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## Conservation Reserve Program (Warming)

### 1NC Shell

#### Text: The USFG should expand and fully fund the USDA Conservation Reserve Program Initiative

#### 1. CP solves global warming – carbon sequestration slows it down

Adam Benton, Environmental Law, AND Elizabeth Burleson, doctorate, 11-26-08, “The Conservation Reserve Program: A Productive Past and Challenging Future,” Conservation Reserve Program, ZM

Finding good data on the effects the Conservation Reserve Program has had on wildlife is relatively easy. There are countless success stories published every year in states all across America and the United States Department of Agriculture goes out of their way to see to it that recognition is given to their Conservation Reserve Program. However, there is other positive data published every year that can be a little more difficult to find, but that is equally, if not more important, than the benefits to wildlife. That data is in regards to the other environmental benefits stemming from the Conservation Reserve Program. It’s important for an individual to understand that for millions of years, the Earth has done a phenomenal job of taking care of itself. There are natural processes to remove greenhouse gasses from the air and pollutants from the water. It wasn’t until humans stepped in and starting manipulating the Earth that these processes ceased to be adequate. With the inception of the Conservation Reserve Program in 1985, millions of acres of land have been given back to the Earth to be used in some of those natural processes and the results are staggering. According to a study performed by the United States Department of Agriculture for the CRP’s twentieth birthday (2005-2006), the Conservation Reserve Program has decreased topsoil erosion and the harmful pollutants contained in much of that topsoil to the tune of 450 million tons every year (Theisse 2008). The state of South Dakota alone is saving over twenty-two million tons of soil from eroding every year (US, “Future” 4). The country’s overall topsoil loss has decreased by over twenty percent thanks to CRP (US, “Future” 126). Decreased wind erosion has led to marked gains in rural air quality. Grasses and trees planted on America’s thirty-five million acres of CRP have already sequestered forty-eight million metric tons of carbon from the atmosphere, going a long way towards reducing America’s negative contribution to global warming (US, “Estimating Water Quality”). Within the Conservation Reserve Program’s thirty-five million acres are 1.8 million acres of wetlands. Historically, wetlands have been the Earth’s most efficient method of maintaining water quality. In addition to the impact wetlands have had on water quality, the Conservation Reserve Program also includes nearly 170,000 miles of land bordering streams and rivers (Thiesse 2008). Ecologists point to these buffer zones between the uplands and the riparian corridors as some of the most environmentally important land on the planet. These buffer zones serve to filter and slow runoff from agricultural fields, substantially decreasing the amount of pollutants that wash into water systems across the country.

### Solvency

## Keystone (Oil Dependency/Econ)

### 1NC Shell

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should construct and operate the Keystone XL pipeline.

#### 1. Keystone XL solves US foreign oil dependence

Kathleen Petty, staff writer, 2-24-12, “Dewhurst says Keystone XL Pipeline needed to decrease America's foreign oil dependency,” My West Texas, http://www.mywesttexas.com/top\_stories/article\_fe7651e5-9398-5373-9532-7290e2f36587.html

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

#### 2. CP solves oil dependency and the economy – increasing global supply is the only way to curb volatility while decreasing unemployment

NPN, National Petroleum News, 3-28-12, “Refiners to U.S. House: High crude oil prices drive high gasoline prices,” https://www.npnweb.com/ME2/dirmod.asp?sid=901D2CC3506F4C1187DF5BE4A8A2C0FF&nm=&type=MultiPublishing&mod=PublishingTitles&mid=8F3A7027421841978F18BE895F87F791&tier=4&id=4D1DB78127494E7CBB83363976B04A70

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

### Solvency

## F-35s (Hegemony)

### 1NC Shell

#### Text: The USFG should increase the funding of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program.

**1. F-35 fighters are key to US hegemony**

EnerGeoPolitics, 1-23-12, “US geostrategic reach and capabilities are growing, not shrinking,” http://energeopolitics.com/2012/01/23/us-geostrategic-reach-and-capabilities/

