 No country or organization is emerging to play a comparable role, and none is likely to do so in the foreseeable future. Hence, the consequences of a lessened American presence or even outright disengagement would mean not that other countries would become more engaged, but that shared forms of world order would be more likely to weaken.

### AT: China Prevents Collapse

#### China can’t solve—structural economic problems and competitiveness

Robert J. Lieber, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University, 2011, “Can the US Retain Primacy?”, Israel Journal of foreign Affairs V : 3, http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-3/5-3-4-RobertJLieber.pdf

Arguments about American decline inevitably rest in large part on assumptions about the rise of China. Observers marvel at its extraordinary economic dynamism, formidable export-led growth, and massive modernization and development projects. They are awed by China’s sheer size, appetite for resources, ruthless competitive behavior, growing geopolitical influence, and potential to surpass the US as the world’s leading power. Illustratively, Harvard historian Niall Ferguson depicts the PRC’s inevitable rise as bringing the “end of 500 years of Western predominance.”23 Yet any assessment of China needs to be tempered with caution, and some of the sense of foreboding bears an uncanny resemblance to worries about Japan a mere two decades ago. At the end of the 1980s, Akio Morita, a co-founder of Sony, and Shintaro Ishihara, a leading Japanese politician, authored a widely circulated book entitled, The Japan that Can Say No. In that work, Morita asserted, “We are going to have a totally new configuration in the balance of power in the world,” and Ishihara added, “There is no hope for the US.”24 Indeed, as recently as 1993, Samuel Huntington expressed alarm, writing that “Japanese strategy is a strategy of economic warfare.”25 Yet Japan was already entering an era of economic stagnation and demographic decline by the time Huntington’s article appeared in print. Granted, China today is far more formidable than was Japan, but it remains essential to assess China’s vulnerabilities as well as its impressive strengths. These vulnerabilities are both internal, in social, economic and political terms, and external, as China’s neighbors develop increased qualms about what was supposed to be its “peaceful rise.”26 China has been the subject of much uncritical observation, while in reality Beijing faces a host of serious problems that it will need to overcome, and for which the solutions are difficult or uncertain. These include the likelihood that the economic model of export-led growth cannot be sustained indefinitely, as well as increasing raw material costs, demands for higher wages, pressures for revaluation of the yuan, and widening foreign resentments over the PRC’s predatory and mercantilist behavior. China’s extraordinary growth has taken place with enormous damage to its environment, as evident in severe pollution of the air, ground water, and food chain. Banks hold a large number of bad loans, and an enormous commercial and residential real estate bubble carries the potential for future financial disruption. China lacks an adequate social safety network, and in the next ten to fifteen years will also face a major demographic problem. Due to its one child policy, China’s population is expected to peak near 1.4 billion and then enter what a leading demographer cites as an era of “prolonged, even indefinite, population decline and a period of accelerated ageing.”27 Higher education is also a realm in which China’s emergence has been widely touted but overstated. Despite enormous expansion of higher education, China does not yet have institutions comparable to the best research universities in the US, and the problem is exacerbated by a widespread emphasis on quantity over quality. Columnists and pundits are fond of citing China’s achievement in annually graduating 600,000 engineering majors compared with a mere 70,000 in America. Yet half of China’s graduates have only associate degrees (i.e., some post-secondary training, but not the real undergraduate BA or BSc degree) and a widely cited 2005 report by the McKinsey Global Institute found that a mere 10 percent of these engineers were “employable,” as contrasted with 81 percent of American graduates. 28 Moreover, as China has ramped up higher education, hundreds of thousands of recent college graduates are unable to find jobs that meet their expectations.

### Econ Collapse Bad – Laundry List

#### Economic decline causes nuclear terrorism, regional nuclear war and great power resource conflict

Mathew Burrows, counselor in the National Intelligence Council, and Jennifer Harris, counselor in the National Intelligence Council, 2009, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis,” The Washington Quarterly, 32:2, pp. 27-38, CIAO.

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Hostility toward the U.S. as the source of the crisis may have received too little credence. Revisiting the Futureopportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groupsinheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacksand newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### Econ Collapse Bad – War

#### Econ decline causes democratic back sliding and resurgence of illiberal governments

Earl Tilford, PhD in history from George Washington University and served for thirty-two years as a military officer and analyst with the Air Force and Army, 2008, “Critical Mass: Economic Leadership or Dictatorship,” The Cedartown Standard, Lexis

Could it happen again? Bourgeois democracy requires a vibrant capitalist system. Without it, the role of the individual shrinks as government expands. At the very least, the dimensions of the U.S. government economic intervention will foster a growth in bureaucracy to administer the multi-faceted programs necessary for implementation. Bureaucracies, once established, inevitably become self-serving and self-perpetuating. Will this lead to “socialism” as some conservative economic prognosticators suggest? Perhaps. But so is the possibility of dictatorship. If the American economy collapses, especially in wartime, there remains that possibility. And if that happens the American democratic era may be over. If the world economies collapse, totalitarianism will almost certainly return to Russia, which already is well along that path in any event. Fragile democracies in South America and Eastern Europe could crumble.  A global economic collapse will also increase the chance of global conflict. As economic systems shut down, so will the distribution systems for resources like petroleum and food. It is certainly within the realm of possibility that nations perceiving themselves in peril will, if they have the military capability, use force, just as Japan and Nazi Germany did in the mid-to-late 1930s. Every nation in the world needs access to food and water. Industrial nations—the world powers of North America, Europe, and Asia—need access to energy. When the world economy runs smoothly, reciprocal trade meets these needs. If the world economy collapses, the use of military force becomes a more likely alternative. And given the increasingly rapid rate at which world affairs move; the world could devolve to that point very quickly.

### Econ Collapse Bad – China War

#### US economic strength key to deterring China

Michael Cole, staff writer, 10-19-2011, “Deterrence key to curbing China, report says,” Taipei Times, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2011/10/19/2003516134/2>

Armed conflict between the US and China during the next 20 years is improbable, provided Washington retains the capacity to deter behavior that would lead to such a clash, a US think tank says in a new report. In an occasional paper titled Conflict with China: Prospects, Consequences and Strategies for Deterrence prepared by RAND Corp for the US Army, the authors say China’s security interests and military capabilities for the next two decades are expected to remain focused on its immediate periphery, with conflict likeliest to occur over Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula, one or more countries in Southeast Asia or India. “China is seeking neither territorial aggrandizement nor ideological sway over its neighbors,” the report says. “It shows no interest in matching US military expenditures, achieving a comparable global reach or assuming defense commitments beyond its immediate periphery.” While such intentions could change, the US would probably receive considerable warning of such a shift, given the lead time needed to develop the capabilities needed for a new strategy that would seek to alter China’s current emphasis on regional contingencies. “While China’s overall military capabilities will not equal those of the United States anytime soon, it will more quickly achieve local superiority in its immediate neighborhood, first in and around Taiwan and then at somewhat greater distances,” the paper says. “In consequence, the direct defense of contested assets in that region will become progressively more difficult, eventually approaching impossible.” Given this, the US will become increasingly dependent on “escalatory options for defense and retaliatory capabilities for deterrence,” it says. “Conventional strikes on mainland Chinese military targets may be the best escalatory option, but there is little reason to be confident that conflict could be so confined,” the authors say. Regarding Taiwan, the authors say while relations between Beijing and Taipei have improved, “no meaningful progress has been made on the key issue between the two states, which is if, when, and how the island’s ultimate status — as an independent polity or as part of a ‘reunified’ China — will be determined.” “The chance of conflict across the Taiwan Strait will remain so long as this fundamental disagreement persists,” they write. Core missions for the US, it says, would include “preventing China from gaining air and sea dominance, and limiting the impact of Beijing’s land-attack missiles” through “flexible combinations of active and passive defense and offensive action.” Those include the possibility of US strikes against targets in China associated with the offensive against Taiwan. “As China’s military modernization progresses, the US ability to confidently accomplish these missions is eroding,” it says. “Absent an unlikely reversal in the ongoing rebalancing of military power in the area ... a direct defense of Taiwan has already become a challenge and is likely to become increasingly difficult in coming years.” The best option for planners in Washington to reduce the risk of escalation before a conflict turned hot is to “enable the [military] capabilities” and buttress the resolve of China’s neighbors in a way that does not signal to Beijing that Washington is attempting to encircle China. A parallel effort should be made to draw China into cooperative security endeavors, it says. In the end, the economic consequences of a Sino-American conflict could be historically unparalleled, even if both sides avoid economic warfare, they write, adding that this acts as “a powerful mutual deterrent, one marginally in the American favor at present.” “Strengthening the US economy is the best way of ensuring that the balance of interdependence and of the associated deterrence does not shift dangerously against the United States over the next several decades,” the paper says.

#### US-China war = Extinction

Straits Times (Singapore), June 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable.Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.

### Econ Collapse Bad – Environment

#### Economic collapse causes a last ditch effort to grab resources – destroys the environment

David Ehrenfeld, Dept. of Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources @ Rutgers University, April 2005, “The Environmental Limits to Globalization,” Conservation Biology, Pages 318–326 Volume 19, No. 2, April 2005, Ebsco.

Finally, a few ecological systems may survive in a comparatively undamaged state; most will be stressed to the breaking point, directly or indirectly, by many environmental and social factors interacting unpredictably. Lady Luck, as always, will have much to say. In his book The Collapse of Complex Societies, the archaeologist Joseph Tainter (1988) notes that collapse, which has happened to all past empires, inevitably results in human systems of lower complexity and less specialization, less centralized control, lower economic activity, less information flow, lower population levels, less trade, and less redistribution of resources. All of these changes are inimical to globalization. This less-complex, less-globalized condition is probably what human societies will be like when the dust settles. I do not think, however, that we can make such specific predictions about the ultimate state of the environment after globalization, because we have never experienced anything like this exceptionally rapid, global environmental damage before. History and science have little to tell us in this situation. The end of the current economic system and the transition to a postglobalized state is and will be accompanied by a desperate last raid on resources and a chaotic flurry of environmental destruction whose results cannot possibly be told in advance. All one can say is that the surviving species, ecosystems, and resources will be greatly impoverished compared with what we have now, and our descendants will not thank us for having adopted, however briefly, an economic system that consumed their inheritance and damaged their planet so wantonly. Environment is a true bottom line—concern for its condition must trump all purely economic growth strategies if both the developed and developing nations are to survive and prosper.

## Energy Security

### 1AC Energy Security

#### Energy dependence on unstable regions is growing – causes inevitable military clashes across the world.

Tom Z. Collina, Executive Director of 20-20 Vision, 10-19-2005, testimony in front of Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs United States Senate “Oil Dependence and U.S. Foreign Policy: Real Dangers, Realistic Solutions”. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2005\_hr/051020-collina.pdf

More conflicts in the Middle East America imports almost 60% of its oil today and, at this rate, we’ll import 70% by 2025. Where will that oil come from? Two-thirds of the world’s oil is in the Middle East, primarily in Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq. The United States has less than 3% of global oil. The Department of Energy predicts that North American oil imports from the Persian Gulf will double from 2001 to 2025.i Other oil suppliers, such as Venezuela, Russia, and West Africa, are also politically unstable and hold no significant long-term oil reserves compared to those in the Middle East. Bottom line: our economy and security are increasingly dependent on one of the most unstable regions on earth. Unless we change our ways, we will find ourselves even more at the mercy of Middle East oil and thus more likely to get involved in future conflicts. The greater our dependence on oil, the greater the pressure to protect and control that oil. The growing American dependence on imported oil is the primary driver of U.S. foreign and military policy today, particularly in the Middle East, and motivates an aggressive military policy now on display in Iraq. To help avoid similar wars in the future and to encourage a more cooperative, responsible, and multilateral foreign policy the United States must significantly reduce its oil use. Before the Iraq war started, Anthony H. Cordesman of the Center for Strategic and International Studies said: “Regardless of whether we say so publicly, we will go to war, because Saddam sits at the center of a region with more than 60 percent of all the world's oil reserves.” Unfortunately, he was right. In fact, the use of military power to protect the flow of oil has been a central tenet of U.S. foreign policy since 1945. That was the year that President Franklin D. Roosevelt promised King Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia that the United States would protect the kingdom in return for special access to Saudi oil—a promise that governs U.S. foreign policy today. This policy was formalized by President Jimmy Carter in 1980 when he announced that the secure flow of oil from the Persian Gulf was in “the vital interests of the United States of America” and that America would use “any means necessary, including military force” to protect those interests from outside forces. This doctrine was expanded by President Ronald Reagan in 1981 to cover internal threats, and was used by the first President Bush to justify the Gulf War of 1990-91, and provided a key, if unspoken rationale for the second President Bush’s invasion of Iraq in 2003.ii The Carter/Reagan Doctrine also led to the build up of U.S. forces in the Persian Gulf on a permanent basis and to the establishment of the Rapid Deployment Force and the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM). The United States now spends over $50 Billion per year (in peacetime) to maintain our readiness to intervene in the Gulf.iii America has tried to address its oil vulnerability by using our military to protect supply routes and to prop up or install friendly regimes. But as Iraq shows the price is astronomical—$200 Billion and counting. Moreover, it doesn’t work—Iraq is now producing less oil than it did before the invasion. While the reasons behind the Bush administration’s decision to invade Iraq may be complex, can anyone doubt that we would not be there today if Iraq exported coffee instead of oil? It is time for a new approach. Americans are no longer willing to support U.S. misadventures in the Persian Gulf. Recent polls show that almost two-thirds of Americans think the Iraq war was not worth the price in terms of blood and treasure. Lt. Gen William Odom, director of the National Security Agency during President Reagan's second term, recently said: "The invasion of Iraq will turn out to be the greatest strategic disaster in U.S. history." The nation is understandably split about what to do now in Iraq, but there appears to be widespread agreement that America should not make the same mistake again—and we can take a giant step toward that goal by reducing our dependence on oil.

