## Amazon Advantage Updates

### Alt Cause - Dredging - 1NC

**Panamax expansion means newer, bigger ships are coming - failure to dredge makes aff impacts inevitable. The status quo doesn't solve**

**Bridges 11** - (Jerry Bridges, Chairman of the Board of the American Association of Port Authorities, 10/26/11, "The Economic importance of Seaports: Is the United States Prepared for 21st Century Trade Realities?," Congressional Testimony)

Since the birth of our nation, U.S. seaports and waterways that connect them have served as a vital economic lifeline by bringing goods and services to people around the world and by delivering prosperity to our nation. U.S. seaports are responsible for moving more than 99 percent of our country’s overseas cargo. Today, international trade accounts for more than a quarter of Americas Gross Domestic Product. Americas seaports support the employment of 13.3 million U.S. workers, and seaport- related jobs account for $649 billion in annual personal income. For every $1 billion in exports shipped through seaports, 15,000 U.S. jobs are created. Seaports facilitate trade and commerce, create jobs, help secure our borders, support our military and serve as stewards of valuable coastal environmental resources. Ports are dynamic, vibrant centers of trade and commerce, but what is most important to understand is that seaports rely on partnerships. Seaports invest more than $2.5 billion every year to maintain and improve their infrastructure. In recent years, however, this commitment has not been adequately matched by the federal government. Federal funding for dredging federal navigation channels has slowed and decreased, especially for new construction. Further, maintenance dredging is sorely underfunded, despite a more than $6 billion and growing surplus in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Landside improvements have also been too low a priority, with little of the highway funds going to freight transportation projects. The only bright light has been the newly created TIGER grants, although not enough of this funding benefited ports. Virginia Port Authority received a TIGER grant for its heartland project. As we look to the future, we do know that there are challenges and opportunities. As we recover from this economic downturn, we must make investments today to address the trade realities of the future. Here are some the challenges and we have to ask: are we ready? The Panama Canal expansion is due to be completed in 2014 and is expected to influence trade patterns. VPA and other ports have been making investments, but federal funding has been slow to match these investments. Ship sizes continue to get larger, requiring on-'going modernization of ports and federal navigation channels, even for ports that will not require 50 feet of depth. Canada and Mexico are making investments which could result in losses of maritime jobs in the U.S. as cargo enters the U.S. through these countries. We have already seen this job loss on the West Coast.

### Alt Cause - Dredging - 2NC

**Insufficient port depth means trade standstills inevitable**

**Port Technology**, **1/12**/2012 (US port infrastructure ranked behind Iceland and Estonia, p. http://www.porttechnology.org/news/us\_port\_infrastructure\_ranked\_behind\_iceland\_and\_estonia/)

Elected officials call for increased funding to help modernize US facilities World Economic Forum now ranks US port infrastructure as 22nd in the world The condition of port infrastructure in the United States was further realized this week with claims that its port development is falling behind countries including Iceland and Estonia. The subject was at the forefront of a recent policy forum attended by a coalition of elected officials from the Building America’s Future Educational Fund (BAF) and Jacksonville’s Chamber of Commerce, the JAX Chamber, to highlight the need for continued investment in the country’s port infrastructure. “Other countries understand that port innovation and capacity is key to competitiveness in an export-driven economy,” former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, and BAF co-chair, told the IFW. “The World Economic Forum now ranks US port infrastructure 22nd in the world, behind such countries as Iceland and Estonia.” During his keynote speech, Rendell noted how the 59 busiest ports in America were only operable 35 percent of the time. As a result US ports have experienced notable delays and backlogs, which have increased the cost of goods going in and out of the country considerably. “Policy-makers in Washington need to make smart infrastructure investments a priority, because if we don’t, we will only fall further behind the rest of the world.” A key area of investment highlighted by Rendell was the dredging of US harbors in preparation for the completion of Panama Canal expansion in 2014. Rendell stressed that unless necessary funding was provided then the country could face the prospect of losing millions of dollars of trade, as shipping companies seek alternative ports in neighboring countries capable of handling the larger ships that will navigate the Panama Canal from 2014.

**Only dredging prevents collisions - otherwise domestic markets can't even access trade**

**Hurst 6/16** (Nathan Hurts, CQ Staff Writer, "Dredging Up More Money for Maintenance," Congressional Quarterly)

For ports along the Eastern Seaboard and Gulf Coast, the $5.3 billion expansion of the Panama Canal to accommodate wider and heavier vessels is an opportunity to grab a bigger share of trans-Pacific cargo shipping. Instead of sending Asian cargo across the country by rail, for instance, it could be shipped directly by sea to major East Coast ports.¶ Seizing that opportunity will be an expensive proposition. The only eastern port completely ready for “New Panamax” ships — those that will fit through the expanded canal, as opposed to “Panamax” ships that can fit through it today — is Norfolk, Va. Navigation channels in most major harbors are too shallow, while the port of New York and New Jersey would have to spend about $1 billion to raise the Bayonne Bridge by about 64 feet so larger ships could pass.¶ Compounding the challenge is an estimated $2.2 billion backlog in current harbor maintenance before new, deeper channels could be dredged. The Army Corps of Engineers reports that the full, authorized channel dimensions at the 59 busiest U.S. ports are available less than 35 percent of the time, increasing the risk of collisions and groundings and raising the cost of shipping because vessels have to carry lighter loads.

### China Ag Defense

**Status quo innovations solve**

**Reuters, 2/1**/2012 (China to invest in agriculture innovation to boost food security, p. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/01/us-china-agriculture-idUSTRE81016L20120201)

China said on Wednesday it would boost agriculture innovation in an effort to increase food output, signaling that the world's most populous country is trying to tackle outdated farm and food infrastructure to feed its people. China accounts for a fifth of the world's population with less than 9 percent of its arable land, and the cabinet suggested in a document that China's leaders were aiming to get serious about technology to ensure long-term food supplies. The State Council, or cabinet, said in the first policy document of the year it would increase investment and subsidies for the agricultural technology sector this year to stabilize grain production, state media reported. Technological innovation in the sector would "improve land yield, resource efficiency and labor productivity," the official Xinhua news agency said. The No. 1 Document, as it is called, has for the past nine years focused on rural issues, including agriculture, water conservation, farmers' income, and land transfer issues. The State Council said in this year's paper the government would encourage research focusing on areas including bio-technology, seed production and effective use of farmland, Xinhua reported.

**Droughts make price shocks inevitable.**

**Carlson, 8/1**/2012 (Benjamin, US agricultural exports to China become costly in times of drought, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/global-post/2012/08/us-agricultural-exports-china-become-costly-times-drought>)

As the world’s largest importer of American agricultural products, China stands to get walloped by the drought that is ravaging US croplands. With the worst dry spell in 50 years threatening to kill corn and soybean crops across a wide swath of the Midwest, driving food prices to record highs, Chinese officials are bracing for a shock that could complicate plans to revive the economy this year. In 2011, China imported $20 billion worth of soybeans, corn, cotton and hides from US farmers, surpassing Canada for the first time. China is particularly dependent on soybeans, which have become a crucial feed crop for the country’s massive pig farms. As more Chinese can afford to eat meat more regularly, pork consumption has skyrocketed. More than half of the world’s pork is now produced and consumed within China. Corn imports are also important, with China purchasing more from the US than any country but Japan. Next year, it is expected to buy 5 million tons of American corn. But analysts don’t expect the prices to come down anytime soon. A bullish run on soybean futures drove up the cost to $16.92 per bushel for November delivery, beating the previous all-time high of $16.37 set during the global food crisis of 2008. All this constrains Beijing's ability to fix its economy. If rising food prices boost inflation, the government would have less room to increase the money supply and fuel growth — a key concern given that the economy has been slowing all year. Already, analysts are predicting that ordinary Chinese could feel some sticker shock when they go to the butcher. Zhang Zhiwei at Nomura says that the “sharp rise of global agricultural prices will likely push up pork prices in China,” according to the Financial Times

**Price swings are inevitable - their impact evidence describes natural price cycles**

**Farmers’ Advance**, 7/25/20**12** (Weekly Price Outlook: Expected price pattern for corn, soybeans, p.

http://www.farmersadvance.com/article/20120725/MARKETOUTLOOK/207250316/%3Cspan-class=%5c-headline%5c-%3EWeekly-Price-Outlook--Expected-price-pattern-for-corn--soybeans%3C/span%3E%3Cbr%3E)

"It is widely anticipated that corn and soybean prices will reach a peak early, sometime in a relatively wide window around harvest time, and then decline as the marketing year progresses," Good said. "The anticipated pattern is generally described by the adage that 'short crops have long tails.' At this juncture of the 2012 season, it appears likely that the corn and soybean price pattern will follow a more or less typical short crop price pattern, at least in terms of the timing of the price peak.¶ "Based on historical patterns, however, the timing of the price peak could range from the current month until after harvest. With an early harvest, a price peak by September seems most likely, assuming that prices go high enough to slow the pace of consumption sufficiently. Prices are probably not yet high enough for either crop to accomplish that objective," Good said.¶ According to Good, for both corn and soybeans there is considerable risk that the U.S. average yield will be lower than now anticipated. For soybeans, demand is also very strong due to the shortfall in the 2012 South American crop and ongoing large purchases of U.S. soybeans by China.¶ Good explained that for producers with substantial quantities of 2012 crop corn and soybeans to sell, the window for the best price opportunities may be open for a while, but it is not possible to predict the timing and magnitude of the price peak. A strategy of spreading sales over the next several weeks may be prudent. For producers with little or no crop to sell, the major focus may be on maximizing crop insurance payments.¶