Daniel Drezner wrote this past weekend that “predictions about the death of American hegemony may have been greatly exaggerated.” Drezner points out that, among other things, the preponderance of US military power vis a vis China is even greater today than it was 20 years ago. And, with older weapons systems being phased out and newer, more advanced ones coming on line, that disparity is about to grow even greater. Key to that, and **a primary threat to any Chinese designs on challenging US hegemony, is the F-35 Joint Strike Figher.** Dr. Robbin Laird writing at US Naval Institute’s journal Proceedings details how, **by combining the F-35 with existing** (and developing) Aegis **technology**, **the US is building a global, mobile defense network that will far outmatch anything any competitor can field**: **Originally designed as a Cold War tool** to bolster fleet defense against a challenging Soviet Navy, **the Aegis program has** since the 1970s **evolved and morphed**. Among the factors that have exponentially increased the core program’s capabilities, the software and microelectronics revolution has played a major role. Targeting precision, C4ISR, and missile technologies have all developed, and today Aegis is a key element in global missile defense. Of central relevance not only to the program but to global security, **Aegis coupled with the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter will provide unprecedented modular flexibility** at sea **for U.S. command authority** and our allies as they shape responses to inevitable future crises. Aegis at-sea systems are a key element of sea-based defensive capability that has been provided with strategic mobility. Add the F-35Bs to the South Korean military, and now you can disperse force, complicate any North Korean attack, and add this capability to the country’s mobile naval force that currently is being rolled out. Deterrence of China is also enhanced, because mobility of operations from South Korea makes China’s thinking more difficult. For one thing, there is no single line of attack on U.S. forces. If the Chinese should target Guam, we would now have multiple bases from the sea and land from which the 360-degree-enabled **F-35s** coupled with Aegis and other systems **would provide a troubling situation for our enemy**, who would not be guaranteed success with a large-area single strike.

### Solvency

#### Investment in the F-35 is crucial to counter threats abroad

Pat Host, staff writer, 3-26-12, “Think Tank Report Says U.S. Must Reinvest In Next-Gen Air Capabilities,” Defense Daily, LexisNexis, ZM

The Obama administration and Congress must prioritize recapitalizing combat air capabilities to adequately support the president's new emphasis on the Asia-Pacific region, according to a recent report by the conservative think tank American Enterprise Institute.¶ The March 2012 report, "Nearing Coffin Corner: US Air Power on the Edge," said the White House and Congress must prioritize investment in next-generation weapon programs like the next generation bomber; the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter; the KC-46 aerial refueling tanker; F-22 modernization; low-range, low-observable, carrier-based strike platforms and joint electronic warfare capabilities to make the Asia-Pacific strategy successful.¶ Diversified logistics lines, air base resiliency, carrier-based group defenses, vigorous cyber capabilities, strong command and control networks and robust data links will also be critical enablers for the entire joint force, according to the report.¶ "Should the United States find itself underequipped in a future conflict, it simply will not be possible to rapidly design, develop and field modern weapons systems and their requisite support elements," the report said.¶ Reinvesting in air power is also critical due to the development of Anti-Access/Area-Denial (A2/AD) capabilities in the Asia-Pacific, according to the report. China has spent the last 20 years developing comprehensive aerial A2/AD capability with next-generation weapons programs like the J-20 stealth fighter, HQ-9 surface-to-air-missile and DF-21 anti-ship ballistic missile, according to the report.¶ "Even where new technology is not available, China has the advantage of amassing its assets at home without having to worry about the complexities entailed with power projection," the report said. "This means that Chinese capabilities do not necessarily need to equal or exceed those of the United States to be effective."¶ The report said with only 185 F-22s and 20 B-2s, the United States has an extremely limited number of stealth aircraft that could participate in a first-wave assault to eliminate the source of A2/AD threats.¶ "These small-fleet dynamics become even more complex considering that only a portion of these aircraft would be combat-coded and available at a given time," the report said.¶ Lockheed Martin [LMT] produces the F-22 and F-35, Northrop Grumman [NOC] the B-2 and Boeing [BA] the KC-46.