#### Clashes over oil result in extinction

Stephen Lendman, Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization, 2007 “Resource Wars - Can We Survive Them” http://www.rense.com/general76/resrouce.htm

With the world's energy supplies finite, the US heavily dependent on imports, and "peak oil" near or approaching, "security" for America means assuring a sustainable supply of what we can't do without. It includes waging wars to get it, protect it, and defend the maritime trade routes. over which it travels. That means Energy's partnered with predatory New World Order globalization, militarism, wars, ecological recklessness, and now an extremist US administration willing to risk Armageddon for world dominance. Central to its plan is first controlling essential resources everywhere, at any cost, starting with oil and where most of it is located in the Middle East and Central Asia. The New "Great Game" and Perils From It The new "Great Game's" begun, but this time the stakes are greater than ever as explained above. The old one lasted nearly 100 years pitting the British empire against Tsarist Russia when the issue wasn't oil. This time, it's the US with help from Israel, Britain, the West, and satellite states like Japan, South Korea and Taiwan challenging Russia and China with today's weapons and technology on both sides making earlier ones look like toys. At stake is more than oil. It's planet earth with survival of all life on it issue number one twice over. Resources and wars for them means militarism is increasing, peace declining, and the planet's ability to sustain life front and center, if anyone's paying attention. They'd better be because beyond the point of no return, there's no second chance the way Einstein explained after the atom was split. His famous quote on future wars was : "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." Under a worst case scenario, it's more dire than that. There may be nothing left but resilient beetles and bacteria in the wake of a nuclear holocaust meaning even a new stone age is way in the future, if at all. The threat is real and once nearly happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October, 1962. We later learned a miracle saved us at the 40th anniversary October, 2002 summit meeting in Havana attended by the US and Russia along with host country Cuba. For the first time, we were told how close we came to nuclear Armageddon. Devastation was avoided only because Soviet submarine captain Vasily Arkhipov countermanded his order to fire nuclear-tipped torpedos when Russian submarines were attacked by US destroyers near Kennedy's "quarantine" line. Had he done it, only our imagination can speculate what might have followed and whether planet earth, or at least a big part of it, would have survived.

### 1AC Energy Security

#### Total independence isn’t key – partial reductions are sufficient

Benjamin K. Sovacool, an Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore, 2007, “Oil Independence Possible for U.S. by 2030” http://scitizen.com/authors/Benjamin-K.-Sovacool-a-899\_s\_08b456d033fcee27acbc8caf208135e8.html

Oil independence is possible for the U.S. if comprehensive and aggressive energy policies are implemented aimed at reducing demand for oil, increasing supply, and promoting alternative fuels. Contrary to what most people might think, oil independence is possible for the United States by 2030. The news is especially important when one considers that, between 1970 and 2000, economists estimate that the costs of American dependence on foreign supplies of oil have ranged between $5 and $13 trillion dollars. That’s more than the cost of all wars fought by the U.S. (adjusted for inflation) going all the way back to the Revolutionary War. The trick is to start by thinking about oil independence a little differently. Oil independence should not be viewed as eliminating all imports of oil or reducing imports from hostile or unstable oil producing states. Instead, but by creating a world where costs of the country’s dependence on oil would be so small that there would be little to no effect on our economic, military, or foreign policy. It means creating a world where the estimated total economic costs of oil dependence would be less than one percent of U.S. gross domestic product by 2030. Conceived in this way (and contrary to much political commentary these days), researchers at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) have calculated that if the country as a whole reduced their demand for oil by 7.22 million barrels per day (MBD) and increased supply by 3 MBD, oil independence would be achieved by 2030 with a 95 percent chance of success. By reducing demand for oil, increasing its price elasticity, and increasing the supply of conventional and unconventional petroleum products, ORNL researchers noted that the country would be virtually immune from oil price shocks and market uncertainty. If large oil producing states were to respond to the U.S. by cutting back production, their initial gains from higher prices would also reduce their market share, in turn further limiting their ability to influence the oil market in the future. So if decreasing American demand for oil by 7.22 MBD and increasing supply by 3 MBD would enable the U.S. to achieve oil independence in 2030, which combination of policies offers an optimal strategy? Policymakers, for instance, could lower demand for oil by making automobiles more efficient (by legislating more stringent fuel economy standards for light and heavy duty vehicles or lowering the interstate speed limit), promoting alternatives in mode choice (such as mass transit, light rail, and carpooling), or establishing telecommuting centers and incentives for commuters to work from home. They could also promote rigorous standards for tire inflation and reduce oil consumption in other sectors of the economy.

#### HSR is key to energy security

Anthony Perl, Director of Urban Studies Program at Simon Fraser University, 11-18-2011, “How green is high-speed rail?” http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html

Grid-connected traction offers the only realistic option for significantly reducing oil use in transportation over the next 10 years. If a shift doesn’t begin during this decade, risk of global economic collapse and/or geo-political conflict over the world's remaining oil reserves become dangerously elevated. Making a significant dent in transportation's oil addiction within 10 years is sooner than fuel cells, biofuels, battery-electric vehicles and other alternative energy technologies will be ready to deliver change. Biofuels that could power aircraft now cost hundreds of dollars per gallon to produce. Batteries that a big enough charge to power vehicles between cities are still too big and expensive to make electric cars and buses affordable. But grid-connected electric trains have been operating at scale and across continents for over a century. And when the Japanese introduced modern high-speed trains through their Shinkansen, in 1964, the utility of electric trains was greatly extended.

### 1AC Energy Security

#### HSR is the single most powerful thing the U.S. can do to get us off foreign oil

USHSR, 2012, United States High Speed Rail, created of HSR, “Rail - The Solution to Rising Gas Prices”, http://www.ushsr.com/benefits/energysecurity.html

Building an electrically-powered national high speed rail network across America is the most powerful thing to get the nation off oil and into a secure, sustainable form of mobility. A national network of high speed trains can be powered by a combination of renewable energy sources including wind, solar, geothermal, and ocean/tidal energy. America's dependency on oil is the most severe in the world, and inevitably pulls us into costly resource wars. It also pushes us into exploring for oil in extreme locations such as 10,000 feet deep below the Gulf of Mexico. We use 25% of the entire world's oil supply, yet we only have 5% of the world's population. We use 8-10 times more oil per person per day than Europeans, and they have faster, easier and better mobility than we do. The extremely high daily oil consumption of Americans is not due to a higher standard of living, but because of the extremely inefficient nature of our national transportation system – based on individual vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, combined with our sprawling community designs that force people into cars for every trip. As world oil supply peaks and then irreversibly declines, prices will rise faster the situation will get far worse for America if we don't quickly reduce our national oil dependency. This dependency cuts across our entire society and affects our daily survival. Oil provides 95% of the energy to grow, process and deliver food to the nation. Our entire national transportation system is powered mostly by oil. Numerous daily products we use are made from oil. We use 20 million barrels of oil every day - just in America - 70% of it for transportation. Of the 20 million barrels we consume, we import 2/3 of this oil (13 million barrels per day) from foreign sources, many in unstable places. No combination of drilling off our coasts, hydrogen fuel cells, natural gas, biofuels, and used French fry oil will solve this and carry 300 million Americans into the future. None of these fuels can be scaled up to anywhere near the amount of liquid fuel we use daily in any practical, economical, or sustainable way.

### Energy Security Long Impact

#### Energy dependence kills heg, the economy, causes Iranian prolif, and collapses democracy

John Deutch, Institute Professor at MIT, Undersecretary of Energy, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Director of Central Intelligence, 2006, “national security consequences of u.s. oil dependency,” Council on Foreign Relations, Independent Task Force Report no. 58.

First, the control of enormous oil revenues gives exporting countries the flexibility to adopt policies that oppose U.S. interests and values. Iran proceeds with a program that appears to be headed toward acquiring a nuclear weapons capability. Russia is able to ignore Western attitudes as it has moved to authoritarian policies in part because huge revenues from oil and gas exports are available to finance that style of government. Venezuela has the resources from its oil exports to invite realignment in Latin American political relationships and to fund changes such as Argentina’s exit from its International Monetary Fund (IMF) standby agreement and Bolivia’s recent decision to nationalize its oil and gas resources. Because of their oil wealth, these and other producer countries are free to ignore U.S. policies and to pursue interests inimical to our national security. Second, oil dependence causes political realignments that constrain the ability of the United States to form partnerships to achieve common objectives. Perhaps the most pervasive effect arises as countries dependent on imports subtly modify their policies to be more congenial to suppliers. For example, China is aligning its relationships in the Middle East (e.g., Iran and Saudi Arabia) and Africa (e.g., Nigeria and Sudan) because of its desire to secure oil supplies. France and Germany, and with them much of the European Union, are more reluctant to confront difficult issues with Russia and Iran because of their dependence on imported oil and gas as well as the desire to pursue business opportunities in those countries. These new realignments have further diminished U.S. leverage, particularly in the Middle East and Central Asia. For example, Chinese interest in securing oil and gas supplies challenges U.S. influence in central Asia, notably in Kazakhstan. And Russia’s influence is likely to grow as it exports oil and (within perhaps a decade) large amounts of natural gas to Japan and China. All consuming countries, including the United States, are more constrained in dealing with producing states when oil markets are tight. To cite one current example, concern about losing Iran’s 2.5 million barrels per day of world oil exports will cause importing states to be reluctant to take action against Iran’s nuclear program. Third, high prices and seemingly scarce supplies create fears— especially evident in Beijing and New Delhi, as well as in European capitals and in Washington—that the current system of open markets is unable to ensure secure supply. The present competition has resulted in oil and gas deals that include political arrangements in addition to commercial terms. Highly publicized Chinese oil investments in Africa have included funding for infrastructure projects such as an airport, a railroad, and a telecommunications system, in addition to the agreement that the oil be shipped to China. Many more of these investments also include equity stakes for state-controlled Chinese companies. Another example is Chinese firms taking a position in Saudi Arabia, along with several Western firms, in developing Saudi Arabia’s gas infrastructure. At present, these arrangements have little effect on world oil and gas markets because the volumes affected are small. However, such arrangements are spreading. These arrangements are worrisome because they lead to special political relationships that pose difficulties for the United States. And they allow importers to believe that they obtain security through links to particular suppliers rather than from the proper functioning of a global market.28 We note that the United States, in the past, has also taken decisions to restrict markets partly due to similar concerns about energy security. For example, when the trans-Alaska pipeline opened, it included a prohibition against exporting the oil. The hostility toward proposals by the Chinese National Overseas Oil Company (CNOOC) to purchase UnionOil ofCalifornia is seen by some as denying investment opportunity in the U.S. market in a similar manner to what the United States decries about other nations’ conduct. The Task Force believes that foreign entities should be able to purchase U.S. assets provided that the acquisitions meet the criteria established by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS). 12 Opening a dialoguewith rapidly growing consumers, notablyChina and India, can help those consumers gain confidence that will lead to a greater willingness to allow markets to operate. (We return to this policy recommendation later.) The United States and other consuming countries have a tremendous interest in maintaining the present open market oil commodity trading rules. Fourth, revenues from oil and gas exports can undermine local governance. The United States has an interest in promoting good governance both for its own sake and because it encourages investment that can increase the level and security of supply. States that are politically unstable and poorly governed often struggle with the task of responsibly managing the large revenues that come from their oil and gas exports. The elements of good governance include democratic accountability, low corruption, and fiscal transparency. Production in fragile democracies, such as in Nigeria, can be undermined when politicians or local warlords focus on ways to seize oil and gas rents rather than on the longer-term task of governance. Totalitarian governments that have control over those revenue flows can entrench their rule. When markets are tight, large oil consumers have tended to become especially focused on securing supply and ignore the effects of their investments on corruption and mismanagement. In Sudan, for example, despite civil war and widespread human rights abuses, the Chinese government and its oil enterprises are funding extensive oil supply and infrastructure projects. China has used its threat of a veto in the UN Security Council to thwart collective efforts by other countries to manage the Darfur crisis in Sudan. Similarly, China, India, and several Western European countries continue to invest in Iran despite the need to contain its nuclear aspirations. Fifth, a significant interruption in oil supply will have adverse political and economic consequences in the United States and in other importing countries. When such a disruption occurs, it upends all ongoing policy activity in a frantic effort to return to normal conditions. Inevitably, those efforts include matters of foreign policy, such as coordination with other countries to find measures that will mitigate the consequences of the supply disruption. Some of these responses may be preplanned, such as the coordinated release of strategic reserves, but other responses will be hurried, ineffectual, or even counterproductive.