**No impact to price swings - self-sufficiency means China can adjust**

**Carlson**, 8/1/**2012** (Benjamin, US agricultural exports to China become costly in times of drought, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/global-post/2012/08/us-agricultural-exports-china-become-costly-times-drought>)

Still, a few factors make analysts hopeful that China, despite its reliance on US imports, will survive the drought relatively unscathed.¶ First, though China buys a lot of US agricultural products, it is nearly self-sufficient in terms of basic food staples, such as rice and wheat. This is no accident: famine and food shortages have repeatedly led to unrest throughout China’s history, not least in the disastrous Great Leap Forward that killed roughly 20 million between 1958 and 1961. As a result, the government has deliberately sought to cultivate domestic food supplies, and minimize dependence on the global market.¶ Second, inflation in China is already falling. Thanks to the slowing economy and cooling real-estate sector, inflation is nowhere near last year's 6 percent rate — in fact, it fell slightly over 2 percent in June. Pork prices, which pushed up consumer grocery bills last year, are now 12 percent lower than they were in 2011.¶ Not everyone is convinced that higher corn and soy prices will have much impact. As Frederic Neumann, economist for HSBC based in Hong Kong, wrote in an an analyst's note, the current surge in commodity prices is “unlikely” to push China's inflation rate back up. Oil and rice matter much more for determining food prices, he says.¶ “How worried should we be? Not overly,” he writes. “Sure, Asia has structural inflation problems. But soy isn’t one of them.”¶ “China endeavors to be close to self-sufficient,” says professor Harold Corke, who studies food security at the University of Hong Kong. “Rising prices will squeeze out buyers from, for example, Africa, long before they impose serious problems in China.”

### Africa Turn

**Lack of food security results in Chinese investment in African agriculture.**

**Vidal**, 5/10/**2012** (John – environment editor of the Guardian, Chinese food security may be motivating investments in Africa, The Guardian, p. http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2012/may/10/chinese-food-security-investments-africa)

China's long-term motivation for investing in African farming could be to export food back to its home markets, a research paper from Standard Chartered bank has warned. The world's largest country is more or less self-sufficient in grains, but within 20-30 years it is expected to need to import an extra 100m tonnes of food a year to meet the growing appetites of its middle classes.¶ "Where China will turn to meet these agricultural needs is the key question," said the paper's authors, who have analysed China's involvement in African farming. "Concerns about global food security have raised questions over whether investments in African agriculture are for export. While we do not see investment as securing Chinese food security for now, this could be a longer-term motivation."¶ China's investment in African agriculture is still insignificant compared with the money it has ploughed into African oil, gas, mineral resources and infrastructure. Of an estimated $67bn of large-scale investments in Africa from 2006 to 2012, only $3.5bn was invested in agriculture according to the bank, which earns 90% of its profits from Africa, Asia and the Middle East.¶ But there are strong signals that China is getting more interested in African farming. It has pledged to provide, in the next few years, up to 3,000 experts for technical assistance and training, as well as training 2,000 African agricultural technicians and setting up 14 major agricultural technology centres.¶ Africa's population is expected to match or overtake China's by 2050, but the paper says China will soon need to develop deeper trade ties with key African countries to help feed its 1.3 billion population.¶ "China's current engagement in African agriculture is primarily aimed at addressing African food security," said the report. "[But] by investing in the region with the greatest agricultural potential, China could also be seeking to support its long-term food security."

**That's key to Chinese soft power and influence**

**Luo & Zhang 9** — Luo Jianbo, Associate Professor of the Institute for International Strategic Studies, Central Party School of the Communist Party of China AND Zhang Xiaomin Associate Professor of the School of International Studies and Diplomacy, Beijing Foreign Studies University, "China’s African Policy and its Soft Power", in AntePodium, Victoria University of Wellington)

For over half a century, China and Africa have maintained a close historical friendship. During the period of African national liberation movements, China upheld the banner of support for African people’s national independence movements and stood together with African countries to fight against imperialism, colonialism, hegemonism and racism. When Africa experienced a wave of national independence movements in the 1960s, Mao Zedong frequently received friends and organizations from Asia, Africa and Latin America, proclaiming China’s “sincere sympathy and entire support for African people’s fight against imperialism and colonialism”. During visits to African countries from December 1963 to February 1964, Premier Zhou Enlai brought forward the “Five Principles” of developing relations with African countries and Arabian countries as well as the “Eight Principles” of economic and technological aid, which designated clearly China’s political stance towards African countries and marked the formation of China’s African policy. From 1956 to 1977, China, despite its own great economic plight, offered economic aid amounting to $2.476 billion to Africa countries, which accounted for 58% of China’s total foreign aid. What is mentioned most often is the 1,860 km long Tanzania-Zambia railroad built by China in six years, which constituted great support for southern African countries’ national independence and liberation movements. This manifested successfully China’s will and ability to help African countries, expanded China’s influence in the African continent and improved China’s position and prestige both in the Third World and in the international society. ¶ Since the 1980s, most African countries no longer struggle for national independence, and the tasks of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and anti-racism have given way to economic development. Around this time, China also introduced a new policy of reform and opening-up, pronouncing economic construction the most important work hereafter. Under these circumstances, China’s assistance to Africa mainly aims at helping African countries to realize political stability and economic development, which takes a number of forms such as more investments in Africa, personnel training, timely humanitarian assistance to some countries and writing off in its power debt owed by those heavily-indebted countries. As the statistics indicate, since the first Ministerial Conference of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) in 2000, China has canceled debt totaling 10.9 billion Yuan (US$1.4 billion) owed by the heavily indebted poor countries and the least developed countries in Africa that have diplomatic relations with China. At present, China is fulfilling its pledge of canceling debt of another 10 billion yuan owed by some African countries. The above facts provide evidence that China is determined to help African countries to realize their common development. The essence of friendly Sino-African relations, “mutual help” and “win-win”, lay not only in helping and supporting each other on the world stage but more importantly, win-win cooperation for economic and social development lays a solid foundation for furthering development of future relations. At the Beijing Summit of FOCAC in 2006, China and African countries pledged to establish a “new type of Sino-African Strategic partnership” on the basis of “political equality, mutual trust, economic cooperation, win-win, and cultural exchanges.” ¶ We think that China’s Africa foreign policy is characterized by “equality, respect and goodwill”. Since establishing diplomatic ties with African countries, China has been adhering to the principle of “equal sovereignty” and “non-interference of the internal affairs”. China endeavors to establish partnerships with all African countries except those who maintain “diplomatic ties” with Taiwan. On the contrary, some western countries maintain diplomatic ties with African countries through choice. Take France for example, it mainly maintains relations with those countries where French is spoken. Not like western countries that offer aid to Africa with rigorous political and economic terms, China’s aid, without any political or economic terms, aims at promoting the development of African countries and consolidating Sino-African friendly cooperation. Moreover, China never poses as an almsgiver. It tries to avoid words like “donor”, “aid receiver”, “poverty” and “backwardness” as far as Africa is concerned. Instead, China emphasizes “solidarity, mutual help, equality, mutual benefit and common development” in the course of cooperation, which constitutes a remarkable difference from western countries. ¶ Because the above-mentioned policies led to China having greater sincerity and credit standing in Africa, China has gained African countries’ recognition and support for over half a century. They reciprocated China’s political support and assistance. In 1971, 76 countries voted for China’s resumption of its legal seat in the UN, of which 26 were African countries. Chairman Mao vividly pointed out, “It was the African people who carried China in the UN.” After the “Tiananmen Incident” in 1989, African countries stood firmly on side with the Chinese government despite western pressure. Nine leaders of African countries visited China that year, which played a key role in helping China smash sanctions and isolation by western countries. African countries also support China’s stance at human rights conferences. Since 1990, with the help of African countries, China has frustrated consecutively for 11 times the human rights motions against China initiated by America and some European countries at the UN Human Rights Commission. Most of these motions condemned China for its lack of political democracy, lack of safeguard for human rights, violation of rights and interests of minorities and Tibet and Xinjiang issues. For example, on the pretext of lacking human rights in Tibet, America and some other western countries submitted a motion of “Situation in Tibet” to the UN Human Rights Commission in 1992. Concerning the Taiwan issue, most African countries stick firmly to the “one China” principle.