#### F-35 investment is key to keep U.S. readiness- this ensures deterrence and peace and also avoids the link to spending

Mackenzie Eaglen, Resident Fellow at the Marilyn Ware Center for Security Studies, Douglas A. Birkey, staff writer, 3-21-12, “Nearing coffin corner: US air power on the edge,” American Enterprise Institute, <http://aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/defense/nearing-coffin-corner-us-air-power-on-the-edge/>, ZM

Policymakers’ investment priorities should focus on the next-generation bomber; F-35, KC-46, and F-22 modernization; acquiring long-range, low-observable, carrier-based strike and air dominance platforms; and joint electronic warfare capabilities. Additionally, they must ensure that the glue that holds the force together is modernized to ensure operational capacity amidst a contested environment. Diversified logistics lines, air base resiliency, carrier battle group defenses, vigorous cyber capabilities, strong command and control networks, and robust data links will also stand forth as critical enablers for the entire joint force. Realistic training and maintaining high readiness levels are also important to keeping the force prepared for conflict and ensuring credible peacetime deterrence.¶ No matter how capable weapons systems might be on an individual level, the Asia-Pacific domain demands adequate numbers of key platforms. Since the end of the Cold War, the services have struggled to fill their stated military requirements for major systems. Whether discussing the B-2, Seawolf-class attack submarine, F-22, DDG-1000, or Global Hawk, multiple administrations and many Congresses have repeatedly chosen to prematurely curtail needed production. Although this approach affords the illusion of short-term costs savings, it actually induces tremendous long-term costs because research and procurement expenses are not efficiently amortized. The results are clear: the nation expends vast resources developing a capability but fails to procure adequate numbers to realize a full return on our investment—we develop devastating weapons, but we fail to buy enough of them. With the military requirement left unmet, leaders have fewer national security options, and those in uniform must accept increased risk.¶ As legacy systems more quickly age out of the inventory, entire mission sets are now at risk. Even if new programs are started, they end up costing far more than if leaders had simply invested in purchasing the original replacement system. The administration and Congress are in the midst of repeating this cycle for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program. Full-rate production is continually delayed, yielding unit cost growth and a cut in production. This destructive cycle must be stopped. Aside from exposing the nation to tremendous cost imposition for minimal return, such patterns suggest leaders assume America’s perceived military preeminence no matter the details of diminishing defense budgets. These assumptions are dangerous.¶ The past decade has illustrated what it means to force the military to accept ever more risk: forces are put into harm’s way with too few of the capabilities required to ensure timely mission success and basic survival. More risk also means more American lives lost and more strategic objectives not achieved or delayed. Policymakers must learn from such mistakes. The scale and scope of America’s interests in the Asia-Pacific demand sustained investment based on strategic wisdom, not short-term opportunism.

### Air Power Net Benefit

#### 1. Recent cuts and air force advancements in competing countries are a challenge to U.S. airpower

Michael Auslin, associate professor of history and senior research fellow at the MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies, 8-19-10, “Make No Mistake, Air Power Keeps Us Safe,” American Enterprise Institute, <http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/defense/make-no-mistake-air-power-keeps-us-safe/>, ZM