#### Heg solves nuke war

Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND, Washington Quarterly, Spring, 1995

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

#### Iranian proliferation cause nuke war

Jim Krane, Associated Press Writer, Iranian Nukes could spawn Gulf arms race, Singapore elder statesman says, AP, 11-21-2006, nexis

Lee, the island state's longtime prime minister, warned that an atomic Iran makes nuclear war more likely than during the Cold War, when Washington and Moscow understood the need to communicate their intentions to keep their nations secure. No such understanding exists between Israel and its Muslim enemies like Iran and Hezbollah, and miscalculations by both sides already resulted in a disastrous war last summer in Lebanon, he said.

#### Democracy solves extinction

Diamond, October 1995, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s,” http://www.carnegie.org//sub/pubs/deadly/dia95\_01.html, accessed on 12/11/99

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

### Energy Security Short Impact

#### US energy dependence makes great power war inevitable

Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, 5-19-2008, “The New Geopolitics of Energy,” http://www.thenation.com/article/new-geopolitics-energy

These and other efforts by Russia and China, combined with stepped-up US military aid to states in the region, are part of a larger, though often hidden, struggle to control the flow of oil and natural gas from the Caspian Sea basin to markets in Europe and Asia. And this struggle, in turn, is but part of a global struggle over energy. The great risk is that this struggle will someday breach the boundaries of economic and diplomatic competition and enter the military realm. This will not be because any of the states involved make a deliberate decision to provoke a conflict with a competitor--the leaders of all these countries know that the price of violence is far too high to pay for any conceivable return. The problem, instead, is that all are engaging in behaviors that make the outbreak of inadvertent escalation ever more likely. These include, for example, the deployment of growing numbers of American, Russian and Chinese military instructors and advisers in areas of instability where there is every risk that these outsiders will someday be caught up in local conflicts on opposite sides. This risk is made all the greater because intensified production of oil, natural gas, uranium and minerals is itself a source of instability, acting as a magnet for arms deliveries and outside intervention. The nations involved are largely poor, so whoever controls the resources controls the one sure source of abundant wealth. This is an invitation for the monopolization of power by greedy elites who use control over military and police to suppress rivals. The result, more often than not, is a wealthy strata of crony capitalists kept in power by brutal security forces and surrounded by disaffected and impoverished masses, often belonging to a different ethnic group--a recipe for unrest and insurgency. This is the situation today in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, in Darfur and southern Sudan, in the uranium-producing areas of Niger, in Zimbabwe, in the Cabinda province of Angola (where most of that country's oil lies) and in numerous other areas suffering from what's been called the "resource curse." The danger, of course, is that the great powers will be sucked into these internal conflicts. This is not a far-fetched scenario; the United States, Russia and China are already providing arms and military-support services to factions in many of these disputes. The United States is arming government forces in Nigeria and Angola, China is aiding government forces in Sudan and Zimbabwe, and so on. An even more dangerous situation prevails in Georgia, where the United States is backing the pro-Western government of President Mikhail Saakashvili with arms and military support while Russia is backing the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia plays an important strategic role for both countries because it harbors the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline, a US-backed conduit carrying Caspian Sea oil to markets in the West. There are US and Russian military advisers/instructors in both areas, in some cases within visual range of each other. It is not difficult, therefore, to conjure up scenarios in which a future blow-up between Georgian and separatist forces could lead, willy-nilly, to a clash between American and Russian soldiers, sparking a much greater crisis. It is essential that America reverse the militarization of its dependence on imported energy and ease geopolitical competition with China and Russia over control of foreign resources. Because this would require greater investment in energy alternatives, it would also lead to an improved energy economy at home (with lower prices in the long run) and a better chance at overcoming global warming.

### Energy Security Good – Heg

#### Oil security key to heg

Fareed Zakaria, host of CNN’s flagship international affairs program—GPS, Editor at Large of TIME, a Washington Post columnist, and a New York Times bestselling author, 8-23-2005, “ Mile by Mile, Into the Oil Trap”, The Washington Post, August 23, 2005, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/08/22/AR2005082201114.html

If I could change one thing about American foreign policy, what would it be? The answer is easy, but it's not something most of us think of as foreign policy. I would adopt a serious national program geared toward energy efficiency and independence. Reducing our dependence on oil would be the single greatest multiplier of American power in the world. I leave it to economists to sort out what expensive oil does to America's growth and inflation prospects. What is less often noticed is how crippling this situation is for American foreign policy. "Everything we're trying to do in the world is made much more difficult in the current environment of rising oil prices," says Michael Mandelbaum, author of "The Ideas That Conquered the World." Consider: • Terror ism . Over the past three decades, Islamic extremism and violence have been funded from two countries, Saudi Arabia and Iran, not coincidentally the world's first- and second-largest oil exporters. Both countries are now awash in money, and no matter what the controls, some of this cash is surely getting to unsavory groups and individuals. • Democracy. The centerpiece of President Bush's foreign policy -- encouraging democracy in the Middle East -- could easily lose steam in a world of high-priced oil. Governments reform when they have to. But many Middle Eastern governments are likely to have easy access to huge surpluses for years, making it easier for them to avoid change. Saudi Arabia will probably have a budget surplus of more than $26 billion this year because the price of oil is so much higher than anticipated. That means it can keep the old ways going, bribing the Wahhabi imams, funding the army and National Guard, spending freely on patronage programs. (And that would still leave plenty to fund dozens of new palaces and yachts.) Ditto for other corrupt, quasi-feudal oil states.

#### Heg solves nuke war

Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND, Washington Quarterly, Spring, 1995

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

### Energy Security Good – Econ

#### Transitioning away from oil dependence is a pre-requisite to sustain economic recovery

Gal Luft, executive director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security, 11-18, “Energy independence for America is possible, and necessary,” <http://www.energypublisher.com/> article.asp?idCategory=34&idsub=158&id=43522&t=Energy+independence+for+America+is+possible%2C+and+necessary

Unlike Europe, which is heavily dependent on Russian natural gas for its electricity generation, the U.S. is essentially energy independent when it comes to its power supply. It does not need to import coal and natural gas, chief sources of electricity generation, and no foreign nation can turn off the United States' power at will. The U.S. energy security challenge boils down to one problem: oil. Oil is the world's most strategic commodity not because the U.S. consumes or imports a lot of it, but because it enjoys a virtual monopoly over the global transportation fuel sector. This monopoly—almost all of the world's cars, trucks, ships and planes run on nothing but petroleum—enables a small group of nations, most of them members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), to constrict oil supply, manipulate its prices, and even use it as an economic weapon when conflict emerges, as was the case during the 1973-74 Arab Oil Embargo. While the OPEC cartel owns 78 percent of the world's reserves, it produces only one third of the world's oil—far less than its capacity permits. In fact, today OPEC pumps less oil than it did 40 years ago even though the global economy has doubled over the same period. U.S. Security and Economic Interests Most Americans fully understand the national security consequences of oil dependence. After all, petrodollars are the main source of revenue for some of America's sworn enemies. As long as the nations responsible for the spread of Islamic terrorism control the global transportation sector, which underlies the world economy, America will not be able to accomplish its foreign policy goals. But in times of economic adversity, one should also recognize the toxic impact oil dependence has on the U.S. economy. The United States' oil imports comprise nearly 40 percent of its trade deficit. Under current oil prices the U.S. spends over $350 billion on foreign oil, money that could have stayed inside the country, creating urgently-needed jobs and investment opportunities. In 2008, when oil prices reached nearly $150 a barrel, America's oil bill surpassed its defense budget. Studies show that every recession since the Second World War was preceded by an oil shock. The current recession is no exception. A report by the U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee determined that "the significant rise in oil prices in 2007-2008 […] was one of the causes of the Great Recession, as consumers faced higher transportation costs and had less money for consumption of other goods and services." Once the economy begins to fully recover, demand for oil will spike and prices of goods and services will rise accordingly, which, in turn, will dampen growth and send the economy into another recessionary period. For the U.S. economy, oil dependence is a double whammy. While it contributes to economic decline, it allows OPEC governments to not only laugh all the way to the bank but to literally own the bank. In recent years, sovereign wealth funds owned by OPEC members bought chunks of America's prime symbols of economic prowess—places such as Citigroup, Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, Blackstone Group, and the late Bear Stearns. This is only a preview to what is yet to come should oil prices bounce back to the three-digit territory. So if Americans are to prosper again and free hundreds of billions of dollars per year to stimulate the U.S. economy instead of the economies of OPEC, the U.S. must reduce its oil bill and, more important, its vulnerability to oil supply shocks. Stripping Oil of its Status Despite the broad agreement on the urgent need to reduce petroleum dependence, America's energy policy still suffers from institutional paralysis. The main reason for the stalemate is that throughout the years the energy problem has not been properly defined and, as a result, policy has been primarily focused on non-transformational, tactical solutions that perpetuate petroleum's domination over the global economy's very enabler, the transportation sector. The combination of oil's monopoly over transportation and the overwhelming control of OPEC over the world's oil market means that neither efforts to expand petroleum supply through domestic drilling nor those to crimp petroleum demand by imposing mandatory fuel efficiency standards are enough to strip oil of its strategic status. When oil importing countries like the U.S. reduce net demand or expand production, OPEC responds by throttling down its own supply to drive prices back up. In other words, when the U.S. drills more, OPEC drills less, and when Americans use less, OPEC, again, drills less. In order to achieve energy security the U.S. must change the playing field altogether. The story of salt can act as a guide. Until around the beginning of the 19th century, salt held the strategic position oil does today because it was the only means of preserving food. Salt mines conferred national power and wars were fought over their control. However today, no nation sways history because it has salt mines. Salt is still a useful commodity for a range of purposes. The United States imports much of its salt, so if one defines independence as autarky, the U.S. is not "salt independent." But most would agree there is no "salt dependence" problem in the world because canning, electricity and refrigeration decisively ended salt's monopoly over food preservation, and thus, its strategic importance. Similarly, ensuring that new cars sold in the U.S. and, by extension, the rest of the world, are platforms on which fuels can compete will spark a competitive market in fuels made from a wide array of energy sources, thus breaking oil's transportation fuel monopoly and eventually stripping the commodity of its strategic importance.

### Energy Security Good – Relations

#### Energy security key to stable relations with China and Russia –

John Deutch, Institute Professor at MIT, Undersecretary of Energy, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Director of Central Intelligence, 2006, “national security consequences of u.s. oil dependency,” Council on Foreign Relations, Independent Task Force Report no. 58.

The lack of sustained attention to energy issues is undercutting U.S. foreign policy and U.S. national security. Major energy suppliers— from Russia to Iran to Venezuela—have been increasingly able and willing to use their energy resources to pursue their strategic and political objectives. Major energy consumers—notably the United States, but other countries as well—are finding that their growing dependence on imported energy increases their strategic vulnerability and constrains their ability to pursue a broad range of foreign policy and national security objectives. Dependence also puts the United States into increasing competition with other importing countries, notably with today’s rapidly growing emerging economies of China and India. At best, these trends will challenge U.S. foreign policy; at worst, they will seriously strain relations between the United States and these countries. This report focuses on the foreign policy issues that arise from dependence on energy traded in world markets and outlines a strategy for response. And because U.S. reliance on the global market for oil, much of which comes from politically unstable parts of the world, is greater than for any other primary energy source, this report is mainly about oil. To a lesser degree it also addresses natural gas. Put simply, the reliable and affordable supply of energy—‘‘energy security’’—is an increasingly prominent feature of the international political landscape and bears on the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. At the same time, however, the United States has largely continued to treat ‘‘energy policy’’ as something that is separate and distinct— 34 National Security Consequences of U.S. Oil Dependency substantively and organizationally—from ‘‘foreign policy.’’ This must change. The United States needs not merely to coordinate but to integrate energy issues with its foreign policy.

### Energy Security Good – China

#### Energy dependence terminally screws relations

Gal Luft, writer for IAGS, 2004, “Fueling the dragon: China's race into the oil market,” http://www.iags.org/china.htm

U.S.-China relations are influenced by a wide array of issues from Taiwan to trade relations and human rights. But undoubtedly access to Middle East oil will become a key issue in the relations between the two powers. Clearly, in the short term, China recognizes that its energy security is increasingly dependent on cooperation with the U.S., rather than competition with it. China would like to maintain good relations with the U.S. and enjoy the economic benefits derived from such cooperation. But this inclination is balanced by the feeling among many Chinese leaders that the U.S. seeks to dominate the Persian Gulf in order to exercise control over its energy resources and that it tries to contain China's aspirations in the region. The U.S. is therefore considered a major threat to China's long-term energy security. Although China is banking on oil development projects outside the Middle East, Beijing most likely will insist on nurturing its relations with the main oil-producing states in that region as an insurance policy. But its attempts to gain a foothold in the Middle East and build up a long-term strategic links with countries hostile to the U.S. could also bear heavily on U.S.-China relations. Especially troubling are China's arms sales to the region, its support of state sponsors of terrorism and its proliferation of dual use technology.