**Chinese soft power key to solve economic collapse and nuclear war**

**Buzan 4** — (Barry Buzan, International Relations and PoliSci @ LSE AND Rosemary Foot, IR @ St. Anthony College, "Does China Matter? A Reassessment," p. 145-147)

China, East Asia and the world

The underlying argument in this section is that there is a strong link between the global standing of a major power and the ¶ way that power relates to the other states in its home region. As a general rule, the status of great power, and more so ¶ superpower, requires not only that the state concerned be able and willing to project its political influence beyond ¶ its immediate region, but that it also be able in some sense to manage, and perhaps lead, its region (Buzan and ¶ Wæver, 2003). The US clearly does this in North America, and more arguably for the Western hemisphere as a whole, and the EU does it in Europe. The ¶ Soviet Union did it from 1945 to 1989, and the possible inability of Russia to do it (and its desperation to do so) explain the current question marks ¶ around its status. India's failure to do it is a big part of what denies it the great-power recognition it craves. During the Cold War, and up to a point still, ¶ Japan could exploit its political geography to detach itself from much of Asian politics, and float free as a kind of economic great power. China does ¶ not have that kind of geopolitical option. Like Russia and India, it cannot escape regional politics. China's global standing thus¶ depends crucially on what kind of relationship it has with its neighbours. If China is able to reassert some form of ¶ hegemony over twenty-first century Asia - getting most or all of its neighbours to bandwagon with it - then its ¶ global standing will be hugely enhanced. But if China inspires fear in its neighbours - causing them to balance ¶ against it - then like India, and possibly Russia, it will be locked into its region, and its global standing will be ¶ diminished. Since the US is strongly present in Asia, its influence also plays into this equation. ¶ Indeed, if China is at odds with its neighbours then its position will be worse than that of Russia and India. In their ¶ immediate regions, those two have only to deal with powers much smaller than themselves. In China's region there are several very ¶ substantial powers whose antagonism would be a real burden. The importance of regional relations for a major power's global ¶ standing is easily shown by two extreme scenarios for China's future. In the first, China's development provides it with the strength ¶ and the identity to become the central hub of Asia, in the process largely displacing the US. It projects an ¶ acceptable political and economic image, and its neighbours bandwagon with it out of some combination of ¶ fear, prudence, admiration and hope for economic advantage. Its economy becomes the regional locomotive, ¶ and in political and military terms it is acknowledged as primus inter pares by Japan, Korea and the ASEAN ¶ states. Japan takes up a similar subordinate relationship with China to that it now has with the US, and China is able to use the regional institutions ¶ created by ASEAN rather as the US uses the Organization of American States. If the other Asian states fear to antagonize China, and ¶ don't balance against it, then China is both free to play a larger global role, and is insulated against pressure ¶ from the West. And if China succeeds in positioning itself at the centre of an Asian economy, then it can claim ¶ 'locomotive' status along with the US and the EU in the global economy. In the second scenario, China inspires fear in ¶ its neighbours. Japan's alliance with the US deepens, and India, Southeast Asia, Japan and possibly Russia ¶ coordinate their defences against China, probably with US support. Under the first set of conditions, China acquires a ¶ stable regional base which gives it both the status and the capability to play seriously on the global political ¶ stage. Under the second set of conditions, China may still be the biggest power in East Asia, but its ability to play on the ¶ global stage would be seriously curtailed.¶ The task for this section is thus to examine the social and material forces in play and ask how they might support or block a move in either of these directions. Is it likely that China will acquire hegemony ¶ in East Asia, or is its rise to power more likely to produce US-backed regional balancing against it? I will examine the factors playing into this question on three levels: China's capabilities and the trajectory ¶ of its internal development; China's relations with its Asian neighbours; and its relationships with the US and the other great powers. ¶ China's capabilities and the trajectory of its internal development ¶ Debates about China's capability and prospects for development can be placed within a matrix formed by two variables:¶ • Does China get stronger (because its economic development continues successfully) or weaker (because its development runs into obstacles, or triggers socio-political instability)? ¶ • Does China become a malign, aggressive, threatening force in international society (because it becomes hypernationalist or fascist), or does it become more benign and cooperative (because economic ¶ development brings internal democratization and liberalization)? ¶ If China's development falters and it becomes weak, then it will neither dominate its region nor project itself on ¶ to the global stage. Whether it is then politically benign or malign will be a much less pressing issue in terms of how others respond to it in the ¶ traditional politico-military security domain. What could happen in this scenario is that a breakdown in the socio-political ¶ order, perhaps triggered by economic or environmental troubles, might well trigger large-scale migrations, ¶ political fragmentations, or wider economic crises that would pose serious threats to China's neighbours. A ¶ major political collapse in China could also pose threats at the global level, via the scenario of a failed nuclear ¶ weapon state. But, if China becomes strong, then the malign or benign question matters a great deal. The benign and malign options could be ¶ alternative paths, or could occur in sequence, with a malign phase giving way to a benign one, as happened with Germany and Japan during their ¶ comparable phases of industrialization. The likelihood of just such a sequence was what underpinned Gerry's concern to promote constrainment.

### Politics Links - Fuel Tax

**The plan results in partisan fights - increases the diesel fuel tax**

**Pittsburg Post-Gazette**, 3/25/20**12** (Legislation proposed to fund deteriorating locks and dams, p. http://old.post-gazette.com/pg/12085/1219043-28.stm)

Legislation that would more than double the money available each year to fix the nation's crumbling locks and dams could be introduced as early as this week. It also would raise for the first time in 17 years the tax that barge operators pay to support the river infrastructure projects, a tax increase the industry is supporting. The measure would not impose tolls on barges moving through locks, an idea the barge industry has successfully fought for more than 70 years, and would make taxpayers bear more of the cost burden for projects. The legislation, to be introduced by U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., would implement recommendations that a task force composed of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers personnel and industry officials made in 2010 to clean up an $8 billion backlog of projects. The backlog, caused in part by piecemeal funding from Congress that is limited to about $170 million a year, has increased the costs and delayed completion of projects nationwide. Corps officials say delays put more pressure on the antiquated facilities and increase the chances that a debilitated lock or dam will fail, an event they say would have widespread economic consequences. The potential impacts include higher electricity costs, water supply issues and increased congestion on highways as trucks would be required to deliver goods normally moved on rivers. Nearly 60 percent of the more than 200 locks on the nation's rivers are more than 50 years old, which is how long they were built to last. Several of them are in Western Pennsylvania, including the locks and dam on the Monongahela River at Elizabeth that were completed in 1907. To speed the replacement of at-risk facilities, the legislation would provide $380 million in funding for 20 years. Most of the new money would be provided by taxpayers. The measure also would increase the diesel fuel tax that barge operators pay to support those projects to 26 cents. It has been 20 cents per gallon since 1995. The gas tax generates about $85 million each year for lock and dam projects, money that is matched by taxpayers. "We're willing to pay more. Our customers are willing to pay more," said Michael Toohey, president of the Waterways Council, an Arlington, Va., group that represents barge operators, shippers and related groups. A spokeswoman for Mr. Whitfield said he hopes to introduce the bill this week. Mr. Toohey said four members of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee -- two Republicans and two Democrats -- have agreed to cosponsor Mr. Whitfield's measure: U.S. Rep. Timothy Johnson, R-Ill.; U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Ill.; U.S. Rep. John Duncan, R-Tenn.; and U.S. Rep. Russ Carnahan, D-Mo. Mr. Duncan's office confirmed he is interested in cosponsoring the proposal but declined further comment. A spokesman for Mr. Johnson said the Illinois Republican supports the measure because locks on Illinois rivers are in horrible shape, industry backs the tax increase and the measure includes reforms to curb hefty cost overruns that have plagued Corps projects. Despite the bipartisan support Mr. Whitfield has received, his proposal faces considerable hurdles. It comes as partisan wrangling over the federal budget deficit and the no-tax increase credo of conservative Republicans makes it difficult to fund big-ticket projects. Mr. Whitfield and his two Republican backers have signed the no tax increase pledge sponsored by Grover Norquist of the Americans for Taxpayer Reform.

### Amazon - Tech Solves

**Tech solves - soy farmers don't have to solely rely on land expansion**

**Goldsmith 8** (Peter Goldsmith, Soybean Industry Endowed Associate Professor in Agricultural Strategy, Executive Director, the National Soybean Research Laboratory, UIUC, "Soybean Production and Processing in Brazil,"https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/pgoldsmi/www/book\_chapters/Soybean%20Production%20and%20Processing%20in%20Brazil.pdf)

The development of low-latitude soybean germ plasm by EMBRAPA, Brazil’s national research agency, is one of the most important technological innovations in agriculture since the green revolution. The doubling of production in the last 10 yr is attributable to the development of soybean technology and practices adapted to the Cerrado region in the Center-West region of the country. The Cerrado is a low growth savannah that, prior to the 1970s, was not considered suitable for broad acre crop production. Most of the world’s reserves of arable land reside in the low-latitude region. Important as well, most of the world’s malnutrition occurs in low-latitude regions. Lowlatitude technologies like those developed by public and private researchers in Brazil will play an increasing role addressing the world’s fast-growing food and bioenergy demand. The shift to the low latitudes is already well underway as 68% of the crops and 53% of the livestock products come from developing countries, an increase of 14% in the last 10 yr. (FAO, 2007). Soybean farmers in the Center-West currently have a comparative advantage in soybean production compared with producers in the United States because of their low opportunity costs. U.S. farmers have increasingly chosen to grow corn, while farmers in the Center-West presently have few better alternatives than soybeans. As a result, the tendency will be for the United States’ role in the global soy complex to decline, while Brazil’s will increase.

