# ARS Aff Updates- Monday

## Nina

CP fails – flawed science and impossible to carry out

Allsopp et al. 07 (Michelle Allsopp; David Santillo; Paul Johnston; “A Scientific Critique of Oceanic Iron Fertilization as a Climate Change Mitigation Strategy”; September 2007; Greenpeace Research Laboratories Technical Note; http://www.greenpeace.to/publications/iron\_fertilisation\_critique.pdf)

With the scientific discovery that phytoplankton growth can be stimulated by the addition of iron to HNLC waters, some have proposed that the ‘biological pump’ could be enhanced by fertilizing the oceans with iron, as a way of drawing down more carbon dioxide from the atmosphere into the oceans and, in so doing, helping mitigate climate change. However, such proposals are founded on an incomplete understanding and highly simplified interpretation of current scientific knowledge. They have not taken properly into account the results of the 12 mesoscale iron enrichment scientific studies carried out to date which suggest that the amount of carbon sequestered in this way would be very small, nor the fundamental influence of hydrodynamics and large uncertainties and indeterminacies in ecosystem response which those studies highlight. Furthermore, such schemes would be virtually impossible to carry out in practice because of the colossal areas that would have to be fertilized to result in significant atmospheric carbon removal. The proposals also do not give due consideration to the high probability and consequences of major ecological perturbations to the oceans through the alteration of plankton communities upon which most marine life is dependent. Neither do they take account of the unpredictable and potentially dangerous geophysical changes that could occur with large-scale ocean fertilization.

CP fails - Food Chain

Watts 2009 (Anthony Watts; “Ocean Iron Fertilization CO2 sequestration experiment a blooming failure”; March 27, 2009; http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/03/27/ocean-iron-fertilization-experiment-a-blooming-failure/)

Earlier this month, the controversial Indian-German Lohafex expedition fertilized 300 square kilometres of the Southern Atlantic with six tonnes of dissolved iron. This triggered a bloom of phytoplankton, which doubled their biomass within two weeks by taking in carbon dioxide from the seawater. The dead phytoplankton were then expected to sink to the ocean bed, dragging carbon along with them. Instead, the experiment turned into an example of how the food chain works, as the bloom was eaten by a swarm of hungry copepods. The huge swarm of copepods were in turn eaten by larger crustaceans called amphipods, which are often eaten by squid and whales. “I think we are seeing the last gasps of ocean iron fertilization as a carbon storage strategy,” says Ken Caldeira of the Carnegie Institution at Stanford University.

### **Counterplan fails**

ETC Group 2008 (ETC Group, International Organization dedicated to the conservation and substantial advancement of cultural and ecological diversity and human rights; “The World Torpedoes Ocean Fertilization: End of Round One on Geo-Engineering”; May 31st, 2008; The ACTivist Magazine; http://activistmagazine.com/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=884&Itemid=143)

"The message from the UN Biodiversity Convention is clear. The world does not want commercial ocean fertilization and companies like Climos should be looking for another occupation," says Pat Mooney, Executive Director of ETC Group, who is in Bonn at the negotiations. "Ocean fertilization could lead to toxic tides, lifeless waters and disrupted ecosystems and livelihoods. There is unanimous agreement among the 191 countries here that it is absolutely the wrong way to tackle climate change."

**California is Cali-fine**

DeBord 7/27 (Matthew DeBord; “Comparing California’s economic growth to the US and the world”; DeBord Report; Southern California Public Radio; http://www.scpr.org/blogs/economy/2012/07/27/9166/comparing-californias-economic-growth-us-and-world/)

Indeed, if it were a stand-alone economy, California would be the world's ninth largest, coming in just above Russia and just below Italy. But let's compare California to the rest of the world in terms of growth. First off, the Golden State saw growth last year that was actually better than the U.S. — 2 percent for Cali, versus 1.8 percent for the U.S.  But California also out-grew every country above it except Germany, Europe's powerhouse; global powerhouse China; and Brazil, the powerhouse of Latin America. And within California, Los Angeles County, with growth for 2011 at 1.8 percent, did likewise. And if you look at the rest of the developed world, both California and Los Angeles County are outperforming the pack. Better than France. Better than the U.K. Better than Italy. Better than Spain. This is translating into an unemployment rate in California that, although high at 10.7, is falling faster than the national rate, which isn't going to drop very much if at all with GDP growth hovering around 2 percent.  So if you look at the very big picture, with much of Europe in recession or flirting with it, California (the country) isn't doing all that badly. In fact, under the circumstances — a world economy that's still shaking off the financial crisis and in Europe entering a new phase — California is doing pretty well.