#### Reducing domestic oil dependence is key to prevent energy competition with China --- it’s an overwhelming internal link to overall cooperation

James Reilly, Quaker International Affairs Representative, June 2007, Avoiding an Energy War with China, http://www.fcnl.org/issues/item.php?item\_id=3252&issue\_id=24

Would the United States and China really go to war over oil? It is an unlikely, but terrifying, possibility. As Chinese state-owned companies scour the globe in search of oil and gas to fuel China’s rapid economic growth, criticism of China for cozying up to dictators in exchange for access to oil, driving up domestic gas prices, and worsening global warming has grown more strident. According to some hardliners in Washington, the U.S. should begin to prepare for future energy conflict with China by strengthening alliances with key oil producers while denying China access to strategic oil supplies. Such policies would be dangerously short sighted. They increase Chinese anxiety about the security of oil supplies, encouraging China to lock in oil resources from unsavory regimes while undermining moderates in Beijing. Hard-line policies on oil could even turn into a self-fulfilling prophesy, fostering a new Cold War between the U.S. and China. In such a zero-sum competition over resources, nobody wins. An alternative is available. Through cooperation and dialogue, China and the U.S. can advance their common interest in secure access to sustainable energy resources at fair prices while avoiding costly and dangerous competition over scarce oil resources. Three key steps are: \* Support for energy efficiency and environmental protection in China \* Engage China in multilateral energy institutions \* Improve energy efficiency and conservation in the U.S. China’s Oil Anxieties China’s remarkable economic boom, fueled for years by China’s massive supply of soft coal, has begun to expand beyond China’s domestic energy supply. While coal still makes up 65 percent of China’s primary energy consumption, oil imports fill a growing percentage of China’s mounting energy needs. A net oil exporter in 1993, China today is the world’s third largest importer of oil and the second largest oil consumer. Over the next fifteen years, Chinese demand is expected to roughly double. By 2020, China will likely import 70% of its total oil needs, compared to 40% today.1 China’s dependence on imported oil raises political anxieties in Beijing. China’s government stakes its political right to rule on economic performance and rising standards of living. Domestic energy shortages, rising oil costs, and the specter of long-term global energy “scarcity” could undermine the country’s economic growth and seriously jeopardize job creation, raising real risks of social instability in China. Beijing is also worried that the U.S. seeks to exploit China’s energy weakness. After all, China sees the U.S. as the global energy giant, importing almost twice the total oil consumption of China and accounting for one-quarter of the world’s daily oil consumption. The U.S. is the third largest oil producer in the world after Saudi Arabia and Russia, and wields enormous power in global oil institutions. The U.S. navy controls all critical energy transport sea lanes. The U.S. military, having gone to war twice in Iraq to secure access to Persian Gulf oil, is now expanding its influence into Central Asia and Africa. U.S. policies have reshaped Iraq’s post-invasion oil development to benefit U.S. oil companies.2 China’s global oil strategy responds to these perceived vulnerabilities. Since Western companies control oil resources from major producers like Saudi Arabia and Iraq, the Chinese government has encouraged state-owned oil companies to reach extraction agreements with so-called “rogue” states such as Iran, the Sudan, Myanmar, Uzbekistan, and Venezuela. After all, seventy-five percent of known available oil reserves are in countries where outside investment in oil development is excluded or sharply limited.3 To avoid their vulnerability to domestic instability in oil-producing countries, Chinese firms try to engage in all stages of oil extraction, refinement, and transport. Meanwhile, the Chinese military has modernized its navy and tightened naval ties with countries such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Myanmar, in an effort to ensure secure oil transport through critical sea lanes. This is not an ideal strategy for China. Long-term, high-risk investments in unstable states carry high economic and political costs for China, while military modernization diverts scarce resources away from economic development at home. Above all, China’s policies are raising tensions with the United States, China’s largest investor and trading partner. The “China Threat” Approach For some people in Washington, China’s global oil strategy signals a dangerous threat to U.S. interests. They call for denying China access to energy resources while building up U.S. military capacity and strengthening alliances with key oil producing states.4 Africa, which supplies over a quarter of China’s oil and gas imports and is expected to provide a quarter of all U.S. oil imports by 2015, is already emerging as the next battleground over oil. The newest U.S. military command, AFRICOM, focuses on the Gulf of Guinea, a region dominated by major oil producing states. AFRICOM will be augmented by forward basing and access agreements the U.S. has recently struck across Africa. Efforts to deny China access to oil also are popular at home, evident in the outcry against China National Offshore Oil Corporation’s bid for Unocal in 2005, and criticism of China’s oil investments in Canada and Venezuela as undermining U.S. oil security.5 Such rhetoric is often based upon misperceptions about how today’s global oil markets actually work. While China has been widely criticized for rapidly rising world oil prices, many experts argue that given the rapid increase in U.S. oil imports over the past decade, the U.S. has been much more of a rogue element than China in the world oil market.6 Efforts to deny China access to oil are not merely misguided--they are dangerous. If Beijing believes that the U.S. is manipulating energy policies to weaken and contain China, then China will likely respond by increasing the pace of its military modernization, tying Chinese energy investments abroad ever more closely to dubious regimes, promoting security cooperation with adversarial governments, and politicizing global energy markets. Hardliners in Beijing who warn of the U.S. military threat will be strengthened, rendering the “China threat” a self-fulfilling prophesy. Engaging China over Oil As the two largest consumers of oil worldwide, the U.S. and China share common interests: avoiding disruption to global energy supplies, ensuring political stability in key oil producer regions, accelerating the development of alternative energy sources, limiting domestic consumption, increasing energy efficiency, creating greater transit and fuel flexibility, and reducing the environmental impacts of fossil fuel consumption. Three specific measures can build mutual trust while reducing the risk of U.S.-China armed conflict over oil: 1. Engage China in Multilateral Energy Institutions China is currently excluded from International Energy Agency (IEA) emergency oil sharing arrangements, which adds to price volatility in times of global supply disruptions. Although Chinese membership in IEA is unlikely given current IEA requirements for all members to be democracies and adhere to international human rights norms, the U.S. could take the lead in establishing an IEA-PRC partnership that would build trust, goodwill, and encourage cooperation on issues such as developing energy-efficient technology, dealing with oil supply disruption in a crisis, and encouraging Beijing to take a less mercantilist approach to meeting its energy demands. 2. Encourage Chinese energy efficiency and environmental protection Chinese government policies have begun to recognize the need for demand-side energy reforms aimed at improving energy efficiency and the diffusion of new energy-saving technologies. China’s national renewable-energy law went into effect in January 2006, offering financial incentives for renewable energy development. Current plans call for 20 percent of China’s electricity capacity by 2020 to come from renewable resources, including wind, biomass, and hydropower. However, China’s current bureaucratic, technical, and economic limitations are likely to undermine such ambitious efforts. Through the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate, and other mechanisms, the U.S. should expand its support for research and development programs which promote the use of renewable energy sources and transportation fuels, clean coal technologies, carbon sequestration, and promote energy and fuel efficiencies in China.7 3. Improve energy efficiency in the U.S. All good foreign policy starts at home. The United States remains an energy glutton, a country in which energy efficiency and conservation measures are the result of private sector reactions to the market rather than of comprehensive public policy initiatives. The Bush administration has focused on supply-side increases, but with limited effect. Even after the enactment of the 2005 Energy Policy Act, experts still project a future doubling of U.S. petroleum import dependency. The U.S. should pursue greater energy efficiency, renewable energy sources, and reductions in demand. Above all, reducing U.S. oil dependence is the key to preventing future conflicts with China over oil.

### Energy Security Good – Terrorism

#### Energy dependence is the root cause of terrorism – causes extinction and destroys the economy.

AmericanEnergyIndependence.com, an internet magazine—an independent publisher of articles, commentary, investigative reports, film documentaries, and current news about America's journey to energy independence, 2010, http://www.americanenergyindependence.com/islam.aspx

Militant Islam is spreading throughout the world—financed by Middle East oil wealth. "The rise of terrorism by militant Islam against the United States and the West coincided with the rise in oil prices of 1979-80 and the subsequent transfer of hundreds of billions of dollars from the West to Muslim countries." – Max Singer, senior fellow, The Hudson Institute. Muslim countries in the Middle East and North Africa are Islamic Republics. An Islamic Republic is a Theocracy, a nation ruled by religious clerics [Although many Muslim countries claim to have various degrees of freedom, they continue to submit to the will of their religious leaders, resulting in a legal system that is equal to a theocracy]. In contrast, the historically Christian countries of Europe and America have separated the religious authority of the church from the legal system that governs the people, thereby ending Christian Theocracy in the western world. The nations comprising the western world are no longer defined by religious beliefs—citizens of western societies are free to individually choose and practice their own beliefs without fear of state censorship. Islamic fundamentalists, supporters of Islamic Republics, view western nations as a threat to their theocratic rule. The religious customs practiced by extreme Muslim fundamentalists today can be compared to Christianity during the Medieval Inquisition: Religion by force, women regarded as property, dissidents burned at the stake, theocratic leaders ruled. Much like the world that Osama Bin Laden and al-Qaeda call Islam. Islam is not a military threat; but in its extreme form it does present an ideological threat to the modern world. Islamic terrorists will never conquer the United States or Europe with military force; that is not their goal. Extreme Muslim fundamentalists (violent Jihadists) believe they can use terrorism to disrupt the Global Economy and thereby slow the progress of modernization and freedom of religion. Islamic Jihad is a battle for the minds of men and women; with the goal of creating a world government known as the Caliphate — a unified political, economic and religious world order — ruled by one man, a Caliph, the successor to Muhammad, Islam's prophet of God. Muslim fundamentalists believe the Caliph will return the world to medieval Islam, using whatever means necessary. Islamic terrorism feeds off of the world's addiction to oil. Oil wealth in the hands of dictators and ideological extremists is financing terrorism. Oil money flowing into the Middle East finances the militant Islamic ideology that is flowing out of the Middle East, spreading around the world. The modern world trades its wealth for Middle East oil enriching the sponsors of terrorism. For these reasons, the war against terrorism cannot be won without Breaking Free of Oil Dependence. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) produces about 40% of the world’s oil today, which translates to OPEC getting 40 cents on every dollar paid for oil anywhere in the world. Current OPEC members are Algeria, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE, and Venezuela. All are Islamic countries except Venezuela which has partnered with Iran. In the year 2007, over 700 billion dollars flowed into OPEC from oil hungry countries around the world. How much of that money was given to support terrorist organizations? From September 2007 through October 2008, the world economy was rocked by the unprecedented transfer of over one trillion dollars from European, Asian and American economies into Middle East national treasuries in exchange for oil. Even with reduced, yet still high oil prices, OPEC countries received $600 billion from oil exports in 2009 and are expected to take in more than $800 billion in 2010. What many people do not see, is that it doesn’t matter where the oil comes from. If the oil comes from a well in Wyoming, California, Texas, Canada, Mexico, Russia, or the North Sea it doesn’t make any difference because oil is a global commodity. The price of oil traded on the world market is the same for everyone in the world. Demand anywhere increases demand everywhere. So, because 40% of the world's oil comes from OPEC, it is always true that OPEC gets 40 cents on every dollar paid for oil. It averages out to that fact. If global oil dependence (“The Petroleum Economy”) continues at over 85 million barrels per day, and the price of oil remains around $70 per barrel, the global economy will pay out over 2 trillion dollars per year for oil. With 40¢ of every dollar going to OPEC, Islamic nations will receive over 800 billion dollars per year from the oil they sell. Islamic terrorism, as a global threat to civilization, cannot sustain itself without the massive oil revenue that finances it. (That does not mean their feelings and beliefs will not sustain, it just means they will have limited influence without the oil wealth.) Islamic militancy is emboldened by the perception of power and dominance that Islam gains from the world’s dependence on oil – oil that the world must get from Arab countries. Eliminate world oil dependence and the Islamic extremists will be deflated psychologically. Ronald Reagan is credited for defeating Communism without firing a shot; by economically isolating and suffocating the Soviet Union, while at the same time enticing their leaders and people toward freedom. In a similar way, initiating action toward achieving global independence from petroleum (as a source of energy) will lead to the defeat of Islamic terrorism. Try to imagine what would have happened if Europe and America had been paying the Soviet Union one Trillion U.S. dollars every year, during the cold war.

#### Nuclear terrorism causes extinction—it escalates to nuclear war with Russia and China.

Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, InformaWorld.

 But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.

### Energy Security Good – War

#### Energy dependence causes multiple flashpoints for war

Mark E. Rosen, Deputy General Counsel @ Center for Naval Analyses & Professor of Homeland Security Law and Policy @ George Washington University, March 2010, “Energy Independence and Climate Change: The Economic and National Security Consequences of Failing to Act,” University of Richmond Law Review, March 2010, Vol. 44, Issue 3.