### Amazon - Resilient

Forests are flat-out resilient - their overall size hasn’t decreased for decades

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>)

This is an important matter because forests are an essential part of the world's environment and, therefore, humanity's well-being. The Psalmists spoke in awe of the cedars of Lebanon. Today we know that trees inhale carbon dioxide and exhale oxygen, which means that they are a first line of defense against air pollution and the specter of global warming. The world forested area, estimated by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), currently amounts to four billion hectares, covering 30% of the land surface of the earth. Few people realize this is the same figure as in the 1950s. . In the United States, vast forests cover a third of the land, according to the US Forest Service. That's equivalent to two-thirds of the amount of land that was forested when the Europeans arrived in the 1600s. This acreage has not declined since 1920. In fact, annual forest growth today is more than 3-1/2 times what it was in 1920. Two-thirds of the nation's forests are classed as timberland, capable of producing at least 20 cubic feet per acre of industrial wood annually. Another fact: Trees are growing 33% faster than they are being cut.

### Amazon - Alt Cause

Alt cause - logging and forestry

Nielsen 11 (Stephen, Staff, Bloomberg News, http://climate-connections.org/2011/07/05/amazon-deforestation-rates-double-as-farmers-anticipate-pardons/)

Deforestation rates in the Amazon, the world’s biggest rain forest, more than doubled in May as Brazilian farmers become more confident they’ll be granted amnesty for illegal logging. Almost 268 square kilometers (66,200 acres) of protected rain forest were cut down in May, up from 110 square kilometers a year ago, the National Institute for Space Research said in an e-mailed statement. Brazil lawmakers are considering a bill that alters its forestry code and would forgive farmers who illegally cleared trees. The possibility that the government may ease these restrictions is encouraging more logging, said Marcio Astrini, coordinator of forest campaigns for Greenpeace International’s Brazil unit. That would hamper international efforts to fight global warming by protecting trees that absorb greenhouse gases. “Brazil’s been reducing its deforestation for the last five years and this bill comes along and now it shoots up,” Astrini said yesterday by phone. “There is only one reason why deforestation is increasing: it’s called the forestry code,” which may be changing. The bill was approved by Brazil’s lower house May 24 by a 410-63 vote. The Senate has not yet voted on it and President Dilma Rousseff has vowed to veto the legislation if it does pass. If the bill is approved in its current form, farmers won’t have to replant trees that were illegally cut prior to July 2008, an estimated 30 million hectares (74 million acres), according to a study by government research agency Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada. That’s about the size of the Philippines. Under Brazil’s current forestry code, penalties for illegal logging include fines and a requirement to replant trees.

**Forestry codes are the largest proximate cause - even under status quo demand they increase deforestation**

**BBC 11** ("Brazil: Amazon rainforest deforestation rises sharply," 5/19)

Some environmentalists argue that rising demand for soy and cattle is prompting farmers to clear more of their land. But others see a direct link between the jump in deforestation and months of debate over easing an existing law on forest protection. "You have 300-400 lawmakers here in Brasilia sending the message that profiting from deforestation will be amnestied, that crime pays," Marcio Astrini from Greenpeace told Reuters. "The only relevant factor is the Forest Code. It is a gigantic rise." The Chamber of Deputies has delayed voting on the Forest Code amid at times acrimonious argument but could consider the issue again next week.

**Comparative evidence - cattle outweighs - the impacts from soy are indirect**

**Barona et. al 10** (Elizabeth Barona1-2, Navin Ramankutty1, Glenn Hyman2, Oliver T Coomes1, Department of Geography, McGill University, International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), "The role of pasture and soybean in deforestation of the Brazilian Amazon," Environmental Research Letters)

The proximate cause of deforestation in the Legal Amazon was predominantly the expansion of pasture, and not of soybeans. However, in Mato Grosso, an increase in soybeans occurred in regions previously used for pasture, which may have displaced pastures further north into the forested areas, causing indirect deforestation there. Therefore, soybean cultivation may still be one of the major underlying causes of deforestation in the Legal Amazon.¶ Our results are consistent with previous studies that have suggested that recent deforestation in the Legal Amazon was predominantly due to cattle ranching (Morton et al 2006, Brown et al 2005, Greenpeace-Brazil 2009), and not soybean expansion. However, whereas these previous studies have used remote sensing imagery to analyze the subsequent land use following deforestation, we examined the large-scale relationship between deforestation and agricultural expansion, including potential geographic shifts in land use. Our results provide support for the hypothesis that soybean expansion in Mato Grosso may have replaced pastures, and displaced them further north into forest areas, causing deforestation indirectly.

**Beef expansion outweighs**

**Merchant 9** (Brian Merchant, 1/31/09, "Cattle Pastures in Deforested Amazon Now the Size of Iceland," http://www.treehugger.com/natural-sciences/cattle-pastures-in-deforested-amazon-now-the-size-of-iceland.html)

The largest rainforest in the world is being chopped down almost entirely for a single purpose: beef. That's right, one of the biggest, most beautifully diverse ecosystems on the planet is being traded in—for hamburgers. According to a report from Mongabay, a full 80 percent of the land cleared by Amazon deforestation from 1996-2006 has been used to create cattle pastures.¶ The rainforest has been cleared at an astonishing rate over the last 12 years—and the cattle craze in the Amazon is only going to get worse.Deforesting the Amazon in the Name of BeefSince 1996, 10 million hectares have been deforested in the Brazilian Amazon just for cattle ranching—an area of land about the size of Iceland. And evidently, all that clearing has only whetted the Brazilian government's appetite for beef. From Mongabay:¶ Now the government aims to double the country's share of the beef export market to 60% by 2018 through low interest loans, infrastructure expansion, and other incentives for producers. Most of this expansion is expected to occur in the Amazon were land is cheap and available — 70 percent of the country's herd expansion between 2002 and 2006 occurred in the region.¶ Even More Bad News for the Beefy Amazon On top of the government's initiative, unchecked, illegal deforestation also runs rampant as well, due to ineffective forest land reserve laws, meager policing, and corruption in frontier areas.What's more, thanks to Brazil's booming beef trade, the cattle ranchers and agriculture businesses have extremely influential lobbies:¶ Many of the country's most influential politicians are linked to the industry. At the behest of these interests, over the past year the Brazilian Congress has introduced measures that would significantly curtail the capacity of environmental NGOs and scientists to operate in the Amazon.

**Deforestation is decreasing and so is soy expansion - efficiency and regulations**

**Colitt 9** (Raymond Colitt, 4/14/09, "Cattle, not soy, drives Amazon deforestation: report," http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/04/14/us-brazil-amazon-idUSTRE53D65C20090414)

Cattle ranchers are far bigger culprits in Amazon deforestation than soy farmers, a study showed on Tuesday, as the environmental record of Brazil's commodity exporters comes under increasing international scrutiny.¶ The study, produced jointly by environmental groups and the soy industry, showed that only 12 of 630 sample areas deforested since July 2006 -- or 0.88 percent of 157,896 hectares (390,000 acres) -- were planted with soy.¶ By comparison, nearly 200 were converted into pasture land for cattle. The rest of the deforested areas had not yet been put to use.¶ "The big villain of Amazon destruction is cattle ranching," said Paulo Adario, Amazon campaign coordinator with Greenpeace, one of the groups that sponsored the report.¶ Each year country-sized chunks of the world's largest rain forest are devastated, although the rate has fallen sharply from a few years ago and preliminary data shows it fell further in the past 10 months.¶ In addition to loggers, ranchers and peasants, large-scale farmers are often blamed for contributing to the devastation as Brazil's agricultural frontier has expanded due to strong foreign demand for the country's commodities in recent years.¶ Brazil is the world's biggest beef exporter and the second-largest exporter of soy, much of which is bought by China.¶ Adario said the size of deforested plots had been falling consistently in recent years. That suggests that soy farmers, who require large areas to be efficient, were no longer involved directly in clearing forest.¶ SOY ACCORD¶ Brazil's soy industry, with exports of $18 billion last year, agreed in July 2006 not to trade soy from deforested areas.¶ That accord helped prevent farmers from clearing large, new areas, the authors of the report said.¶ "Soy is no longer a big threat to the Amazon," said Carlo Lovatelli, head of the soy industry association Abiove.¶ Foreign farm competitors in the United States and Europe often criticize Brazilian exports, such as sugar and beef, for contributing to deforestation.