## AT: Oil Disad

### Uniqueness:

#### The Senate blocked Alaska drilling bill- won’t pass it again

The News Tribune 3/14 (“Senate rejects drilling for oil in Arctic refuge,” 2012, <http://www.thenewstribune.com/2012/03/13/2065560/senate-rejects-drilling-for-oil.html>)

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. Senate on Tuesday resoundingly rejected a sweeping measure to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and other protected areas to drilling as well as approve construction of the Keystone pipeline project.¶ The vote was the first time in four years the Senate has voted on a measure including ANWR drilling, and it failed miserably. The proposal needed 60 votes to pass and avoid a filibuster. It received only 41 votes in favor, with 57 senators against.¶ Kansas Republican Sen. Pat Roberts pushed the measure as an amendment to the bill that funds transportation projects across the nation. His amendment was packed with so many controversial items it was bound to fail in the Democratic-controlled Senate. It was as much a jab at President Obama by Republican leaders during a time of high gas prices and election politics as anything else.¶ Alaska Democratic Sen. Mark Begich still broke with others in his party and voted for the amendment, saying he did it to back ANWR drilling.

#### The Keystone XL pipeline project was already blocked

Brecheen 2/26 (Josh Brecheen, “Brecheen says left-wing environmental concerns are impacting Senate District No. 6,” Durant Democrat, <http://www.durantdemocrat.com/view/full_story/17303583/article-Brecheen-says-left-wing-environmental-concerns-are-impacting-Senate-District-No--6?instance=secondary_opinion_left_column>)

Senate District 6 is one of the Oklahoma Senate districts that will be most impacted by President Obama’s recent decision to nix the $7 billion Keystone XL pipeline project. Senate District 6 consists of Atoka, Bryan, Coal, Johnston and Marshall Counties. Coal, Atoka and Bryan Counties are all included in the proposed route for the Keystone XL pipeline. The project angles through our district from the northwest and heads southeast while passing through the approximate centers of Coal and Atoka Counties and through the east side of Bryan County before crossing the state line.

#### No chance of passage- Obama will block any Republican attempt to expand US oil production

Koenig 7/26 (Brian Koenig, “House Republicans Reject Obama Plan for Offshore Drilling,” The New American, 2012, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/energy/item/12224-house-republicans-rejects-obama-plan-for-offshore-drilling>)

Furthermore, Obama lauded a March attempt by the U.S. Senate to end billions of dollars in tax breaks for the “big five” oil companies, which includes BP, Exxon, Shell, Chevron, and ConocoPhillips. "I think it's time they got by without more help from taxpayers who are already having a tough enough time paying the bills and filling up their gas tank," the president said at the time. "And I think it's curious that some folks in Congress, who are the first to belittle investments in new sources of energy, are the ones that are fighting the hardest to maintain these giveaways for the oil companies."¶ Following his anti-oil theme, Obama expressed staunch opposition against the Republicans’ July 25 efforts to expand U.S. oil production, promising a veto to any bill that moves beyond his proposed legislation. Insofar as its political implications, critics say the president's initiative to keep the oil industry highly regulated could backfire, as persistently high gas prices may shift voters to the other side of the political aisle.

#### The Senate rejected a bill to expand drilling- they’ll reject it again

CNN 2011 (“Senate rejects GOP oil drilling plan,” May 18, <http://articles.cnn.com/2011-05-18/politics/senate.oil.drilling_1_drilling-moratorium-oil-gas-prices?_s=PM:POLITICS>)

The Senate rejected a Republican measure Wednesday to expand offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. coastal waters, signaling a continued partisan stalemate over energy policy and, more specifically, how to respond to rising gas prices.¶ The bill was defeated in a 42-57 vote. Sixty votes were required for passage.¶ Five Republicans -- Alabama's Richard Shelby, Louisiana's David Vitter, Maine's Olympia Snowe, South Carolina's Jim DeMint, and Utah's Mike Lee -- voted against the bill.