There is a growing consensus in U.S. national security circles that American dependence on imported oil constitutes a threat to the United States because a substantial portion of those oil reserves are controlled by governments that have historically pursued policies inimical to U.S. interests. For example, Venezuela, which represents eleven percent of U.S. oil imports, “regularly espouses anti-American and anti-Western rhetoric both at home and abroad . . . [and] . . . promotes . . . [an] anti-U.S. influence in parts of Latin and South America . . .”72 that retards the growth of friendly political and economic ties among the United States, Venezuela, and a few other states in Latin and South America. This scenario plays out in many different regions. Russia, for example, has used its oil leverage to exert extreme political pressure upon Ukraine and Belarus.73 Longstanding Western commercial relations with repressive regimes in the Middle East—i.e., Iran, Sudan, and Saudi Arabia—raise similar issues because of the mixed strategic messages that are being sent. Of course, large wealth transfers have allowed the Taliban in Saudi Arabia to bankroll terrorism.74 A. Chokepoints and Flashpoints For the foreseeable future, the U.S. military will most likely be involved in protecting access to oil supplies—including the political independence of oil producers—and the global movements of using oil to help sustain the smooth functioning of the world economy. The security challenges associated with preserving access to oil are complicated by geographical “chokepoints,” through which oil flows or is transported, but which are vulnerable to piracy or closure.75 “Flashpoints” also exist as a result of political—and sometimes military—competition to secure commercial or sovereign access to oil in the face of disputed maritime and land claims that are associated with oil and gas deposits. Together, these challenges have necessitated that the United States and its allies maintain costly navies and air forces to protect sea lanes, ocean access, and maintain a presence to deter military competition in disputed regions. A selection of today’s chokepoints and flashpoints follow. The Strait of Hormuz. This strait is the narrow waterway that allows access from the Indian Ocean into the Persian Gulf. Two thirds of the world’s oil is transported by ocean, and a very large percentage of that trade moves through Hormuz. The northern tip of Oman forms the southern shoreline of the strait.76 Hormuz is protected by the constant transits of the U.S. Navy and its allies. Even though the strait has not been closed, the Persian Gulf has been the scene of extensive military conflict.77 On September 22, 1980, Iraq invaded Iran, initiating an eight-year war between the two countries that featured the “War of the Tankers,” in which 543 ships, including the USS Stark, were attacked, while the U.S. Navy provided escort services to protect tankers that were transiting the Persian Gulf.78 There have been past threats by Iran to militarily close the strait.79 Additionally, there are ongoing territorial disputes between the United Arab Emirates and Iran over ownership of three islands that are located in approaches to the strait.80 Closure of the strait would cause severe disruption in the movements of the world’s oil supplies and, at a minimum, cause significant price increases and perhaps supply shortages in many regions for the duration of the closure.81 During the War of the Tankers, oil prices increased from $13 per barrel to $31 a barrel due to supply disruptions and other “fear” factors.82 Bab el-Mandeb. The strait separates Africa (Djibouti and Eritrea) and Asia (Yemen), and it connects the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean via the Gulf of Aden. The strait is an oil transit chokepoint since most of Europe’s crude oil from the Middle East passes north through Bab el-Mandeb into the Mediterranean via the Suez Canal.83 Closure of the strait due to terrorist activities or for political/military reasons, could keep tankers from the Persian Gulf from reaching the Suez Canal and Sumed Pipeline complex, diverting them around the southern tip of Africa (the Cape of Good Hope).84 This would add greatly to transit time and cost, and would effectively tie-up spare tanker capacity. Closure of the Bab el-Mandeb would effectively block non-oil shipping from using the Suez Canal.85 In October 2002 the French-flagged tanker Limburg was attacked off the coast of Yemen by terrorists.86 During the Yom Kippur War in 1973, Egypt closed the strait as a means of blockading the southern Israeli port of Eilat.87 The Turkish Straits and Caspian Oil. The term “Turkish Straits” refers to the two narrow straits in northwestern Turkey, the Bosporus and the Dardanelles, which connect the Sea of Marmara with the Black Sea on one side and the Aegean arm of the Mediterranean Sea on the other. Turkey and Russia have been locked in a longstanding dispute over passage issues involving the Turkish Straits.88 The 1936 Montreux Convention puts Turkey in charge of regulating traffic through the straits;89 yet Turkey has been hard pressed to stop an onslaught of Russian, Ukrainian, and Cypriot tankers, which transport Caspian Sea oil to markets in Western Europe.90 Because of the very heavy shipping traffic and very challenging geography, there have been many collisions and groundings in the past, creating terrible pollution incidents and death.91 Thus far, none of these incidents have been attributed to state-on-state-conflict or terrorism;92 however, the confined waterway is an especially attractive target because of the grave economic and environmental damage that would result from a well-timed and well-placed attack on a loaded tanker. The issues surrounding the straits are also a subset of larger problems associated with the exploitation of Caspian oil, including severe pollution of the Caspian Sea as a result of imprudent extraction techniques, as well as the ever-present potential for conflict among the various claimants to the Caspian’s hydrocarbon resources due to an inability of the various Caspian littoral states to agree on their maritime boundaries—and their legal areas in which to drill.93 Any one of these problems could become a major flashpoint in the future. China vs. Japan. The Daiyu/Senkaku islands located in the East China Sea have become an increasingly contentious dispute because both claimants have, in the past, used modern military platforms to patrol the areas of their claims in which there are suspected oil and gas deposits in the seabed.94 In September 2005, for example, China dispatched five warships to disputed waters surrounding its oil and gas platforms, which were spotted by a Japanese maritime patrol aircraft.95 There have been other similar military-to-military encounters.96 Given the fact that both countries have modern armed forces and are comparatively energy starved, it is not difficult to envision serious conflict erupting over these disputed areas. The Arctic Super Highway. Traditionalists would probably not include the Arctic as a security chokepoint. The oil connection is reasonably well known: “22 percent of the world’s undiscovered energy reserves are projected to be in the region (including 13 percent of the world’s petroleum and 30 percent of natural gas).”97 However, given the very small margins that transporters earn transporting oil from point A to B,98 shipping companies are always in search of shorter routes to transport oil to market. As the thawing of the Arctic Ocean continues as a result of climate change,99 this may create new shipping routes that transporters of oil and other goods will use to maximize their profits and minimize their transit times. As supplies of readily exploitable crude oil are reduced, the probability increases that some of this trade will result from exploitation activities in the land and littoral areas adjacent to the Arctic Sea. This development is concerning for a number of reasons: (1) the area is very remote and could provide a safe haven to pirates seeking to hijack cargoes; (2) the environmental sensitivity of the area, and the concomitant difficulty of mounting a cleanup effort, means that an oil spill in that marine environment will be much more persistent than an oil spill in temperate waters;100 (3) the Arctic presents unique navigational difficulties due to the lack of good charts, navigational aids, and communications towers, as well as the impacts of extreme cold on the operational effectiveness of systems;101 (4) the unsettled nature of claims by various countries, including the United States, to the seabed continental shelf resources in the littoral areas off their coastlines creates the potential for military competition and conflict over these claims.102 The International Maritime Organization (“IMO”) is now circulating draft guidelines for ships operating in Arctic areas to promote—but not require—ship hardening against an iceberg strike, better crew training, and environmental protection measures.103 These guidelines are merely advisory and can only be implemented via the flag states.104 Also, neither IMO nor any of the UN Law of the Sea Institutions have mandatory jurisdiction over any of the flashpoint issues re lating to competing continental shelf claims in the Arctic,105 meaning that any disputes will remain unresolved for a long time. The above is only a selected list of potential flashpoints in which oil is the main culprit. Disputes between China and six other nations of the Spratly Islands, and other territories in the South China Sea, remain unresolved.106 The Spratly Islands could become a flashpoint in the future, involving the United States or its allies, because of the proximity of those areas to the major sea routes to Japan and Korea.107 The strategic straits of Malacca, Lombok, and Sunda in Southeast Asia are absolutely essential to the movement of raw materials to Japan, Korea, and China.108 Because of Lombok’s depth and strategic location, it is a major transit route for very large crude carriers that move between the Middle East and Asia.109 Lombok is an undefended waterway that is only eighteen kilometers in width at its southern opening, making it an attractive chokepoint for hijacking or eco-terrorism in which the waters of the environmentally sensitive Indonesian archipelago would be held hostage.110

### Energy Security Good – War

#### US energy dependence makes great power war inevitable

Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, 5-19-2008, “The New Geopolitics of Energy,” http://www.thenation.com/article/new-geopolitics-energy

These and other efforts by Russia and China, combined with stepped-up US military aid to states in the region, are part of a larger, though often hidden, struggle to control the flow of oil and natural gas from the Caspian Sea basin to markets in Europe and Asia. And this struggle, in turn, is but part of a global struggle over energy. The great risk is that this struggle will someday breach the boundaries of economic and diplomatic competition and enter the military realm. This will not be because any of the states involved make a deliberate decision to provoke a conflict with a competitor--the leaders of all these countries know that the price of violence is far too high to pay for any conceivable return. The problem, instead, is that all are engaging in behaviors that make the outbreak of inadvertent escalation ever more likely. These include, for example, the deployment of growing numbers of American, Russian and Chinese military instructors and advisers in areas of instability where there is every risk that these outsiders will someday be caught up in local conflicts on opposite sides. This risk is made all the greater because intensified production of oil, natural gas, uranium and minerals is itself a source of instability, acting as a magnet for arms deliveries and outside intervention. The nations involved are largely poor, so whoever controls the resources controls the one sure source of abundant wealth. This is an invitation for the monopolization of power by greedy elites who use control over military and police to suppress rivals. The result, more often than not, is a wealthy strata of crony capitalists kept in power by brutal security forces and surrounded by disaffected and impoverished masses, often belonging to a different ethnic group--a recipe for unrest and insurgency. This is the situation today in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, in Darfur and southern Sudan, in the uranium-producing areas of Niger, in Zimbabwe, in the Cabinda province of Angola (where most of that country's oil lies) and in numerous other areas suffering from what's been called the "resource curse." The danger, of course, is that the great powers will be sucked into these internal conflicts. This is not a far-fetched scenario; the United States, Russia and China are already providing arms and military-support services to factions in many of these disputes. The United States is arming government forces in Nigeria and Angola, China is aiding government forces in Sudan and Zimbabwe, and so on. An even more dangerous situation prevails in Georgia, where the United States is backing the pro-Western government of President Mikhail Saakashvili with arms and military support while Russia is backing the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia plays an important strategic role for both countries because it harbors the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline, a US-backed conduit carrying Caspian Sea oil to markets in the West. There are US and Russian military advisers/instructors in both areas, in some cases within visual range of each other. It is not difficult, therefore, to conjure up scenarios in which a future blow-up between Georgian and separatist forces could lead, willy-nilly, to a clash between American and Russian soldiers, sparking a much greater crisis. It is essential that America reverse the militarization of its dependence on imported energy and ease geopolitical competition with China and Russia over control of foreign resources. Because this would require greater investment in energy alternatives, it would also lead to an improved energy economy at home (with lower prices in the long run) and a better chance at overcoming global warming.

## Solvency

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should invest in the planning and completion of a national High-Speed Rail system.

### Solvency

#### Federal action key – creates stable market.

Petra Todorovich, assistant visiting professor at the Pratt Institute Graduate Center for Planning and the Environment, 2011, “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers,” Policy Focus Report, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Even though PRIIA is authorized through 2013, stakeholders in the rail industry, including one of the drafters of PRIIA, have remarked on the need to adjust federal rail policy to respond to current circumstances, including greater political instability in the Middle East and its implications for America’s dependence on foreign oil; growing international and private sector interest in helping to ﬁnance high-speed rail in the United States; and the president’s own ambitious proposals for a national high-speed rail network to give 80 percent of Americans access to High-Speed Rail over the next 25 years (Gardner 2011). Such a vision requires a stronger, more active federal commitment that starts with secure funding. The most recent setback of zero funding for high-speed rail in the FY 2011 budget underscores the need for a sustainable revenue source as reliable as funding for highway and transit programs in the past. President Obama’s proposal to include a $53 billion, six-year high-speed rail program as part of the surface transportation bill would help to achieve this kind of equity among transportation modes. In conjunction with a funding strategy, the role of high-speed rail in America’s larger transportation network needs to be better deﬁned (U.S. GAO 2009). A sharper, more narrowly focused program directed at corridors that meet clearly articulated objectives for high-speed rail service would address criticisms that the program is diffuse, ineffective, and dependent on ongoing subsidies. Nationally available data could help to evaluate the most promising regions for attracting ridership and enhancing economic and other beneﬁts. A phasing plan and funding allocation strategy could help develop the full build-out of a national network by helping states secure rights-of-way for high-speed rail corridors. Another challenge is to clarify the differences between conventional and high-speed rail corridors. PRIIA provides federal grants for both conventional passenger rail and new high-speed corridors, although the media has tended to focus on the high-speed program. Neither PRIIA nor ARRA speciﬁed the share of federal funding to be used for high-speed Core Express corridors versus conventional passenger rail. In fact, the dearth of highspeed rail projects in the planning pipeline means that grants will be shared among various types of rail projects. A more active role by the federal government could clarify the respective roles of high-speed Core Express corridors and conventional Regional and Emerging/Feeder routes, including funding them through separate programs and clearly deﬁning the objectives for each type of rail service. Funding for maintaining and upgrading existing rail corridors could be provided through formula funds based on passenger train movements, track miles, or ridership. President Obama’s FY 2012 budget proposal for the Department of Transportation moved in this direction by establishing different competitive grant programs, including network development for constructing new corridors and system preservation for maintaining safety and reliability on existing corridors (White House 2011). The national high-speed rail program also must overcome a lack of effective institutions and administrative structures for building and operating multistate corridors. Public beneﬁt corporations capable of entering into public-private partnerships could develop and maintain high-speed rail infrastructure across megaregional, multistate, and even binational territories. These corporations would be responsible for the tracks, while separate public and private entities would operate the trains. Federal legislation could be developed to enable the creation of these public infrastructure corporations. International examples of publicly chartered infrastructure corporations include the High Speed 1 (HS1) and High Speed 2 (HS2) companies in the United Kingdom, Spain’s state-owned Administrator of Railway Infrastructures (Adif), and Réseau Ferré de France (RFF), the French Rail Network. Regional public beneﬁt corporations could be created in the United States to develop and manage track infrastructure, receive federal high-speed rail grants, and enter into contracts with private consortia for design, construction, and maintenance. S U M M A R Y The PRIIA legislation enacted in 2008 provided a transition from an era with no federal partner for high-speed and passenger rail to a period of active federal partnership with the states. Thirty-two states, the District of Columbia, and Amtrak have been awarded funding through the HSIPR Program and are moving ahead to plan or build high-speed and conventional rail projects. Given the quick start-up nature of the program, the FRA did an admirable job of responding to many simultaneous new duties, but also faced challenges in both laying the groundwork for a foundational program and implementing it at the same time. The setbacks experienced in 2011, when several governors cancelled rail projects and Congress appropriated zero dollars for highspeed rail, provide an impetus to reset the program in a way that will better position it for long-term success. Federal policy initiatives could set the program on ﬁrmer footing for a long-term commitment and restore public conﬁdence in an era of ﬁscal austerity