Last year, the White House killed the F-22 program, prematurely ending production of the most advanced fighter in the world, and leaving Air Force commanders with a fraction of the F-22s they need to ensure air superiority and to use as the most flexible intelligence asset in the sky.¶ Bombing runs are carried out by bombers built as long ago as the early 1960s, and our planes are refueled by half-century old tankers.¶ Secretary of Defense Robert Gates canceled, then restarted the next generation bomber program, meaning there will be no new bomber at least until 2025, and the Pentagon has been trying to kill the C-17, America's most advanced transport plane, even as demand for airlift operations is prematurely aging the fleet.¶ Some may question why the U.S. needs such a large air force, when no other country has even a fraction of our capabilities. But no other nation has America's global responsibilities, either.¶ A modern, balanced air force is a central ingredient in America's defense strategy, and is the prerequisite to being able to intervene in the earliest stages of a conflict.¶ Moreover, American airmen will soon face more capable adversaries, as other nations are building up their air forces, most notably China, which is introducing advanced fighter aircraft and new weapons designed to keep U.S. aircraft carriers at bay, and Russia, which has just test flown a fifth-generation challenger to America's F-22.

**2. F-35s are the key ingredient to ensuring U.S. air dominance for the next 40 years**

Loren B. Thompson, doctoral and master’s degrees in government, 1-19-12, “A Simple Explanation of Why the F-35 Fighter Is Essential,” Lexington Institute, <http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/a-simple-explanation-of-why-the-f-35-fighter-is-essential?a=1&c=1171>, ZM

Air dominance is crucial to victory in modern warfare. If you can't control the air space over contested territory, every facet of warfighting is harder. Not only are friendly ground forces vulnerable to attack from above, but the mobility, firepower, reconnaissance and resupply they count on from aircraft may not be available. That is why the first move in every recent U.S. military campaign has been to assure air dominance by destroying enemy combat planes and suppressing air defenses. Air dominance is the main reason why no U.S. soldier has been killed by hostile aircraft since the Korean War. The F-35 was designed to assure American forces will continue to have air dominance for the next 40 years, and to leverage that dominance in carrying out a range of other missions such as precision bombing and fire support of ground troops.

### AT: Links to Politics

## Corporate Tax Cuts (Econ)

### 1NC Shell

#### Text: The United States federal government should lower corporate tax rates

#### 1. Lowering corporate tax rates is key to economic growth and has bipartisan support

Peter Roff, senior fellow at the Institute for Liberty and at Let Freedom Ring, 5-16-12, “Obama Should Cut the Corporate Tax Rate,” US News, <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/peter-roff/2012/05/16/obama-should-cut-the-corporate-tax-rate>, ZM

The United States has continued to adhere to the policy of high corporate tax rates combined with targeted narrow tax breaks. This approach to tax policy creates substantial uncertainty regarding future policies and undermines job creation.¶ Firms facing a burdensome corporate tax rate like those in the United States are at a competitive disadvantage against their international counterparts and could potentially "fall behind in innovation and productive capacity."¶ A lower federal corporate income tax rate will lead to additional capital investment and greater productivity. This boost in earnings and capital will serve as a direct catalyst for job creation and growth.¶ Lower corporate tax rates equal a lower cost of capital while higher rates raise the cost of capital to firms. Studies have shown that companies facing high corporate tax rates will reduce a firm's capital investment. "Innovation has spurred American growth and economic vitality for decades," said James P. Pinkerton, cochair of the Reforming America's Tax Rates Equitably Coalition and former White House domestic policy adviser to Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. "By highlighting the importance of lowered tax rates and a simplified code to innovation and its impact on economic growth, Robert Rizzi and Jonathan Sallet have made a critical contribution to the tax reform debate."¶ "Experts and policymakers on both sides of the aisle agree that a nation's innovative capacity is directly tied to investment, job creation and ultimately, economic growth," said Elaine Kamarck, cochair of the coalition along with Pinkerton and a former adviser to President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore. "The fact that the United States must be the world leader in innovation is yet another subject on which Democratic and Republican lawmakers agree and adds to the growing number of issues related to corporate tax reform on which there is bipartisan consensus."