#### Democrats and Obama will block oil drilling expansion

Snyder July 26 (Jim Snyder, “Senate Republicans Push on Offshore Drilling, Keystone XL,” Business Week, 2012, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-07-26/senate-republicans-push-on-offshore-drilling-keystone-xl>)

Senate Republicans introduced a bill to expand offshore drilling, cut regulations and override U.S. State Department rejection of the Keystone XL pipeline as both parties seek to make energy a winning election-year issue.¶ The Senate legislation is made up of provisions the Republican-led House has already passed and that haven’t advanced in the Senate, which is led by Democrats. White House aides have President Barack Obama has opposed legislative efforts to speed Keystone and expand offshore drilling.¶ “This administration and congressional Democrats have repeatedly taken steps to restrict and inhibit American energy production,” Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky said today in a statement.¶ The legislation adds to a list of energy bills introduced by members of both parties that probably have little chance of advancing this year, given the congressional calendar and disagreement between parties. Lawmakers plan to begin a five- week recess on Aug. 3, and then adjourn before the election.¶ Republicans have made unsuccessful attempts to force approval of TransCanada Corp. (TRP)’s Keystone project, which would carry crude from Alberta’s oil sands to refineries in the Gulf Coast.¶ President Barack Obama rejected a permit in January over concerns a rupture might threaten an aquifer in Nebraska. The administration is reviewing a new proposal from the Calgary- based company.

#### Both the transportation bill and drilling bill can’t pass

Switchboard 1/29 (“House Republicans Hijacking Transportation Bill to Drill, Baby, Drill,” Natural Resources Defense Council Staff Blog, 2012, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/rperks/congress_should_not_hold_trans.html>)

With no real support in the Senate on either side of the political aisle, it’s safe to say that Rep. Boehner’s dubious drilling bill is simply a poison pill that, if passed in the House as part of a transportation bill, would prevent the House and Senate from passing legislation critical to funding transportation. The last thing our transportation system needs these days is more gridlock.¶ America does desperately need to invest in our crumbling transportation infrastructure to meet the needs of the 21st century. Therefore, it is wrong for Rep. Boehner to pollute the legislative process by pushing 19th century energy solutions. From both an environmental and economic standpoint, he should stop trying to drill the House transportation bill.

### Impacts

#### The environmental risks are not that bad

Taylor 2008 (Jerry Taylor, “Offshore Drilling Is a Risk Worth Taking,” CATO Institute, August 18, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/offshore-drilling-is-risk-worth-taking>)

You might, of course, want to argue that the environmental risks are greater than the energy rewards. For the sake of argument, let's assume that the EIA is right and 18 billion barrels of oil are at stake. And let's further assume that the oil could be sold for an average price of $100 a barrel. How likely is it that the cost of the environmental damages associated with this incremental increase in oil production would exceed $1.8 trillion? If it did not, then the environmental risks were worth taking.

## Conditions CP Competition cards

#### The recent transportation bill required brokers to have a surety bond

Szakonyi 6/29 (Mark Szakonyi, “Transport Bill Raises Forwarder, Broker Surety Bond Requirement,” The Journal of Commerce Online, 2012, <http://www.joc.com/regulation/transport-bill-raises-forwarder-broker-surety-bond-requirement>)

The newly-passed surface transportation bill requires freight brokers and forwarders to have a $75,000 surety bond, a mandate that supporters said will help prevent fraud in the industry.¶ Transportation Intermediaries Association President and CEO Bob Voltmann said the requirement will help prevent “underfunded companies” that have given the industry a “black eye.” TIA backed language in the House and Senate bill versions calling for a $100,000 surety bond requirement, but Voltmann said the slightly smaller bond minimum “is still a significant improvement.”¶ The Association of Independent Property Brokers and Agents opposed the raising of the surety bond from the existing $10,000 level, saying it would put thousands of small brokers out of business. The $75,000 surety bond requirement mirrors that required of non-vessel operating common carriers.¶ The transport bill also tightens regulations on brokers, forwarders and trust companies, and it forbids motor carriers from from re-brokering freight without proper broker authority and bond. Customs brokers and air freight forwarders will remain exempt from such changes.