### Amazon - No Impact

**Deforestation is not a threat - regulations check**

**Vaughan 8/3** (Adam Vaughan, "Amazon deforestation falls again," The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/03/amazon-deforestation-falls-again)

Deforestation in the Amazon rainforest has fallen again in the past 12 months, according to preliminary data published by Brazil's National Institute for Space Research. The reduction follows the passing of Brazil's Forest Code in April, which green campaigners say weakened forest protection measurements, despite a partial veto by president Dilma Rouseff of the most controversial elements. Data from satellite images shows a 23% reduction in deforestation from August 2011 to July 2012 against the previous year, with 2,049 sq km being cleared compared with 2,679 sq km in the previous 12 months. The figures, published on Thursday, mark the continuation of a long-term trend that has seen clearance rates in the Amazon fall by about three quarters since peak deforestation in 2004. Brazil's environment minister, Izabella Teixeria, said: "This is a great result, which makes us want to work even harder to tackle illegal deforestation."

### Amazon - AT: Warming

Cloud changes check the impact

Bala et. al 7 (G. Bala, K. Caldeira, M. Wickett, T. J. Phillips, D. B. Lobell, C. Delire, and A. Mirin, “Combined climate and carbon-cycle effects of large-scale deforestation,” http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1871823/)

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, In the tropics, however, increases in surface albedo (Fig. 4A and Table 1) do not produce as much cooling, largely due to the changes in clouds. The removal of forests also decreases evapotranspiration (Fig. 4B), resulting in a decrease of clouds (Fig. 4C). Thus, the replacement of tropical forests with grasslands and shrublands brightens the surface, but the decrease of clouds tends to darken the planet. These effects nearly cancel each other so that the planetary albedo at the top of the atmosphere (Fig. 4D) changes little over tropical regions. This observation suggests that cloud feedbacks initiated by evapotranspiration changes play a major role in determining the overall climatic impact of deforestation in the tropics.

Doesn’t cause warming

Pearce 10 (Fred, Staff, NewScientist, December 8, http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn19817-deforestation-not-so-important-for-climate-change.html)

Climate negotiations were dealt a bombshell at the weekend when ecologists reported that carbon emissions from the destruction of tropical forests are probably only half previous estimates. If we are emitting less carbon dioxide from deforestation that's got to be good news, surely. The trouble is the findings seriously question the only success so far of the UN negotiations on curbing climate change under way in Cancún, Mexico. If cutting down trees emits far less CO2 than we thought, where's the incentive to stop chopping? This is a dismaying thought when negotiators feel they are close to a deal on compensating tropical countries for curbing deforestation. Four years ago, the UN's Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change estimated that deforestation was responsible for up to 20 per cent of CO2 emissions. A more recent study by Richard Houghton of Woods Hole Research Center in Falmouth, Massachusetts, revised that down to 15 per cent for the period 2000 to 2005. Both estimates relied on national declarations of forest loss made to the UN, coupled with simple estimates to convert that loss into carbon emissions. But now ecologists at Winrock International, a respected US consultancy based in Arlington, Virginia, whose work was funded by the World Bank and the Norwegian government, says a more detailed analysis puts the figure for 2000 to 2005 at around 8 per cent, with a possible range between 5 and 12 per cent. Nancy Harris of Winrock said in Cancun that the estimate was "the lowest reported to date". The analysis, which has yet to be formally published, used more than 3 million data points from a laser-radar satellite measurement technique known as lidar and 4000 carbon inventories from forest plots on the ground. Harris said it did not include forest regrowth after deforested land had been abandoned by farmers, which could reduce the figure further.

### Amazon - AT: Environment

Regrowth solves the impact

**Rothbard 97** (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, "The Rainforest Issue: Myths and Facts," CFACT Briefing Paper 102)

Thus, just by simple logic, this means that the idea that once rainforest is gone, it is gone forever is obviously a myth. If people have been in the forests for centuries, clearing huge areas for agriculture and other purposes, and now it's hard to even find evidence of their civilization, the rainforest obviously grows back quite well. Travel to Mexico, for instance, and see ancient Mayan ruins that have only recently been discovered because entire cities have been swallowed up by the reforested jungle, and this will be more than clear. In fact, at Dartmouth University, Thomas Lovejoy was recently giving a lecture and showing pictures of Amazon land that had been deforested only four to five years before. The regrowth in these areas was "verdant and vigorous; the canopy had ascended to a height of nearly 25 feet. In order to study an `island' of rainforest, it must remain isolated, surrounded by cleared land. So when asked if the second growth interfered with his project, Lovejoy jokingly admitted, `Well we have a chain saw.'" (Dartmouth Review, p.8) Nigel Smith points out that "a pattern of waxing and waning of forest cover is not unique to Amazonia. The forests of New England in the United States, for example, are more extensive now than they were during the time of the colonies. The oak forests of southern England, severely cut back in Roman times, had largely returned by the time Henry VIII assumed the throne, only to be felled again for iron smelting, building materials, and agriculture." (Smith, p. 238-239)

### Protectionist Rhetoric Now

**Protectionist rhetoric inevitable - elections**

**Barro 6/22** (Josh Barro, "Obama’s Protectionism Would Be Immoral If It Weren’t Fake," Bloomberg)

President Barack Obama gave a speech today attacking Mitt Romney as an "outsourcing pioneer" and promoting his own plan to use corporate tax policy to favor companies that choose to locate operations in the United States instead of abroad. He said:¶ Now, not only does Governor Romney disagree with this plan, today it was reported in The Washington Post that the companies his firm owned were ‘pioneers’ in the outsourcing of American jobs to places like China and India. Pioneers!¶ Tampa, we don’t need an outsourcing pioneer in the Oval Office. We need a president who will fight for American jobs and American manufacturing. And that’s what my plan will do.¶ I am always struck by just how immoral this viewpoint is. International trade not only creates efficiencies and increases total global wealth. It is also gradually lifting the populations of China and India out of poverty.¶ But Obama insists that, in order to protect the interests of a subset of U.S. workers and businesses, we should take steps that increase consumer prices for everyone else in U.S., and make it harder for the Chinese and Indian masses to rise into the middle class.¶ I suspect Obama understands this, and his attacks on outsourcing are purely cynical. During the 2008 campaign, when he was promising to "renegotiate NAFTA," adviser Austan Goolsbee let slip to Canadian officials that Obama was just blowing smoke, causing a gaffe. As president, Obama has made no moves to touch NAFTA, and he signed trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea.¶ Obama is most likely just grandstanding now, too. But it would be nice if he didn't feel the need to pretend that there was something wrong with giving a job to someone in a developing country -- and if voters didn't agree with that sentiment.

### Protectionism Now

**Protectionism high now internationally**

**Bosco 6/6** (David Bosco, Assistant Professor International Politics at American, Fulbright Scholar, Senior Editor at Foreign Policy, "The darkening world trade picture," Foreign Policy, The Multilateralist)

It's been a turbulent several days in the world of international trade. In the face of complaints to the World Trade Organization about its recent trade policy, Argentina is announcing....more trade restrictions:¶ Argentina slapped new import tariffs on capital goods on Wednesday as President Cristina Fernandez works to shore up slowing local industry with protectionist measures that are riling some trade partners.¶ The center-left Fernandez has imposed tough and sometimes unorthodox controls on imports this year in a bid to keep factories open and prop up the trade surplus in Latin America's third-biggest economy.¶ Such steps led the European Union to file a suit against Argentina at the World Trade Organization in May.¶ Meanwhile, the European Union has suggested that Russia has still not complied with the obligations it made as a condition for joining the WTO:¶ Russia will probably be in breach of global trade rules when it joins the World Trade Organisation this year, the EU executive said on Wednesday, signalling Brussels would feel justified in filing a case against the club's newest member.¶ Russia is set to join the WTO once its parliament rubber-stamps its application. But the European Commission said in a report that Moscow will be in breach of its obligations in several areas if it does not take steps to dismantle the trade barriers it has put up.¶ And in the United States, business groups are warning that a bill in Congress to hold Russian officials accountable for human rights abuses may prevent U.S. companies from enjoying the trade liberalization that has occurred in Russia:¶ Congressional sponsors want the bill linked with or incorporated into another bill granting Russia permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status, something the United States wants to do by August, when Russia is to join the World Trade Organization. Unless trade relations are normalized by then, U.S. exports to Russia would face higher tariffs than those from other nations.¶ For their part, Russian officials have insisted that passage of the proposed legislation would lead to retaliatory action.¶ These events come against the backdrop of the stalled Doha trade negotiations and what WTO chief Pascal Lamy has described as a post-2008 pattern of increasing protectionism. In a speech last week in Bangkok, Lamy reached for a medical analogy to describe the dynamic: "Protectionism is like cholesterol: the slow accumulation of trade restrictive measures since 2008 — now covering almost 3 per cent of world merchandise trade, and almost 4 per cent of G20 trade — can lead to the clogging of trade flows." A new WTO report, prepared for the upcoming G20 summit, gathers the evidence:¶ The past seven months have not witnessed any slowdown in the imposition of new trade restricting measures by G-20 economies. These are adding to the stock of restrictions put in place since the outbreak of the global crisis. At the same time, the promised removal of existing restrictions is very slow. G-20 governments need to redouble their efforts to resist protectionist pressures and take active steps to keep markets open and advance trade liberalization.