### Solvency

#### Lowering the tax rate won’t add to the deficit

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at Cato, 1-25-11, “Obama Calls for Corporate Tax Cut,” CATO @ Liberty, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/obama-calls-for-corporate-tax-cut/>, ZM

In his State of the Union, President Obama pulled one from the Cato playbook and called for a corporate tax rate cut.¶ “But all the rest [of our companies] are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change. So tonight, I’m asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system. Get rid of the loopholes. Level the playing field. And use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years – without adding to our deficit.”¶ The stuff about loopholes and simplification–that’s window dressing. The real story is that the reality has sunk in even to liberal Democrats that we are shooting ourselves in the foot with the highest corporate tax rate in the world.¶ “Loopholes” will take care of themselves if we dramatically lower our tax rate. Chopping the statutory rate will automatically broaden the tax base, close homemade corporate loopholes, and not “add to our deficit” in the long-run.

#### Corporate tax rate reductions will increase U.S. economic competitiveness

Desmond Lachman, Resident Fellow, 7-19-12, “Decision time in the United States,” American Enterprise Institute, <http://www.aei.org/article/politics-and-public-opinion/elections/decision-time-in-the-united-states/>, ZM

President Obama subscribes to the view that in restoring fiscal sustainability the greatest of care needs to be taken not to withdraw fiscal stimulus too quickly for fear of derailing a still very fragile U.S. economic recovery. He also believes that while reining in public spending must play a role in rebalancing the budget, an equally important role must be played by tax revenue enhancements and that care should also be taken to protect the country’s various entitlement programs. In particular, President Obama believes that the Bush tax cuts, which are due to expire at the end of this year, should only be extended for those earning less than US$250,000 a year, and that those in the upper-income brackets should be required to pay their "fair share" in taxes. ¶ Governor Romney characterizes the president’s approach to fiscal policy as being excessively Keynesian in orientation and excessively hostile to business enterprise and innovation. He sees excessive public spending and high tax rates as major factors in the country’s present economic malaise. On those grounds, he believes that the Bush tax cuts should be universally extended and that corporate tax rates should be reduced to make the United States more competitive abroad. In Governor Romney’s view, a 5 percent across-the-board cut in non-defense discretionary spending should play the major role in reducing the budget deficit.

#### Cutting corporate taxes will promote faster growth by stimulating the economy

Romina Boccia, staff writer, 6-10-11, “Stimulate the Weak Economy by Cutting Corporate Taxes,” Heritage Foundation, <http://blog.heritage.org/2011/06/10/stimulate-the-weak-economy-by-cutting-corporate-taxes/>, ZM

Heritage fiscal policy expert J.D. Foster explains what Congress and the President could do instead to stimulate the economy toward faster growth in the recession’s aftermath:¶ They can do so by improving incentives to produce and to work: for example, by reducing regulations and tax distortions. They can do so by reducing the uncertainties surrounding future policy. They can do so by expanding foreign markets for domestic goods and services. Recent efforts to stimulate the economy have been unsuccessful because they did little or none of these things. Regulations have increased. Uncertainty has increased. Tax distortions have been left in place or even increased in some areas. And efforts toward free trade have been anemic, at best.¶ One example would be cutting the corporate income tax rate from its uncompetitive high of 35 percent down to 25 percent. This would provide entrepreneurs with much-needed incentives and certainty to expand and grow their businesses and hire more workers. As the Heritage Center for Data Analysis estimated, the number of jobs in the U.S. would grow by an average of 581,000 annually over the next decade given a 25 percent corporate income tax rate.¶ The ailing economy should signal to Congress and the President that it is high time to change course and to pursue those fiscal policies that in fact spur economic and job growth.