#### Solves gas emissions

Sam Schwartz, President and CEO, Sam Schwartz Engineering (SSE), a multi-disciplinary consulting firm specializing in traffic and transportation engineering, 2008, “Breaking the Logjam: Environmental Reform for the New Congress and Administration: Panel V: Urban Issues: A Comprehensive Transportation Policy for the 21st Century: A Case Study of Congestion Pricing in New York City,” New York University Environmental Law Journal, 2008, 17 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 580

Transportation funding at Federal level plays a direct role in environmental protection as cars and other vehicles contribute significantly to urban air pollution by producing CO2, the primary pollutant attributed to global climate change. Pricing strategies that consider the true costs of travel, such as congestion pricing measures in urban areas, as well as increased aviation fees and rail investment, particularly between well-traveled metropolitan areas, are direct measures that could reduce VMT while funding transit and rail. To achieve reductions in VMT between metropolitan areas less than 500 miles apart, rail needs to become a more affordable alternative to flying. This is a significant challenge as the cost of flying has become cheaper and more affordable in recent years due to the rise of bargain airlines and shrinking rail subsidies. Despite the Federal trend steering some funding away from traditional highway projects, the table below shows that the annual lion's share of Federal funding is directed at highways ($ 34 billion), with air travel receiving a little less than half that amount ($ 13.8 billion) (see Table 5). Meanwhile, rail funding is just a meager $ 360 million, or 1 percent of highway allocation and 3 percent of air funding. Of the $ 13.8 billion in air travel funding, $ 2.4 billion was allocated towards infrastructure development, capital improvements and efficiency. In fact, there are more than [\*606] one hundred locales in the U.S. that receive federally subsidized airline service. n44 In contrast, funding for passenger rail in 2001 was at its lowest level in over ten years. Adjusted for inflation, passenger rail in 2003 received less than two-thirds of what it was getting twenty years ago, while funding for highways and aviation have doubled. n45 Air travelers contribute little to the cost of providing public services. Some critics have proposed imposing an aviation tax to offset some of these externalities. In fact, Britain's Department for Transport suggested in December 2000 that if these hidden costs were included, air travel demand would decrease by 3 to 5 percent, equal to a tax of about £ 1 billion. Further, the European Environment Agency has suggested that total external cost of [\*607] British aviation alone is about £ 6 billion per year. Advisor to the British government on the economics of climate change, Sir Nicholas Stern, has argued that if, for example, the environmental cost of each ton of CO2 emitted were priced at $ 85, one London-Miami return flight emitting approximately two tons of CO2 per passenger would need to add $ 170 to the current price. n46 Similar pricing strategies have been proposed (beyond congestion pricing) to account for the true cost of driving. Although it is impossible to calculate the precise cost of these externalities, some conservative estimates show them adding up to 22 cents for every mile Americans drive. At 22 cents per mile, a gas tax of $ 6.60 a gallon would be necessary to make drivers fully pay for the cost that car travel imposes on the economy. n47 To increase public usage of rail, Federal subsidies must increase, including investments to infrastructure, as well as the development of new high speed rail service. To further institute a system where travel is more accurately priced to reflect its true cost, the cost of flying must increase. In recent years, Americans have become increasingly enlightened to the problems facing the environment and are likely to be more open than ever to changes in the functioning of their transportation system. In facing the lead-up to the 2009 reauthorization of the federal transportation bill, Congress now has the opportunity to provide leadership on a host of transportation reforms. Measures such as congestion pricing and an increased investment in regional rail could be instrumental in reducing overall VMT and, as a result, in decreasing emissions. Such steps are imperative in addressing global climate change and the long-term impacts of man on the environment.

#### Investment is sufficient to overcome obstacles

Darren A. Prum, director at the center for urban infrastructure, 2012, “High Speed Rail in America: An Evaluation of the Regulatory, Real Property, and Environmental Obstacles a Project will Encounter,“ North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology

With the foregoing in mind, none of the issues outlined are insurmountable to accomplish the goal of bringing HSR to the United States. However, HSR will not occur in this country if the different levels of government do not start to align their transportation, environmental, and economic policies into a unified direction. Unfortunately few of the enumerated benefits will occur if transit budgets remain slashed and if states continue to lack a nexus between their transportation, environmental, and economic policies. A HSR system will not reach its potential if rail feeder buses and light and commuter rail services are abandoned. If our leaders are sincere about implementing climate change initiatives, transit should be recognized as the most essential component lending to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions instead of treated as a mere afterthought. In practical terms, adequate funding must be preserved to promote all modes of public transportation To this end, the foundational elements that justify HSR’s existence need continued support by all levels of government. In order to successfully implement a HSR system in this nation, the many opponents will need proof that HSR is a system that not only can be built in a sustainable, responsible, and efficient manner but also follows the environmental guidelines of NEPA and relevant state laws while lowering travel times, increasing mobility, as well as reducing congestion and emissions Hence, the Obama Administration created the initial momentum to take control of some of the many global warming issues, while pushing for a cleaner energy policy throughout the country by investing in a smarter and greener transportation infrastructure such as HSR that creates multiple benefits simultaneously.

## Inherency

### Inherency

#### Congress is blocking funding for HSR

David Schaper, 5/13/2012 , Lack of Support Puts the Brakes on High-Speed Rail, North Country Public Radio, p. http://www.northcountrypublicradio.org/news/npr/152587645/lack-of-support-puts-the-brakes-on-high-speed-rail

Three years ago, President Obama was rolling out an ambitious vision for high-speed rail in America. "Imagine whisking through towns at speeds over 100 mph," the president said at the time. Today, there are a few Amtrak trains going that fast, but for the most part, the president's plans for high-speed trains have slowed considerably. On Amtrak's Wolverine service, which goes from Chicago to Ann Arbor, Mich., and then to Detroit and Pontiac, Mich., the train reaches speeds of up to 110 mph. It's the fastest of any U.S. train outside the Northeast Corridor. It is quite a feat, even though the train is only able to go that fast over about a 90-mile portion of the trip. "It's got to be viewed as only the beginning," says Joe Szabo, administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration. He says additional track and signal improvements are underway to help speed up trains throughout the Midwest. "So in the next two to two-and-a-half years, you're going to see almost 80 percent of Chicago-Detroit and almost 80 percent of Chicago-St. Louis at sustained speeds of 110 mph." That would reduce travel times on those routes to fewer than four hours, making the train faster than driving and competitive with flying, says Szabo. Both the Michigan and Illinois routes are benefiting because other states have been turning down funding for high-speed rail funds. Mixed Acceptance Republican governors in Wisconsin, Ohio and Florida sent back hundreds of millions of dollars in stimulus funding. They argued that few people would ride the trains, which would leave their states on the hook for millions in operating subsidies. So that makes Michigan's Republican Gov. Rick Snyder an outlier of sorts because he sees spending on high-speed rail as a wise investment. "Our folks in Michigan are looking for it," says Michigan transportation director Kirk Steudle. "They're interested, they want to ride it; the ridership numbers are going up and it proves that passenger transportation is a very viable option in Michigan for the corridor between Detroit and Chicago." Amtrak says it had a record number of riders nationwide last year. With gas prices still relatively high, the rail service is on track for another record year. But it's hardly smooth sailing for fast trains in this country. Scattered Focus "Increasing top speeds to 110 mph does not necessarily make a high-speed rail service," says Ken Orski, a former top U.S. Department of Transportation official who now publishes a transportation newsletter. He says what really counts is the average speed over an entire trip, and that's where Amtrak has trouble. Since most Amtrak trains run on freight railroad tracks, freight traffic backups often cause lengthy Amtrak delays. The poor condition of some stretches of leased track can slow passenger trains to just 20 to 25 mph until repairs can be made Orski says high-speed rail works best in densely populated corridors between cities only a few hundred miles apart, such as the Northeast corridor between Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. "That is where the administration should have focused its efforts, rather than scatter $10 billion on some 140 projects in 32 states," Orski says. That $10 billion mostly came from the stimulus package three years ago, and a big chunk of it went to California, which is developing a 200-mph, high-speed rail service between Los Angeles and San Francisco. It's a project many experts say shows some promise, but its ballooning cost and planning problems lead some critics to call it the train to nowhere. Congress has now put on the brakes on funding for high-speed rail, but high-speed rail advocates say if Amtrak can at least get enough funding to keep making improvements, that might whet the appetite for greater rail spending.

### Inherency – AT: Future Congressional Funding

#### HSR is blocked by Congressional infighting and a lack of permanent funding

United Press International, 5/22/2012 High-speed rail still a dream in U.S., p. http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Energy-Resources/2012/05/22/High-speed-rail-still-a-dream-in-US/UPI-19121337682600/

High-speed systems are often idealized as the optimal form of passenger rail. Both supporters and non-supporters of so-called bullet trains say that high-speed rail may be the best but it's the pinnacle -- something worth working toward. That's because, done right, high-speed trains are fast, economical, and efficient and relieve congestion on roads and in airports, supporting a cleaner natural environment. By 2030, the United States will have access to about half as much oil as is available today, High Speed Rail Association Chief Executive Officer Andy Kunz said. This a big reason to think about alternative mass transit systems and certainly a part of why Obama has a vision that 80 percent of Americans should have access to high-speed rail within 25 years. That's a lofty goal given the tough economy, a Congress hindered by partisanship and the problems seen with projects just begun in places like California. But it's a nice vision. The reality is weighed down by the practical. Like the federal highway system, which took nearly 40 years to build, a designated long-term passenger rail program -- not just an intermittently funded high-speed rail program -- would likely have to be established to see an effective program put into place.

## CPs

### AT: States CP

#### No State jurisdiction

United States Government Accountability Office, 2009 – the audit, evaluation, and investigation arm of the United States Congress, “High Speed Passenger Rail: Future Development Will Depend on Addressing Financial and Other Challenges and Establishing a Clear Federal Role,” Report to Congressional Requesters, March 2009, p. 11, http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09317.pdf?source=ra

Several federal agencies have played a role in the planning and development of high speed rail projects to date, and others may potentially be involved as projects progress. FRA has generally been the lead federal agency—sharing that role with other federal agencies, such as the Surface Transportation Board—regarding the environmental review process. The Surface Transportation Board must give its approval before any new rail lines can be constructed that connect to the interstate rail network.11 FRA also designates corridors as “high speed rail” corridors, and is the agency responsible for any safety regulations or standards regarding high speed rail operations. Safety standards relative to tracks and signaling requirements become more stringent as train speeds increase. For example, at speeds of 125 miles per hour or higher, highway-rail grade crossings must be eliminated, and trains must be equipped with positive train control, which will automatically stop a train if the locomotive engineer fails to respond to a signal. To operate at speeds above 150 miles per hour, FRA requires dedicated track—that is, track that can only be used for high speed rail service. No safety regulations currently exist for speeds above 200 miles per hour. In addition to FRA and the Surface Transportation Board, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) may play a role if highway or other transit right-of-way will be used or if highway or transit funds are to be used for some part of a high speed rail project. The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for granting rights-of-way on public lands for transportation purposes and, thus, would be involved in any new high speed rail project that envisions using public lands. Various other agencies would be involved in the environmental approval process, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency, among others.

#### States fail – companies wont invest

American Public Transportation Association, 2012 – non-profit that advocates for the advancement of public transportation programs in the U.S., “An Inventory of the Criticisms of High-Speed Rail: with Suggested Responses and Counterpoints,” p. 36, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf

If the Post read the Review Group report carefully, it would better understand why private capital has been reluctant to openly commit to the project. The demonstration of firm public sector financial commitments will be an absolute necessity prior to approaching sources of private capital, it stressed. In other words, investors won’t sink money into a project that’s under the threat of rescission by the likes of Rep. Lewis.