### Trade Bad - Disease

**Free trade lowers quality control standards and spreads disease**

**Fidler 97** - Associate Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law - Bloomington (David P., Minnesota Law Review , April, 81 Minn. L. Rev. 771, L/N)

The international movement of goods also contributes to the EID problem. Since the end of the Cold War, free trade dominates thinking about international economic relations, as evidenced by the World Trade Organization, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the continued building of the common market in the European Union. Trade is, of course, not a new phenomenon in international relations, but the nature of international trade today is historically novel since it is truly universal and involves the movements of unprecedented quantities of food. Today, up to seventy percent of fruits and vegetables consumed in some U.S. states is imported from developing countries. n126 The Institute of Medicine states that "international trade has become so pervasive that it is virtually impossible to screen most of the food entering the country for known microbial hazards, let alone for new microbiological threats." n127 While international trade agreements typically reserve a country's powers to inspect, and even prohibit the entry of imported food under so-called sanitary and phytosanitary provisions, n128 [\*798] the Institute of Medicine believes that the momentum of free trade will result in decreased inspections of imported food. n129 In the United States, increasing occurrence of food-borne infectious disease outbreaks underscores the dangers inherent in the global food trade. n130 In 1996, an outbreak of cyclosporan131 caught U.S. public health officials by surprise. n132 Health officials believe that imported strawberries were contaminated with cyclospora, but little is actually known about the parasite, its host, and means of transmission. n133 U.S. officials suspected a link to imported food and consulted the Pan American Health Organization, a unit of WHO, about testing for cyclospora in the water of Latin American countries that export to the United States. n134 Other reports suggest that imported Guatemalan raspberries were the source of the cyclospora outbreak. n135 [\*799] Trade is a significant factor in the EID problem beyond food contamination. Means of transportation themselves - ships and airplanes - can harbor infectious agents. n136 Because transportation offers opportunities to infectious agents, the International Health Regulations require as many ports and airports in a country as possible to have facilities for disinfecting, disinsecting, and deratting of ships and airplanes used in international travel. n137 Certain internationally-traded products are also recurring conduits for infectious diseases. The Institute of Medicine warns that the lack of effective screening of animals imported for scientific research constitutes "perhaps the greatest problem associated with international commerce and its relation to disease emergence." n138 The globalization of trade in human blood, blood products, organs, and tissue represents another trade-related opportunity for infectious diseases to spread. The spread of AIDS was facilitated partly through the transfusion of commercially sold blood and blood [\*800] products. n139 Hepatitis B, Chagas' disease, syphilis, and malaria can also be spread through contaminated blood and blood products. n140 No international legal protections for blood and organ safety currently exist. n141

**Free trade causes widespread disease.**

**Pirages 95** - Dennis Pirages, Politics prof; Director, Harrison Center on the Future Global Agenda, U Maryland, 1995 [The Washington Quarterly, Autumn, lexis]

The fact is that technological innovations really have created a global village through which people and products are moving rapidly 24 hours each day. Thus, diseases such as the “Hong Kong” flu or the “Seoul” virus might originate in geographically remote locations, but spread very quickly to the rest of the world. And people in Hong Kong or Seoul might be much less affected by such diseases than people who have much less evolutionary experience with these viruses. Rapid large-scale movement of people and products has created a host of global hitchhikers— viruses, bacteria, and pests—that sneak rides into new environments. At the viral end of the scale, Seoul virus (hemorrhagic fever) has appeared in Baltimore. What is the mechanism by which this cultural exchange has taken place? Apparently the virus has been transported by the proverbial wharf rats boarding cargo ships in Korea and settling in Baltimore upon disembarkation. At the other end of the scale, larger migrant organisms have for some time been transforming the environment in the United States. The Great Lakes and many related rivers and streams have been afflicted by zebra mussels, which have hitchhiked from Europe in ballast water in cargo ships. The mussels are doing billions of dollars of damage as they clog water intakes and disrupt aquatic ecosystems with their rapid growth rates and voracious appetites. 6 Dozens of other migrants, ranging from Dutch elm disease to California’s “superbugs” (Bemisia tabaci) have had a great impact when transplanted into novel environments. Mass production and distribution of food is another technological change that may well be a double-edged sword. People no longer take trips to the countryside to buy milk and eggs but now get such supplies from the neighborhood supermarket. Agricultural products are increasingly coming from megafarms via food factories. And people are eating less frequently at home and more often at fast food emporiums. Not surprisingly, there have recently been two large-scale (and many minor) outbreaks of disease from bacterial food contamination in the United States. Contaminated fast food hamburgers in the Northwest and ice-cream from Wisconsin were responsible for nasty and widespread outbreaks of an influenza-like illness. Greater reliance on mass production and distribution systems means a greater risk of future large-scale food disasters.

Free trade doesn’t solve war

Friedmen 96 [George and Meredith, Founder and Chairman of Stratfor, The Future of War, p. 7-9]

The argument that interdependence gives rise to peace is flawed in theory as well as in practice. Conflicts arise from friction, particularly friction involving the fundamental interests of different nations. The less interdependence there is, the fewer the areas of serious friction. The more interdependence there is, the greater the areas of friction, and, therefore, the greater the potential for conflict. Two widely separated nations that trade little with each other are unlikely to go to war—Brazil is unlikely to fight Madagascar precisely because they have so little to do with each other. France and Germany, on the other hand, which have engaged in extensive trade and transnational finance, have fought three wars with each other over about seventy years. Interdependence was the root of the conflicts, not the deterrent. There are, of course, cases of interdependence in which one country effectively absorbs the other or in which their interests match so precisely that the two countries simply merge. In other cases, interdependence remains peaceful because the economic, military, and political power of one country is overwhelming and inevitable. In relations between advanced industrialized countries and third-world countries, for example, this sort of asymmetrical relationship can frequently be seen. All such relationships have a quality of unease built into them, particularly when the level of interdependence is great. When one or both nations attempt, intentionally or unintentionally, to shift the balance of power, the result is often tremendous anxiety and, sometimes, real pain. Each side sees the other’s actions as an attempt to gain advantage and becomes frightened. In the end, precisely because the level of interdependence is so great, the relationship can, and frequently does, spiral out of control. Consider the seemingly miraculous ability of the United States and Soviet Union to be rivals and yet avoid open warfare. These two powers could forgo extreme measures because they were not interdependent. Neither relied on the other for its economic well-being, and therefore, its social stability. This provided considerable room for maneuvering. Because there were few economic linkages, neither nation felt irresistible pressure to bring the relationship under control; neither felt any time constraint. Had one country been dependent on the other for something as important as oil or long-term investment, there would have been enormous fear of being held hostage economically. Each would have sought to dominate the relationship, and the result would have been catastrophic. In the years before World War I, as a result of European interdependence, control of key national issues fell into the hands of foreign governments. Thus, decisions made in Paris had tremendous impact on Austria, and decisions made in London determined growth rates in the Ruhr. Each government sought to take charge of its own destiny by shift¬ing the pattern of interdependence in its favor. Where economic means proved insufficient, political and military strategies were tried. The international system following the Cold War resembles the pre—World War I system in some fundamental ways. First, there is a gen¬eral prosperity. That is to say, the international economic system appears to be functioning extremely well, in spite of the normal cyclical down¬turns of the early 1990s. Second, almost no fundamental ideological issues divide the major powers; one could say there is general agreement on matters of political principle. Third, there is a long-standing pattern of interdependence, measured in both trade and financial flows—capital has become transuational. Fourth, and perhaps most important, beneath the apparent prosperity and stability there is a sense within each great power of a real and growing vulnerability to the actions of others. Some nations fear that growing protectionism will shift the balance of the sys¬tem against them, while others are convinced that maintaining the cur¬rent system will be devastating to their interests. Today, observers focus on the first three phenomena, as they did prior to World War I, and argue that there is no economic basis for polit¬ical conflict. What they miss is that the subsurface sense of insecurity— experienced by Japan, the United States, and Europe—marks the beginning of such conflict. Thus, the argument that war is obsolete because of growing inter¬dependence is unsupportable. War may be obsolete, but, if it is, it is not because of interdependence. As we have seen, World War I broke out at a time when interdependence was substantially higher than it is today; indeed, in all likelihood war broke out because interdependence was so high. Today, war remains not only possible but, as a simple statistical matter, highly likely.

Prefer our evidence

Barbieri 2 [Katherine, The Liberal Illusion: Does Trade Promote Peace, p. 45-48]

Even at the dyadic level ,the empirical findings are mixed. Wallensteen (1973) and my own work provide evidence of the conflictual nature of interdependent relationships. These analyses include a more comprehensive temporal and spatial domain than those found in dyadic studies that support the trade¬ promotes-peace hypothesis and are therefore more generalizable to a diverse group of trading relationships.