#### Current views of tax cuts flawed- empirical evidence proves they can stimulate economic growth and prosperity

David Weinberger, staff writer, 10-18-12, “Tax Cuts and Supply-Side Effects,” Heritage Foundation, <http://blog.heritage.org/2011/10/18/tax-cuts-and-supply-side-effects/>, ZM

Lawmakers have recently paid lip service to cutting the corporate tax rate to help boost economic growth. Doing so would be good policy, but it’s important to know why.¶ Information disseminated by both political parties, think tanks, government organizations, media outlets, and political pundits has confused the issue, leading many to believe that reducing the corporate tax rate would have little effect on the economy. This is because most discussion surrounding the utility of tax cuts is filtered primarily through the “demand-side” lens—that is, it views tax cuts as effective only if they increase spending, ignoring their impact on work, savings, and investment.¶ Not all tax cuts are the same. Some, such as the misbegotten tax rebates of 2008, are designed to increase demand by putting more money in people’s pockets in hopes that they would spend it. Other examples of tax cuts aimed at demand are one-time tax breaks and tax credits.¶ But some tax cuts, such as rate reductions on the margins of income and investment, are not intended to feed the demand-side obsession. Rather, they focus on the supply-side effects of such cuts: production and work effort.¶ These types of cuts change incentives, encouraging work effort and production, such as the marginal rate reductions of 2003 on dividends, capital gains, and income and the currently discussed corporate tax rate reduction.¶ The distinction between demand-side and supply-side tax cuts is important. It is inadequate to address the projected consequences of a proposed tax cut utilizing demand-side logic when a supply-side tax cut is what’s being offered. Conducting that type of analysis is like assessing the effectiveness of tanning oil at night: Of course it appears ineffective.¶ Yet the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) focused almost entirely on its effect on spending when analyzing a corporate tax cut:¶ Explaining why a corporate tax rate cut is relatively ineffective as stimulus, [the Congressional Research Service] noted that “Increasing the after-tax income of businesses typically does not create an incentive for them to spend more on labor or to produce more, because production depends on the ability to sell output.”¶ In other words, it wouldn’t affect aggregate demand much and therefore would be relatively ineffective.¶ Similarly, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) writes: “Across-the-board reductions in income tax rates have the disadvantage of placing much more of the tax reduction in the hands of upper-income taxpayers, who, although they have a much larger tax liability, are less likely to spend the additional money.” Again, the analysis is undertaken through a demand-side lens, which these types of cuts don’t aim at.¶ It is unfortunate that many authoritative organizations conduct analysis as if the only benefit to the economy comes from increasing demand. This view stacks the deck in favor of government spenders from the outset: If the goal is to increase spending in the economy, then government spending would surely seem the more effective way of accomplishing that. Hence the 2001, 2008, 2009, and 2011 stimulus schemes, which ranged from tax rebates, tax credits, and temporary tax cuts to direct government purchases, unemployment benefits, and food stamps. All were effectively government spending plans packaged in different ways that were aimed at increasing total demand in the economy.¶ The real tragedy of this single-track analysis is that supply-side tax cuts that have actually worked over the past decade—such as the 2003 marginal rate reductions mentioned earlier—are all but ignored.¶ Historical evidence suggests they deserve more attention. Marginal rate reductions were tried in the 1920s under Presidents Harding and Coolidge, in the 1960s under President Kennedy, in the 1980s under President Reagan, and in the early 2000s under President Bush.¶ In each instance, these rate reductions propelled economic growth and prosperity.¶ Analysts and economists may disagree on whether supply- or demand-side stimulus is better, but ignoring that arguments for tax cuts exist beyond the logic of increasing aggregate demand leads to misunderstandings over important public policy.

### Supply-Side Good

#### Keynesian economist theory has been proven to not work – adopting supply-side economics will ensure innovation which leads to growth.

Arthur Herman, visiting scholar at American Enterprise Institute, 7-8-12, “Supply-side economics could give us needed boost,” Tampa Bay Online, <http://www2.tbo.com/news/opinion/2012/jul/08/vwopino1-supply-side-economics-could-give-us-neede-ar-425259/>, ZM

Others, like the followers of British economist John Maynard Keynes, disagree. They say it's the demand for products and services that fosters innovation and growth — demand created by individuals or the government, it doesn't matter. In fact, since government has lots of money, it can stimulate growth faster by spending it quicker. Indeed, the more, the better.¶ The supply-sider sees this formula as wrong-headed. The marketplace, as opposed to government, knows best where economic effort should go to satisfy demand based on consumer tastes. Producers who get their goods and services out there at the lowest cost will get the biggest rewards, as will consumers.¶ So the top economic priority is making sure producers are free to expand capacity to produce more, and install new technologies that will produce those goods faster and cheaper or even create entirely new products and services.