#### The Buy America provision requires infrastructure projects to use products manufactured in the US

National Conference of State Legislatures 2009 (“Buy American Provisions in the American Recoverey and Reinvestment Act (ARRA),” The Forum for America’s Ideas, May 19, <http://www.ncsl.org/print/statefed/BuyAmericanGuidanceSummary.pdf>)

Infrastructure projects involving construction, alteration, maintenance or repair of public buildings ¶ or public works must be accomplished using iron, steel and manufactured goods produced in the ¶ United States. The Buy American provision is only applied in a manner consistent with United ¶ States obligations under international agreements. Exceptions can be made by the heads of federal ¶ departments or agencies when use of domestic products is: ¶ i. Inconsistent with the public interest (e.g. the EPA partial Buy American waiver [see below]); ¶ ii. Compromised because there are insufficient or reasonably unavailable quantities of domestic ¶ products or their quality is unsatisfactory; or ¶ iii. Likely to increase the cost of the overall project by 25% or more.

#### The recent transportation bill required regulators to conduct more analysis before issuing safety rules

Bloomberg 2/2 (“Transportation Bill Would Streamline Environmental Review, Sponsors Say,” 2012, <http://www.bna.com/transportation-bill-streamline-n12884907581/>)

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Feb. 2 will mark up a transportation reauthorization bill that Republican sponsors say will streamline the environmental review process for new construction projects.¶ The American Energy & Infrastructure Jobs Act (H.R. 7) would impose new timetables on the environmental review process for transportation projects and give states broader authority to exempt projects from analysis.¶ Republicans said reforming the National Environmental Policy Act review process could halve the time to review and construct transportation infrastructure projects.¶ “The average federal highway project takes 15 years from concept to completion in the U.S. because of excessive regulations,” Rep. John J. Duncan Jr. (R-Tenn.), chairman of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, said in a statement. “This is far more than any other nation. This bill will streamline the way we approach infrastructure projects by cutting red tape and reducing federal bureaucracy, all while creating millions of jobs for hard working Americans right here in the United States.”¶ Environmental and transportation groups criticized the bill for imposing artificial deadlines on the environmental review process and limiting public participation and judicial oversight of decisions.¶ House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-Fla.) introduced the five-year, $260 billion surface transportation reauthorization bill Jan. 31 (20 DEN A-12, 2/1/12).¶ In addition to streamlining the environmental review process for new construction projects, the bill would reauthorize federal hazardous materials safety programs through fiscal year 2016 and require regulators to conduct more analysis before issuing safety rules. (See related story in this issue.)¶ Bill Adds New Deadlines¶ The bill would require federal agencies conducting environmental reviews to make a final determination for the project under review within 30 days of the final environmental impact statement or other assessment being made available. Projects would be automatically approved if that determination were not made within the required 30 days.¶ Federal agencies should combine the final environmental impact statement and record of decision if the preferred alternative is being approved rather than issue them separately, according to the bill. The bill also would limit federal agencies' abilities to consider alternatives for the project.

#### The transportation bill had environmental requirements

Sierra Club 2/22 (“House Transportation Bill: Clear-Cutting Environmental Safeguards,” 2012, <http://sierraclub.typepad.com/compass/2012/02/house-transportation-bill-clear-cutting-environmental-safeguards.html>)

We’ve talked about how awful the transportation bill in the House of Representatives is – it’s an all-out attack on public transportation and opens virtually every inch of our nation’s coasts to drilling. House Speaker John Boehner made the process dirtier last week when he split the bill into three sections because he lacked the votes to pass it.¶ While the bill’s attacks on clean transportation options have been well documented, one issue that has not been as highly covered is the absolute evisceration of our bedrock environmental review laws, one of the worst moves in it being:¶ Combining unachievable deadlines for reviews with a rubber stamp – In an extreme departure from current law, the bill would require that all environmental reviews be completed within 270 days and automatically approve any project that does not achieve that arbitrary deadline – regardless of the project’s impacts on communities, the environment, or the economy. Instead of trying to find the best project for a community, this provision would rubber stamp any project as long as the sponsors ran out the clock.

## AT: privatization- climate

#### Private companies are more concerned with profits than climate change

Wordpress 5/14 (“How I Knew The Enviro/Climate Goons Are Anti-Capitalist Marxists,” 2012, <https://suyts.wordpress.com/2012/05/14/how-i-know-the-enviroclimate-goons-are-anti-capitalist-marxists/>)

“The capitalistic systems of economy follow the one principal rule: the rule of profit making. All else must bow down to this rule…The current USA is an example of a failed capitalistic state in which essential long-term goals such as prevention of climate change and limitation of human population growth are subjugated to the short-term profit motive and the principle of economic growth.”—-Jack Trevors, Editor-in-Chief of Water, Air, & Soil Pollution