## Soy Turn Blocks

### Soy Turn Overview

**China is importing soy from the US and Brazil but more so from Brazil because those prices are cheaper - when the US lowers their prices the US becomes the most favored nation which kills Brazil's exports - that decimates the Brazilian economy which is key to bail out the Eurozone**

**A - Turns hegemony. Eurozone collapse kills transatlantic partnerships which deter Russian expansionism**

**B - Turns the economy and protectionism**

**Wright 12** (Thomas Wright, Fellow with the Managing Global Order at Brookings, "What if Europe Fails," The Washington Quarterly, Vol. 35(3))

Thinking through and prioritizing the consequences of a failed Europe yield five of the utmost importance. First, the most immediate casualty of the failure of the European project would be the global economy. A disorderly collapse (as opposed to an orderly failure, which will be explained shortly) would probably trigger a new depression and could lead to the unraveling of economic integration as countries introduce protectionist measures to limit the contagion effects of a collapse. Bare survival would drag down Europe’s economy and would generate increasing and dangerous levels of volatility in the international economic

C - More probable because the US economy is resilient whereas the EU is actually in a volatile condition

### Turns China

**Brazilian soy is key to China - that's Cleary. This turns case because the plan actually kills Chinese agriculture *when* they collapse Brazilian markets - AND they can't solve because the US soy exports are terminally unsustainable**

**Silveira 11** (Fabio, Director of RC Consultores, he holds a Master degree by the University of Grenoble and a Postgraduate degree by the University of Genebra. He graduated in Economics at USP, "China and the Brazilian soybean production," Watershed, http://www.watershed.com.br/article/193/china-and-the-brazilian-soybean-production.aspx)

In line with the above considerations, it is expected that the income of the Brazilian soybean complex – grain, meal and oil in the domestic and foreign markets – will close 2010 with a drop of 13%, down to US$ 35.2 billion, compared with US$ 37.3 billion in 2009. Such projections are strategic to China not only in terms of defining the volume of its imports but are also important to the plans of the Asian country to start planting soybean in Brazilian soil to meet future needs of consumption. Since the middle of this decade, Chinese importers have been trying to acquire the product directly from Brazilian farmers, but without success. Since the middle of this decade, Chinese importers have been trying to acquire the product directly from Brazilian farmers, but without success. However, this intention seems to be close to becoming reality, considering the initial contacts developed between the Brazilian government and state-owned Chongqing Wanzhou Grain and Oils Group. The Chinese company plans to invest US$ 300 million to purchase of 100,000 hectares in western Bahia, with the goal of producing soybean. If the negotiations progress, there will be a growing chance of a scenario of significant expansion in Brazilian supply and, consequently, a reduction in the cost of this commodity for consumers in China, in the long term. This situation, probably, should motivate China to prepare a huge offensive in investment in Brazilian soybean production. Between this and that, there are strong reasons why Brazil should become the world's largest producer of soybean, surpassing of 100 million t/year in the middle of the decade (presently, its annual production is around 69 million t). This additional volume in soybean Brazilian production would be able to properly take care of not only future Chinese demand, but also the international demand for this kind of oilseed.

### Brazil Soy Up

**1. Brazil soy is more competitive - China wants to buy it because prices are down comparatively to the US - that's 1nc ev. Prefer our ev b/c it's predictive -**

**Cleary et. al 10** (David Cleary, Director of Sustainable Harvests, Carrie Brown-Lima and Melissa Clooney, The Nature Conservancy, "An overview of the Brazil-China soybean trade and its strategic implications for conservation," http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/southamerica/brazil/explore/brazil-china-soybean-trade.pdf)

Brazil and China have been maintaining informal trade since 1949. There was a boom in bilateral trade in the 1990s and in early 2000, as Brazil and China formalized an agreement in which China would be supported for a membership position at WTO in exchange for its reduction of some existing tariffs on imports from Brazil [4]. The adoption of a free-floating trade regime by Brazil also promoted an increase in trade. Over the past decade, bilateral trade between Brazil and China has continued to grow considerably (Figure 4). In 2009, China was the destination of US$20.2 billion of Brazilian exports, most of this in the form of non-processed agricultural and mineral products. In 2009, China surpassed the US to become Brazil’s largest trading partner. This was a historic change, as the US had been Brazil’s top trade partner since the 1930s. Although likely to prove temporary, given the US economy’s exceptional weakness that year, it is an indication of the great importance the Chinese market now has for Brazilian commodity exporters. For decades, the main global bilateral trade link has been between the United States, the leading exporter of grain, soybeans and meat, and Japan, the top importer. However, China’s growing population and reduction of croplands combined with Brazil’s rapidly expanding agricultural production, especially soy, has created a new food trade link that will soon surpass that between the US and Japan. China began looking overseas for external food sources in the mid-1990s, when it became clear that the country’s production capacity for food, especially meat products, was insufficient to meet its rising demand. When evaluating which commodity to import, soybeans make more economic sense in a country with a significant shortage of agricultural land, since corn has a greater yield per hectare [5]. By 2009, China imported 41 million tons of soybeans, mostly from the US, Brazil and Argentina. In 2009, soy represented 31% of the total Brazilian exports to China (Figure 4). From 2000 through 2009, Brazil’s overall soybean exports rose from US$2.2 billion to $11.4 billion. While this five-fold increase in total soybean export value is impressive, China’s import of Brazilian soybeans by volume has increased nine times over between 2000 and 2010. In 2000, China was the destination of 16% (1.8 million tons) of Brazil’s total soybean export. By 2009, China was importing 56% (15.9 million tons) of Brazil’s total soybean exports (see figures 5 and 6) [6]. To understand the soy trade relationship between Brazil and China, it is necessary to understand the evolution of Brazil’s soy production and export capacity, as well as the evolution of China’s soy demand.

**2. Ag growth sustainable - land conversion**

**Cleary et. al 10** (David Cleary, Director of Sustainable Harvests, Carrie Brown-Lima and Melissa Clooney, The Nature Conservancy, "An overview of the Brazil-China soybean trade and its strategic implications for conservation," http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/southamerica/brazil/explore/brazil-china-soybean-trade.pdf)

The US cannot bring much new land into agricultural production. This, combined with competition for existing land with other crops such as corn, will likely limit soybean expansion. Brazil faces no such constraints, and will likely out-produce the US in the not too distant future. Brazilian Ministry of Agriculture (http://www.agricultura.gov.br) projections predict an expansion of soy plantations from 21.5 million hectares to 26.5 million hectares by the crop year 2018/2019. These projections indicate an annual increase of 2.43% in production during period, and only a 1.95% annual increase in planted area, primarily in the Cerrado and Amazon. The difference is accounted for by higher yields on land currently planted, and in areas where there is no new land to come into production, the replacement of other crops with soybeans [9].

**3. Brazilian soy will beat the US - land use**

**Cleary et. al 10** (David Cleary, Director of Sustainable Harvests, Carrie Brown-Lima and Melissa Clooney, The Nature Conservancy, "An overview of the Brazil-China soybean trade and its strategic implications for conservation," http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/southamerica/brazil/explore/brazil-china-soybean-trade.pdf)

However, Brazil holds a major strategic advantage in its vast capacity to expand area planted to soybeans. US cropland devoted to soybeans has declined as land use has shifted to corn for ethanol production, with very limited new arable land available for expansion. Another advantage that Brazil holds over the US is the composition of its soybeans. Brazilian soybeans yield about 4.5% more oil and contain 4.5% more protein than US soybeans. Brazilian meal is guaranteed to contain 47-48% protein, while US meal is sold as 44%. While genetically modified soybean strains have been introduced to Brazil, the predominance of non-genetically modified soybeans has made Brazilian exports more attractive to European and Asian consumers. [16]

### Prices Key

**China has a monopsony - prices determine what China buys**

**Cleary et. al 10** (David Cleary, Director of Sustainable Harvests, Carrie Brown-Lima and Melissa Clooney, The Nature Conservancy, "An overview of the Brazil-China soybean trade and its strategic implications for conservation," http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/southamerica/brazil/explore/brazil-china-soybean-trade.pdf)

The global soybean export market has four main players: China, the principal importer (importing over half the world’s exported soy) and the US, Brazil, and Argentina as the principal exporters (Figure 11). According to a trade model market power analysis funded by the USDA-CSREES National Research Initiative (NRI), Chinese soybean importers have stronger market power relative to soybean exporters from the US, Brazil and Argentina and thus control the market. China’s immense demand for soybeans combined with its strategy to purchase soybeans from more than one country gives it monopsony power. China’s importers can strategically use this power to reduce the risk of price increases and maximize soybean import profits. Because China is the most important market for the three exporting nations, they compete with each other for market share. However, the seasonal production differences between the US and the two South American countries allow them to be complementary soybean suppliers for China, with South America’s peak production period extending from June through October and the US peak production period extending from November through May [15]

### AT: Amazon Turn

**1. This links both ways - plan leads to a short-term offset in Brazilian competitiveness - if they win their link, this proves that Brazil would keep on expanding to maintain competitiveness**

**2. Even if Brazil tries to maintain competitiveness via expansion - it's a one time deal - prices are key -**

**[[read prices key here]]**

**3. Insert defense**

### AT: Not Reverse Causal

**1. If they win this that means our DA turns case - they don't actually make the US more competitive - Brazil is still more important to China than the US**