### AT: States CP

#### States lack funding for HSR – USFG’s general fund is key to solvency

Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy, Specialists in Transportation Policy, from the Congressional Research Service- prepares information for members and committees of Congress (“High Speed Rail (HSR) in the United States” CRS Report for Congress, 12-8-2009, p. 27, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40973.pdf

Proponents of rail funding have also recommended the use of bonds, including tax-exempt bonds and tax-credit bonds, to fund development of high speed rail lines. However, by borrowing the money and spreading out the repayment over a long period of time, bonds increase the cost of a project compared to paying for it all upfront. On the other hand, proponents contend that since rail improvements have long lifetimes, there is a case for having the cost of those improvements paid by the people who will benefit from the improvements many years into the future, rather than having the cost paid primarily by those in the present day. Based on the costs of high speed rail development and the revenue experience of high speed lines in other countries, it appears likely that the loans would have to be repaid primarily by the federal or state governments, or both. Consequently, critics of this approach contend that it would be preferable to draw funding from the government’s general fund, since a portion of the federal budget is already being financed by the sale of bonds, which will be repaid by future taxpayers. Prospects for significant funding from states are not promising. Most states’ budgets are constrained by current economic difficulties, and those budgets face growing demands in other areas, such as pensions and health care, as well as for highways and transit. The availability of dedicated funding sources for highway and transit in some states, and the lack of a dedicated funding source for rail, makes it more difficult for states to pursue rail as an alternative to highways or transit when evaluating the need for new transportation investment.

### AT: States CP

#### Federal government key to regional cooperation and planning

GAO, June 2010, “High Speed Rail: Learning From Service Start-ups, Prospects for Increased Industry Investment, and Federal Oversight Plans”

Project sponsors, states, and others with whom we spoke are looking for federal leadership and funding in creating a structure for high speed rail development and in identifying how to achieve the potential benefits that these projects may offer. All but 1 of the 11 high speed rail proposals we reviewed have a projected need for federal funds in addition to any state, local, or other funding they may receive. Aside from funding, project sponsors and others are also looking for a stronger federal policy and programmatic role. For example, officials from 15 of the 16 projects we reviewed told us that the federal role should be to set the vision or direction for high speed rail in the United States. An official with the Florida DOT told us that no high speed rail system would be built in Florida or elsewhere in the United States absent a true federal high speed rail program. Private sector officials also told us of the importance of a federal role and vision for high speed rail, and that leadership is needed from the federal government in providing governance structures for high speed rail projects that help to overcome the institutional challenges previously described in this report. Other stakeholders similarly mentioned the need for a federal role in promoting interagency and interstate cooperation, and identified other potential federal roles, such as setting safety standards, promoting intermodal models of transportation, and assisting with right-of-way acquisition.

#### That’s key – leaving the decisions up to multiple states creates conflicts

Yonah Freemark, 4-19-2010 , “Is the U.S. Ready for a Sustained High-Speed Rail Funding Source?”, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/04/19/is-the-u-s-ready-for-a-sustained-high-speed-rail-funding-source/

If, as has been evident recently, Washington is reluctant to identify corridors for investment, decisions must be made by each individual state or by groups of states. At least under this Administration, a proposed national route network, identifying priorities for investment and specific goals for each line, seems unlikely. Places that don’t want high-speed rail won’t get it, and places that do — and are politically connected in the enormously influential Senate — will. For train spending in big states, like California, Florida, and Texas, the process should be relatively simple to undertake: Once state-level administrators have selected a preferred investment and the federal government has agreed to its importance, a deal similar to the Federal Transit Administration’s New Start full-funding grant agreement can be signed. Done. But the situation becomes far more complicated once multiple states get involved. Take the Northeast Corridor: despite clear evidence that the Washington-Boston mainline holds the most potential for increased ridership, plenty of affected states have been pushing for other investments. New York is focused on the Albany-Buffalo line, Pennsylvania on the Scranton-New York corridor, and Connecticut on the New Haven-Springfield connection. None of this is to suggest that those projects aren’t important, it’s just that they aren’t as essential as the mainline. Yet the fact that states have to respond the the needs of their own constituents means that the region’s broader interests are ignored. Because states want spending within their borders, they’ll fight to prevent the federal government from using “their” tax returns for infrastructure construction elsewhere, even if those projects are indirectly beneficial. The federal government’s unwillingness to step in and promote routes as more important than others means that spending will be scattered around, often distributed to projects that shouldn’t be at the top of the priority list.

### AT: States CP

#### Perception of a lack of a stable funding source destroys investment

Angela Cotey, June 2011, “California HSR officials contend with criticism” http://www.progressiverailroading.com/high\_speed\_rail/article/California-HSR-officials-contend-with-criticism--26838

But for CHSRA to achieve its larger vision, the authority will need tens of billions of dollars in additional funding — federal dollars included. The uncertainty surrounding the near- and long-term prospects for federal funding don’t affect CHSRA’s “day to day,” but it could impact the private sector’s willingness to pony up funds to help California build its sprawling system, says Barker. “It’s a little bit ironic because there are a lot of people, especially in Congress, saying they want private-sector participation, but private firms right now are seeing volatility and political strife, and that’s not an environment in which the private sector will want to participate,” he says. That’s why it’ll be critical for Congress to create a program to fund high-speed rail on an ongoing basis. And as long as the private sector is confident the federal government will pony up more funds for HSR development, there are plenty of firms interested in securing a stake in California’s project.

### AT: States CP

#### California proves federal action is key to investment

Yonah Freemark, 4-19-2010 , “Is the U.S. Ready for a Sustained High-Speed Rail Funding Source?”, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/04/19/is-the-u-s-ready-for-a-sustained-high-speed-rail-funding-source/

The long hoped-for private financing necessary to construct the California High-Speed Rail project will not come as easily as originally planned. That, at least, is the conclusion of the authority empowered to build the project, the nation’s single-largest infrastructure program. According to the Los Angeles Times, in a letter to legislators this week the agency warned that the private money that it had counted on to cover a third of the project’s more than $45 billion costs would likely not be available until after parts of the line were up and running. The problem is that investors are concerned about the fact that of the expected major contribution from the federal government, only $3 billion has been authorized so far — and opposition in Congress to President Obama’s high-speed rail program means more money will be difficult to get, at least until after the 2012 elections. The letter was essentially a preview of the authority’s new business plan, which is due to be submitted November 1. The plan must be approved by the state legislators in order for state funding to be spent on the 220 mph line, which is designed to connect Los Angeles and San Francisco, with future links to San Diego and Sacramento. The news is embarrassing for the authority, which has been arguing for years that it could attract billions in private funds before the project was ready to be built, but it is not altogether surprising given the situation in which it has been placed. As I argued in mid-2009, California may well “never receive a guarantee that the feds will fully fund their prescribed share of the entire corridor’s construction costs. This is a huge problem, because a public agency shouldn’t be expending massive amounts of money on sections of a train system it doesn’t know it can finish completely. The private partners California hopes to interest in its program will not be excited about helping out on a train line they aren’t sure will ever open.” And indeed, this has been a legitimate concern about the Obama Administration’s high-speed rail program since it was first formulated. Though it is designed to sponsor major projects like California’s, its small appropriation ability means that the commitments it should be making — California wanted upwards of $10 billion from Washington, equal to the full amount thus far appropriated by Congress to the national program — cannot be distributed. The fact that the House and Senate have yet to agree on a long-term transportation bill, and the fact that Republicans have shown no interest so far in funding more intercity rail programs using the public purse, suggests that the situation is unlikely to get better for now. This is likely to put a dent in plans to open the new rail line by 2020. The California authority has developed a series of potential solutions to the problem, which must be solved if the agency wants to use the federal grants it has received thus far, since they must be spent by 2017. One option is to use federal loan guarantees and tax credits to provide an incentive for private investors to put their funds into the project or to leverage the $9 billion in state funds (authorized by the public in a 2008 vote) through the bond market, which could allow a tripling of available money. This would all have to be paid off eventually through public sector tax funds or user fees. While the California network is to be operationally profitable like virtually every high-speed rail system, it is unclear whether receipts will be large enough to cover capital costs. The other possibility is to shorten the planned route, replacing what was originally supposed to be a full new line from San Francisco to Los Angeles with a feeder line that would speed up existing Amtrak trains. Because the federal government has committed to a Central Valley segment between Merced and Bakersfield as the first section fo the route to be constructed, it seems likely that the authority would have to concentrate its resources on this project. In some ways, this could be a reasonable approach. Trains between Oakland and Bakersfield currently take six hours to complete their journey, but the high-speed line would allow 52-minute trips between Merced and Bakersfield, compared to three hours today. Thus constructing just this segment would reduce Oakland-Bakersfield trips to less than four hours — a massive reduction in journey times — if the appropriate rolling stock were available. Of course, this would do little to address the greater concern, which was supposed to be linking San Francisco and Los Angeles in 2h40. Currently, there are no direct trains into San Francisco, and the coastal route along which Amtrak trains run from Oakland to L.A. requires 11 to 12 hours of journey times. There is no train link between L.A. and Bakersfield. Because of the federal government’s previous decision to concentrate its resources in the Central Valley, resolving this issue will have to wait for another time if more funding is not found in the short term. But one wonders whether a link between Oakland and Bakersfield will be enough in itself to generate profitable ridership that convinces private investors to commit to the project, as the authority seems to be implying. This news comes just as the European Union announced its most recent Ten-T program, which is investing €31.7 billion in ten E.U.-scale corridors, most of which are designated for high-speed rail. Member countries have committed to hundreds of billions of euros more to build the projects, and indeed, there are active plans for new lines in most European countries. This is a prime example of governments thinking seriously about how to invest their limited resources in transportation projects that will pay off in the long-term. Some might argue that the United States and Europe are simply different, that private investors here recognize that Americans will not ride trains and thus will not commit to funding irrational projects. But the ability of European countries to attract private partners to cover up to half of the costs of their new rail lines has a lot more to do with the fact that there has been a solid commitment from governments there to invest in those programs, whereas American policy on the issue has been erratic at best. The problem is that California has been shunted into an impossible position: forced to make due with very limited federal funds despite a large commitment from state voters, the authority cannot attract private dollars. This is not, I would argue strongly, the fault of the authority or the Department of Transportation, which has funded it so far; blame rests entirely on a Congress that has been incapable of having a serious discussion (and making a final decision) about the merits of major investments in the nation’s transportation infrastructure. Instead, it continues to hand out small amounts, enough to keep projects like California’s alive but not enough to actually implement them. But California is still in a bind. It must either must cancel work — a dead-end proposition that will inevitably require unearthing the proposal in a decade — or build a much-shortened segment with far fewer benefits to the state. While it would be nice to get from Oakland to Bakersfield more quickly, the advantages of such a project pale in comparison to those of a full San Francisco-to-Los Angeles line. None of this news should be cause for celebration for opponents of spending on government infrastructure. The millions of people who are expected to ride the high-speed rail system every year will have to get between their destinations by some mode, and California’s air and roads infrastructure is at capacity. No high-speed system means spending just as much — or more — public dollars on upgrades to the existing system. Meanwhile, even if the financial costs of upgrades to highways and airports were similar to those of building the new rail network, the society’s economic costs of doing so are completely different: The high-speed rail system would offer an ecologically friendly alternative that reinforces the city centers of the state instead of furthering sprawl. Without a real sign of commitment from the federal government, however, projects like California’s simply will not be able to be constructed in the United States. This speaks volumes of the ability of the American public sector to invest in projects that are beneficial to the society as a whole from a long-term perspective.

## Das

### Plan Popular

#### Broad public support

American Public Transportation Association, 2012, non-profit that advocates for the advancement of public transportation programs in the U.S. “An Inventory of the Criticisms of High-Speed Rail: with Suggested Responses and Counterpoints,” p. 29, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf

As is clear, there are specific, over-drawn extrapolations in each of these statements. For example, they suggest that because three governors (one of whom would later reapply for funding) who campaigned against rail improvements in their respective states and won, all governors are against federal passenger rail improvement funding and all voters everywhere also oppose the federal initiative. Even the most basic understanding of logic would tell the casual reader that this construction does not hold up. Plus, there are ample and recent polls that show broad public support for the federal passenger rail improvement initiative.

#### Strong support

American Public Transportation Association, 2012, non-profit that advocates for the advancement of public transportation programs in the U.S. “An Inventory of the Criticisms of High-Speed Rail: with Suggested Responses and Counterpoints,” p. 29, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSR-Defense.pdf

In the case of Florida, where, with the nudging of the Reason Foundation, the gubernatorial candidate argued that accepting the federal funding would straight-jacket taxpayers into at least a $3 billion subsidy, private- sector interests had stepped forward to assume the full costs of the project beyond the federal funding and state financing that was previously approved by the state legislature as well as cover any operating loses that might occur. In early March, the state department of transportation released a study done by an independent consultant that showed the proposed first leg of the proposed high-speed rail system would generate a $10 million surplus in its first year of operations, and that the surplus would grow to more than $26 million annually by the 10th year of that leg’s operation. To date, 23 states (excluding the three that returned theirs) have received rail stimulus funding, and each of them has made every effort to capture all or a portion of the more than $3 billion Florida, Wisconsin and Ohio returned to the Federal Railroad Administration following the governors’ denouncement of the rail initiative. And in a real twist of irony, Governor Walker of Wisconsin has reapplied for a portion of the funding he turned back. Probably one of the most telling measures of public support for passenger rail lies in the fact that Amtrak is enjoying the highest levels of ridership in its history. Additionally, the BizTimes Daily on December 1, 2010 reported a poll commissioned by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) showing that: “Nearly two-thirds of American adults (62 percent) said they would definitely or probably use high-speed rail service for leisure or business travel if it were an option. The survey, taken among 24,711 adults, also asked how important various factors would be in choosing high-speed rail service. Ninety-one percent of respondents said high-speed rail should offer shorter travel times compared to driving to their destinations; 91 percent said the rail service should be less expensive than flying; 89 percent said it should be less expensive than driving; and 85 percent said the rail service should integrate with local public transit so they could avoid using rental cars and cabs, and paying parking fees.” use high-speed rail service for leisure or business travel if it were an option.