## Matching Funds

#### Government still pays for almost all of the project – this guts solvency

KYTC 11 (KYTC, <http://transportation.ky.gov/bike-walk/documents/bike%20funding.pdf>, November 2011)

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)¶ 1. Congestion Mitigation and Qir Quality (CMAQ) (Administered by KYTC Office of Local¶ Programs)¶ Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) is a transportation improvement program focused on¶ reducing emissions in designated areas of the United States. Federal funding is available to¶ government agencies for projects that will contribute greatly to air quality improvements and¶ decreases in traffic congestion.¶ Who Can Apply: Federal CMAQ funds must be spent in non‐attainment or maintenance areas as¶ determined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The following counties in Kentucky are¶ eligible for CMAQ funding: Boone, Boyd, Bullitt, Campbell, Christian, Daviess, Edmonson, Fayette,¶ Jefferson, Kenton, Marshall, Oldham, and Scott. Portions of Greenup, Hancock, Lawrence, and¶ Livingston counties¶ Matching Funds: The federal share is 80 percent and the local share is 20 percent. This is a matching¶ reimbursement grant program.

## JP Stuff

### Renewable Fuels

#### Non-Unique, funding already approved

RE 6/19 Renewable Energy(THE NEWS AND INFORMATION WEBSITE FOR FUEL AND ENERGY PRODUCERS),“California Agency Approves Funding for Green Fuels Projects”,rewmag.com,6/19/2012, <http://www.rewmag.com/california-energy-commission-green-fuels-funding.aspx>

The California Energy Commission has approved funding of $23,110,015 for a host of projects that are meant to develop “green” fuels. The funding also will be used to assist in the installation of fueling stations for these new types of fuel.¶ "These awards support innovative projects that provide a crucial boost to emerging fuels and vehicle technologies," says Energy Commissioner Carla Peterman. "They support a range of efforts, from cutting-edge scientific research to the development of alternative fueling stations. They also benefit all Californians by creating jobs and improving air quality while helping to develop a diverse range of transportation options the state can rely on in the future."¶ The awards are provided through the California Energy Commission's Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, created by Assembly Bill 118. The program provides about $100 million per year to encourage the development and use of alternative and renewable fuels and new vehicle technologies. By leveraging outside funding, many of the projects also attract additional investment in clean energy technology.

### Privitization CP

Tolls create traffic diversions which increase crashes around bases, that’s devastating to readiness

Swan and Belzer 2007 Peter F. Swan(Pennsylvania State University – Harrisburg¶ School of Business Administration) Michael H. Belzer(Wayne State University ¶ College of Liberal Arts and Sciences), “Empirical Evidence of Toll Road Traffic Diversion and ¶ Implications for Highway Infrastructure Privatization”,thenewspaper.com,11/1/2007, <http://www.thenewspaper.com/rlc/docs/2008/tolldiversion.pdf>

Based on these results, one can estimate what might happen if Ohio were to ¶ privatize the Turnpike. First, we estimate the average toll for trucks in 2004 at $0.46 per ¶ mile in nominal dollars.¶ 13¶ Second, this increased toll could result in diversions from the ¶ Turnpike more than four times as great as those previously experienced in Ohio.¶ 14¶ ¶ Although calculating the safety effect of this diversion is beyond the scope of this paper, ¶ we know enough about the frequency and severity of crashes based on highway type to ¶ suggest that a substantial increase in crashes, crash severity, and fatalities in the State of ¶ Ohio probably would occur as a result of this diversion. In 2002, 23% of all fatal crashes ¶ in the United States occurred on divided highways four lanes or wider, with the ¶ remainder on a mix of highways comparable to those to which traffic was diverted ¶ (Campbell, 2005). Third, the State of Ohio and various local governments would be ¶ unable to maintain local roads without significant increases in taxes or revenue ¶ generation of some sort, forcing the state either to toll all reasonable alternative ¶ highways, restrict through trucks from these highways, or increase fuel taxes for those ¶ buying fuel anywhere in the state (a cross-subsidy that would be inefficient and ¶ unpopular politically). Fourth, there would be a deadweight loss to the economy ¶ resulting from firms (of all types) using higher cost alternatives and consequently ¶ producing less. ¶ While this analysis is limited to Ohio and the major alternative routes to I-80 ¶ through Ohio, we can generalize some lessons to other states. Although the evidence ¶ supporting the above prediction is compelling, the effects of toll increases for other ¶ highways would be different, depending on different substitute roads, different costs of ¶ diversion, and therefore a different elasticity of demand for that particular set of ¶ highways. However, the same general rules should apply. If the elasticity of demand is ¶ lower, then prices probably would rise higher before significant diversions would occur, ¶ but significant diversions would still occur. Because we know that secondary roads pose ¶ greater safety hazards, the safety cost of diversion will be substantial. Some deadweight ¶ loss and negative externalities to the economy necessarily will occur, as well, because ¶ truckers will divert to less efficient highways in spite of the cost in time, fuel, wear-andtear on the equipment, and added crash risk that insurance policies generally cannot ¶ capture. If the elasticity of demand is higher, then diversions will occur at a lower toll ¶ rate, but would still occur.