**2. Infrastructure investment is key to reduce prices which makes the US more competitive**

**Schnepf et. al 1** (Randall D. Schnepf, Erik Dohlman, and Christine Bolling. Market and Trade Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, December 2001 "Agriculture in Brazil and Argentina: Developments and Prospects for Major Field Crops," Agriculture and Trade Report)

Competitiveness in commodity markets reflects the influence of many different factors. These include relative resource endowments and agro-climatic conditions, but also the impact of macroeconomic policies (affecting exchange rates, work incentives, investment, energy costs and availability, etc.), sector-specific policies (e.g., credit subsidies, import or export taxes on inputs or final products), infrastructure (for storage and transportation), and supporting institutions (e.g., credit, regulatory, news and information, etc.) that help markets to work effectively. Export shares and growth trends also depend on domestic demand, relative returns to other crops, and other conditions. However, in its simplest terms, international market competitiveness is the ability to deliver a product at the lowest cost—i.e., with the lowest combined farmlevel production, transportation, and marketing costs. On this basis, analysis of 1998/99 cost structures underlying soybean production, transportation, and marketing from principal growing regions to a common export destination, Rotterdam, suggests that the United States lags slightly behind Argentina and Brazil in soybean export cost competitiveness. At the farm level, soybean producers in the U.S. “Heartland” had the highest overall average costs of production at $5.11 per bushel, ranging from 18 to 25 percent above those of Argentine or Brazilian competitors. 1 Total production costs were lowest in Argentina’s central soybean growing region (southern Santa Fe and northern Buenos Aires Provinces) and in Brazil’s interior expansion zone (the State of Mato Grosso), at about $3.90 per bushel in both regions. Production costs in Brazil’s coastal State of Parana (in Brazil’s traditional heartland) were estimated at $4.16 per bushel. High imputed land costs in the United States account for much of the difference in overall production costs. The U.S. production cost disadvantage is partially mitigated by internal transportation and marketing cost savings. In Brazil and Argentina, these costs are two to three times higher, on average, than in the United States, despite important efficiency gains in recent years. Freight charges to Rotterdam are also higher from South America. As a result, the delivered cost of Argentine and Brazilian soybeans at Rotterdam ranged from 2 to 12 percent less than U.S. costs in 1998/99.

**3.** **Transportation is key to price competitiveness**

**Schnepf et. al 1** (Randall D. Schnepf, Erik Dohlman, and Christine Bolling. Market and Trade Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, December 2001 "Agriculture in Brazil and Argentina: Developments and Prospects for Major Field Crops," Agriculture and Trade Report)

U.S. Infrastructure Vastly More Developed The transportation and marketing infrastructure for agricultural products in Argentina and Brazil has played a critical role in determining their international competitiveness. Both Argentina and Brazil possess long coastlines with major seaports providing outlets to international markets. Argentina has an important internal waterway, the Parana-Paraguay River system located close to the major grain-and-oilseed producing region. Brazil also possesses enormous internal waterway potential, including the world’s largest river system—the Amazon River and its many tributaries. Development of the Amazon’s tributaries is just beginning to open Brazil’s interior agricultural areas to the ocean portal provided by the Amazon River. Yet, despite considerably shorter average distances to ports from both Argentina’s Pampas and Brazil’s South, transportation and marketing costs for bulk agricultural product exports have historically been much higher for Argentina and Brazil than for the United States. This has generally reflected an inefficient or underdeveloped barge and railroad transportation system, and a heavy reliance on more expensive truck hauling. A Southern Hemisphere-Atlantic coast orientation and, in the past, export taxes and high port charges have also contributed to higher marketing and transportation costs to major international markets in Europe and East Asia. In contrast, the United States has a widespread internal transportation network, centered on the Mississippi waterway and its many tributaries, to move bulk commodities to international markets cheaply and efficiently. The U.S. grain transport system relies heavily on barges that are unrivaled as the cheapest, most efficient mode for moving bulk commodities to export (table B-5).

### AT: Not k2 Growth

**1. Food prices are key to growth - they've been correlated to the recent boom - that's BBC**

**2. Soy key to stabilize the Brazilian economy**

**Barrionuevo 11** (Alexei, 5/26/11, "China's Interest in Farmland Makes Brazil Uneasy," New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/27/world/americas/27brazil.html?pagewanted=all)

China has become Brazil’s biggest trading partner, buying ever increasing volumes of soybeans and iron ore, while investing billions in Brazil’s energy sector. The demand has helped fuel an economic boom here that has lifted more than 20 million Brazilians from extreme poverty and brought economic stability to a country accustomed to periodic crises.¶ Yet some experts say the partnership has devolved into a classic neo-colonial relationship in which China has the upper hand. Nearly 84 percent of Brazil’s exports to China last year were raw materials, up from 68 percent in 2000. But about 98 percent of China’s exports to Brazil are manufactured products — including the latest, low-priced cars for Brazil’s emerging middle class — that are beating down Brazil’s industrial sector.¶ “The relationship has been very unbalanced,” said Rubens Ricupero, a former Brazilian diplomat and finance minister. “There has been a clear lack of strategy on the Brazilian side.”¶ While visiting China last month, Brazil’s new president, Dilma Rousseff, emphasized the need to sell higher-value products to China, and she has edged closer to the United States. “It is not by accident that there is a sort of effort to revalue the relationship with the United States,” said Paulo Sotero, director of the Brazil Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. “China exposes Brazil’s vulnerabilities more than any other country in the world.”¶ China’s moves to buy land have made officials nervous. Last August, Luís Inácio Adams, Brazil’s attorney general, reinterpreted a 1971 law, making it significantly harder for foreigners to buy land in Brazil. Argentina’s president, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, followed suit last month, sending a law to Congress limiting the size and concentration of rural land foreigners could own.¶ Mr. Adams said his decision was not a direct result of land-buying by China, but he noted that huge “land grabs” in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa, including China’s attempt to lease about three million acres in the Philippines, had alarmed Brazilian officials.¶ “Nothing is preventing investment from happening, but it will be regulated,” Mr. Adams said.¶ A World Bank study last year said that volatile food prices had brought a “rising tide” of large-scale farmland purchases in developing nations, and that China was among a small group of countries making most of the purchases.

### AT: Shocks Inevitable

**1. Recency - their arguments don't assume that the new president is finding ways to stabilize the economy because Brazil wants prestige and international power - prefer our ev because it's more recent and**

**2. This is a question of the link -**

**a. Agriculture is key to sustain growth across multiple sectors b/c of trade - that’s BBC**

**b. Spillover solves - one sector is key to the overall economy - that's Cleary**

**c. Prestige - relative growth is key to give Brazil economic influence in the IMF bailout - that's key to prevent Eurozone collapse. That's Gomez**

### AT: Brazil Not k2 Eurozone

**1. Bailout - Brazil's economic growth is key to finance economic assistance. It allows for the political credibility for Brazil to help prevent the EU economic contagion from spreading - that's Gomez**

**2. Inertia - key to sustained IMF support**

**Winter 11** (Brian Winter, 9/20/2011, "Exclusive: Brazil seeks to help Europe via IMF," Reuters)

(Reuters) - Brazil will propose that it and other large emerging market countries make billions of dollars in new funds available to the International Monetary Fund as a way to help ease the crisis in the euro zone, an official said on Monday.¶ Finance Minister Guido Mantega will make the proposal at a meeting of the BRICS group later this week in Washington, the official told Reuters on condition of anonymity. The BRICS bloc of large emerging markets also includes Russia, India, China and South Africa.¶ "Giving more funds to the IMF looks like one of the more attractive options available for us to help Europe," the official said.¶ Brazil could make up to $10 billion of its own money available to help Europe through various channels, including the IMF or by making bond purchases, the official said.¶ Brazil's contribution by itself would almost certainly be too small to make a major difference in Europe's growing debt crisis. Yet a coordinated effort that includes China and Russia, in particular, could have greater impact at a time when investors are looking to large, growing emerging markets with high foreign reserves as a potential source of help.¶ Consensus toward such a concerted rescue effort appeared to be growing on Monday. Russia's Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin told reporters that countries that hold substantial reserves may assist in bailing out the euro zone's debt-ridden states "on certain conditions.

### AT: Competitiveness Inevitable

**They say competition means exports are inevitable - but if Brazil loses demand now it's gone forever - NGO pressure kills the market**

**Cleary et. al 10** (David Cleary, Director of Sustainable Harvests, Carrie Brown-Lima and Melissa Clooney, The Nature Conservancy, "An overview of the Brazil-China soybean trade and its strategic implications for conservation," http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/southamerica/brazil/explore/brazil-china-soybean-trade.pdf)

 Further projections are discussed in Part 2 of this report. Brazil has felt substantial international pressure from conservation NGOs, the media and European buyers who are concerned about deforestation in the Amazon and the responsible sourcing of soy. However, with the shift to China as the leading importer of Brazilian soy (as shown in figures 7 and 8), these environmentally-conscious voices are overpowered by China’s demand for soybeans. Chinese consumers have not demonstrated the same concern over deforestation as Brazil’s European buyers.