## Cedaw (Feminism)

### 1NC Shell

**Text: The United States federal government should ratify the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.**

**1. CEDAW promotes women’s rights**

Citizens for Global Solutions, 10-18-10, “Women’s Rights are Human Rights: U.S. Ratification of the Convention of the Elimination of

Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)” Testimony for the Record Citizens for Global Solutions

Before: Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Human Right and the Law http://globalsolutions.org/files/public/documents/CEDAW\_Testimony-11-2010.pdf

**CEDAW strengthens the United States as a global leader in standing up for women** and girls**. In countries that have ratified CEDAW, women have partnered with their governments to improve the status of women** and girls, and **as a result have changed laws and policies to create greater safety and opportunity for women and their families. CEDAW can make a difference for women and girls, specifically to reduce sex trafficking and domestic violence, provide access to education** and vocational training, ensure the right to vote, end forced marriage and child marriage, help mothers and families by providing access to maternal health care and to ensure the right to work and own a business without discrimination.

**2. Ratification promotes fem elsewhere**

Lenora Lapidus, Women's Rights Project, AND Vania Leveille, Washington Legislative Office, 11-17-**10**, “Ratify CEDAW, Because Women's Rights are Human Rights,” American Civil Liberties Union, http://www.aclu.org/blog/content/ratify-cedaw-because-womens-rights-are-human-rights

The benefits of ratification to the U.S. are many. **Formally embracing the internationally accepted minimum standards pertaining to women’s human rights would send a powerful message to the rest of the world** that the U.S. stands behind its commitment to providing equal opportunity for all — a commitment that is part of our Constitution and laws. **It would instantly strengthen the credibility of U.S. criticism of women’s rights abuses in other nations. Participation in the CEDAW process would also create an opportunity for the U.S. to benefit from open dialogue and the exchange of ideas about ways that we could continue to enhance women’s equality at home.**

## \*\*\*(Race)\*\*\*

# Advantage CPs AFF

## Conservation Reserve Program

## Keystone

## F-35s

## Corporate Tax Cuts

### Plan unpopular – Congress

#### Counterplan faces uphill battle from Congress and business lobbyists

Jim Zarroli, business reporter for NPR News, 2-23-12, “Obama's Corporate Tax Cut Plan Faces Uphill Battle,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/2012/02/23/147276846/obamas-corporate-tax-cut-plan-faces-uphill-battle, ZM

President Obama's plan to overhaul the nation's corporate tax system would sharply cut the taxes that U.S. companies pay. But it would also eliminate many of the loopholes that help them pare down what they owe.¶ White House spokesman Jay Carney says the proposal unveiled Wednesday should appeal to both Democrats and Republicans, by doing what both sides "say is important to do ... which is lower the rate, broaden the base [and] eliminate the underbrush of unnecessary subsidies and loopholes and special provisions that complicate the tax code."¶ But one phrase in Carney's statement reveals why the plan faces an uphill battle in Congress. "Broaden the base" means making more income, from more people, subject to taxation. And business lobbyists know that means eliminating popular tax breaks.¶ At least on paper, U.S. companies pay a tax rate of 35 percent — higher than almost any other advanced country. Tax Foundation President Scott Hodge says that rate leaves U.S. corporations at a big disadvantage.¶ "Seventy-five countries have cut their corporate tax rates. And if we look at the rest of the world, it's a very competitive place compared to the United States," Hodge says.

## CEDAW

## \*\*\*RACE\*\*\*