### AT: Costs PC

#### Bipartisan

Thomas Hart, Staff writer, 5-23-2012, “High-speed rail's many benefits”, Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html

There is growing consensus among Democrats and Republicans in Congress that the NEC is ideally suited for high-speed rail development. Differences remain, however, on the best path for development. Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, introduced controversial legislation last year that would privatize Amtrak, only to meet strong Democratic resistance. Tea party Republicans eliminated federal funding for high-speed rail in 2012, preferring private-sector financing. Indeed, high-speed rail funding may be zeroed out in the surface transportation bill now being negotiated in a House-Senate conference — though there is growing bipartisan support for provisions that could spark private investment through tax incentives and government guarantees. Given the current political realities, most policymakers now do support a public-private partnership model for the NEC. It’s already proven successful and for infrastructure development at the state and local level as well as in Europe and Asia.

#### HSR has bipartisan support—eleven Republican governors applied for ARRA grants

Richard Harnish, Executive Director of the High Speed Rail Association, Global Midwest Policy Brief, 2011 “Ideas to Ensure Midwest’s Success in a Global Era”, http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/CCGA\_Global\_Midwest\_Policy\_Brief\_Sep\_2011.pdf,

Investing in infrastructure can be a bipartisan cause. Democratic and Republican leaders support high- speed rail and intercity passenger rail. This may be surprising given that the governors who have turned away federal funding have been Republican. But it is important to note that eleven Republican governors applied for ARRA grants in 2009.

### AT: Costs PC

#### GOP support

Richard Harnish, Executive Director of the High Speed Rail Association, Global Midwest Policy Brief, 2011 “Ideas to Ensure Midwest’s Success in a Global Era”, http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/CCGA\_Global\_Midwest\_Policy\_Brief\_Sep\_2011.pdf,

Rick Snyder, the Republican governor of Michigan, is working to purchase a 135-mile segment of the Chicago–Detroit Amtrak line and upgrade the track for 110-mph operations. U.S. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John L. Mica of Florida, a Republican, has supported “true high-speed passenger rail” in the Northeast Corridor. Republican Bill Shuster of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials, has also publicly supported HSR in the Northeast Corridor. Republican Rep. Steven LaTourette of Ohio backs a high-speed rail line along Lake Erie linking Cleveland with Buffalo, Chicago, Detroit, and Toledo. And U.S. Sen. Mark Kirk of Illinois, also a Republican, said he wants to get an HSR project under way in Illinois within his term.

### AT: Costs PC

#### Highly bipartisan

Richard Harnish, Executive Director of the High Speed Rail Association, Global Midwest Policy Brief, 2011 “Ideas to Ensure Midwest’s Success in a Global Era”, http://www.midwesthsr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/CCGA\_Global\_Midwest\_Policy\_Brief\_Sep\_2011.pdf,

In the president's budget, released earlier this year, Obama asked Congress to devote $1 billion for the next five years for high-speed rail, along with the $8 billion already marked for the program under the stimulus bill. The House's decision to increase that number to $4 billion is a direct reaction to the huge response from states and the private sphere for stimulus-based federal rail grants. The FRA revealed that 40 states had applied for more than $103 billion. U.S. Rep. Tom Latham, R-Iowa, attempted to block the inclusion of so much money for [high speed] rail, arguing that the government shouldn't embark on what he argued would be a $100 billion endeavor. Yet his amendment was rejected by a vote of 284-136, with 40 Republicans voting against his measure -- compared to only 16 members of the GOP voting for the bill as a whole. This indicates strong bipartisan support in Congress for high-speed rail investment and bodes well for similar action in the more conservative Senate.

#### GOP supports

Emily Cahn, Staff Writer, 5-23-2011, “GOP pushes private rail investment”, The Hill’s, http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/162817-gop-makes-case-for-private-bids-on-117b-rail-project,

Republicans on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will press the Obama administration this week to rely more on private investment for a high-speed rail project in the Northeast. Committee leaders noted the benefits high-speed rail would provide to cities in the Northeast in a memo distributed by Republican staff, stressing that the corridor between Boston and Washington is an ideal location for the investment. Still, the memo says, a future project must be supported by private investors and not rely too heavily on federal funds. “While the need and opportunity for a successful true high-speed rail project exists, the federal government cannot carry the full financial burden of public infrastructure projects,” the memo states. “Private industry must step up and help fill the gaps in high-speed rail funding and operations.” President Obama has made the creation of a high-speed rail line a priority of his administration, but has received backlash from Republican governors, who said they were worried their states would be hit with some of the costs for the railroad upgrades. The for-profit company Amtrak announced last week that it would look to private investors to help fund a high-speed rail line on the Northeast Corridor — one of the busiest rail lines in the country. But a company spokesman said Amtrak does not know how large a percentage of the project’s funding will come from private investors and won’t know until after June 10, when proposals from interested backers are due.

### Obama Pushing

#### Obamas already pushing HSR

Keith Laing, Transportation Specialist, 6-4-2012, The Hill, “DOT official: Obama support of high-speed rail 'remains as strong as ever'”, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/230777-dot-official-obama-support-of-high-speed-rail-remains-as-strong-as-ever

Federal Railroad Administration chief Joseph Szabo said Monday that President Obama is unwavering in his support for high-speed rail projects. Speaking a conference held by the American Public Transportation Conference in Dallas, Szabo said Obama's support for rail "remains as strong as ever. "His Fiscal Year 2013 budget requests $2.5 billion combined with $6 billion in immediate transportation investments – a total of $8.5 billion for the continued development of high-speed and intercity passenger rail projects," Szabo said. "America’s rail renaissance is well underway."

#### Obama is already selling HSR

Eric Alliance, “High Speed Rail Stimulus Funding”, Cygnus, June 2010, Lexis.

The administration is selling the concept of bullet trains - truly high-speed service. At the same time, the administration's program is incremental, improving or upgrading present service and in some places introducing new conventional passenger rail service. Through the stimulus package the administration is making what it believes to be strategic investments that focus on three primary areas that will deliver transportation, economic recovery and other public benefits: Building new high-speed rail corridors that will fundamentally expand and improve passenger transportation in the geographic regions they serve; Upgrading existing intercity passenger rail services; and, Laying the groundwork for future high-speed passenger rail services through smaller projects and planning efforts. The initiative invests or encourages the investment in significant improvements to currently existing right-of-ways owned and operated by the various freight railroad companies and, in perhaps just two or three cases, it actually underwrites the planning and construction of what the administration terms high-speed rail express service trains that will run at speeds up to 220 mph.

### Obama Pushing

#### Pushing through opposition

Keith Laing, Transportation Specialist, 5-30-2012, “Obama administration officials to speak at high-speed rail conference”, The Hill’s, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/230145-obama-administration-officials-to-speak-at-high-speed-rail-conference.

A pair of key transportation officials from President Obama's administration will address a high-speed rail conference in Philadelphia this summer. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood and Federal Railroad Administrator Joseph Szabo will speak at the 8th World Congress & Trade Exhibition on High-Speed Rail, organizers announced Wednesday. LaHood and Szabo will be joined at the July 10-13 conference by Amtrak CEO Joseph Boardman and the transportation ministers of Canada, Poland and Turkey. The Obama administration has maintained its push for high-speed rail in the face of staunch opposition from Republicans in Congress and in state governments. The president called early in the first half of his tenure in office for a nationwide network of high-speed railways that he said would rival the reach of the interstate highway system, and he included $8 billion for construction in the 2009 economic stimulus.

## Add Ons

### Ozone Add On

#### High speed rail stops ozone depletion

David Hansen, Not the Terrible Band, 3-17-2003, “Don’t Let Train Vow Hit Buffers”, Evening News, Edinburgh, Lexis

AS well as short-term improvements, airport rail links provide the possibility of replacing some air journeys by trains. The Government has yet to escape from a destructive "predict and provide" approach to airport building, which will simply lead to hyper-mobility as it has done on the roads. Short distance air travel is particularly damaging to the ozone layer, causing climate change out of all proportion to the length of journey.

#### Ozone depletion causes extinction

Greenpeace 1995 (Full of Holes: Montreal Protocol and the Continuing Destruction of the Ozone Layer -- A Greenpeace Report with contributions from Ozone Action, http://archive.greenpeace.org/ozone/holes/holebg.html)

When chemists Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina first postulated a link between chlorofluorocarbons and ozone layer depletion in 1974, the news was greeted with scepticism, but taken seriously nonetheless. The vast majority of credible scientists have since confirmed this hypothesis. The ozone layer around the Earth shields us all from harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun. Without the ozone layer, life on earth would not exist. Exposure to increased levels of ultraviolet radiation can cause cataracts, skin cancer, and immune system suppression in humans as well as innumerable effects on other living systems. This is why Rowland's and Molina's theory was taken so seriously, so quickly - the stakes are literally the continuation of life on earth.

### Urban Sprawl Add On

#### High speed rail reverses urban sprawl

ELPC 2010, Environmental Law & Policy Center, “Benefits of High Speed Rail”, http://elpc.org/benefits-of-high-speed-rail

Because high speed rail promises environmental, economic, and transportation benefits, it has garnered broad support from throughout the Midwest. Click here to view a map of the Midwest High Speed Rail Network. High speed trains in the Midwest would be three times as energy efficient as cars and six times as energy efficient as planes. Choosing rail travel over driving or flying will decrease our dependence on foreign oil and reduce air pollution that causes global warming and harms public health. Currently, major portions of the Midwest suffer from “severe” smog problems, according to federal regulators. The construction of high-speed rail will decrease the region’s reliance on automotive transportation and therefore help reduce ozone emissions. Downtown train stations will pull jobs, people and business back into the country’s central cities thus reversing sprawl. High speed rail reduces the need for new outlying highways and airports which exacerbate sprawl.

#### Urban sprawl causes extinction

Lynn Chandler, 2-21-2000, Goddard Space Flight Center, “Urban Sprawl Reduces Annual Photosynthetic Production”, http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Newsroom/view.php?id=20890

According to Imhoff's research, urbanization and industrialization have resulted in the development of mega-cities and urban and suburban sprawl. The environment is altered as a result of replacing land cover with roads, housing, and commercial and industrial structures. "Human survival depends on the ability of the landscape to produce food," said Imhoff. "Food production can be fundamentally linked to primary production or photosynthesis. If the capacity of the landscape to carryout photosynthesis is substantially reduced - then the ability of the planet to support human life must also be diminished." Imhoff said data from the mid-1990's from two different satellite systems were combined with land cover maps and census information on population and housing to study the effect of urbanization on photosynthetic production in the United States. Nighttime images from a Department of Defense satellite, which show a dramatic picture of Earth's city lights, were used to determine which areas and how much land have been converted to urban, suburban, or industrial use. Maps showing urban, peri-urban (suburban), and non-urbanized areas were created from the "city-lights" satellite data. "Using a computer, we combined the city-lights satellite data with another type of satellite data that records a measure of 'greenness' or photosynthetic potential of the landscape over the course of an entire year," Imhoff said. "By merging the satellite data we could examine how urbanization affects the potential of the land surface to carryout photosynthesis by looking at the 'greenness' index inside and outside the urbanized areas for the whole continental United States." Results show that urbanization can have a measurable but variable impact on photosynthetic productivity. Annual photosynthetic productivity can be reduced by as much as 20days in areas where housing and commercial land use is very dense. "However, we also found that in resource limited regions, human activity can increase productivity by altering the environment," he said. "For example, this was the case for arid and semi-arid areas where lawn irrigation and planting changed the ecosystems from shrub lands and desert to deciduous forests." A most interesting finding according to Imhoff was that urbanization seems to elongate the growing season, yet still reduces the overall productivity of the land. "Vegetation greens up earlier in the spring and takes longer to senesce in the fall, but has lower peak season productivity than similar nearby areas that are not urbanized," he said. "This could be demonstrating a profound urban heat island effect and have implications in climate change, especially in the northern Hemisphere where urban development is most intense." Analysis of the data also found clear evidence that human beings definitely tend to locate themselves on the most productive land and that those lands are being transformed into less productive types. "The results of this study should increase our awareness of the importance of land use planning especially in the context of sustainable growth and development," Imhoff stated. "Human survival depends on photosynthesis. If urbanization and industrialization continue, the capacity of the landscape to carry out photosynthesis is substantially reduced. "