#### Doesn’t solve retention internal, generals will quit if they have to pay tolls

Barnett 2011 [Erica C. Barnett](http://publicola.com/author/erica-c-barnett/)(PubliCola’s award-winning journalist, super-sourced city hall reporter and Seattle’s No. 1 news nerd),“[Poll: People Hate Tolls, So Much They’ll Move to Avoid Them](http://publicola.com/2011/07/13/poll-people-hate-tolls-so-much-theyll-move-to-avoid-them/)”,publiccola.com,7/11/2011, <http://publicola.com/2011/07/13/poll-people-hate-tolls-so-much-theyll-move-to-avoid-them/>

According to a new SurveyUSA poll, a strong majority of King County residents say they will change their behavior to avoid tolls that would range between nothing (late at night) to $3.50 (at rush hour) on the new SR-520 bridge—including 13 percent of residents who say they’d actually be willing to move if it meant not paying to cross the bridge between Seattle and Bellevue.¶ Although the vast majority, 87 percent, said they use the 520 bridge once a week or less (and only 6 percent said they use the bridge more than three times a week), that didn’t stop drivers from saying they’d go out of their way to avoid the bridge once it’s tolled. Fully 54 percent said they’d avoid the bridge altogether, while another 25 percent said they’d reduce their use of the bridge. (Just 19 percent said tolls would have no effect on their driving behavior). Three-quarters said they’d be no more likely to use public transit once the bridge is tolled, and a similar percentage (74 percent) said they’d be no more likely to consider carpooling instead of driving alone.¶ Perhaps most surprisingly, 13 percent said they’d consider moving away from their current homes to avoid paying tolls—pretty astonishing when you consider that that’s the same percentage of survey who reported driving across the bridge twice a week or more. Sixteen percent said they’d consider changing jobs to avoid the tolls, and 75 percent said they’d consider an alternate route to avoid 520, similar to the results of an[earlier poll](http://publicola.com/2011/01/27/poll-53-percent-of-drivers-will-switch-to-i-90-to-avoid-520-tolls/). (Of those, 71 percent picked I-90 as their preferred alternative). Most (70 percent) said they opposed implementing a parallel toll on I-90. However, most people weren’t willing to deal with the time impact choosing an alternative route would actually impose: The vast majority (88 percent) said 15 minutes was too long to drive to avoid the tolls.¶ Of course, poll results are no indicator of actual future behavior: Studies, including [traffic projections](http://publicola.com/2010/11/16/tolls-on-520-as-high-as-3-80/) for 520, have shown that as alternative, non-tolled routes get clogged with traffic, people switch back to tolled routes because they’re faster and more convenient.

### CAP

#### Cap is key to solving warming, turns the k

Epstein 2012 Alex Epstein(Principal at MasterResource and Founder of the [Center for Industrial Progress](http://www.industrialprogress.net/)), “How Capitalism Makes Catastrophes Non-Catastrophic (Key data point for energy/climate debate)”,Masterresource.org,2/10/2012, <http://www.masterresource.org/2012/02/how-capitalism-makes-catastrophes-non-catastrophic/>

One of the greatest and most unheralded successes of industrial capitalism is making our climate eminently [livable](http://heartland.org/sites/all/modules/custom/heartland_migration/files/pdfs/25905.pdf).¶ The mass-production of sturdy, weather-proof buildings … the universal availability of heating and air conditioning … the ability to flee the most vicious storms through modern transportation … the protection from drought through modern irrigation … the protection from disease through modern sanitation–all of these have led to a [99 percent reduction](http://www.csccc.info/reports/report_23.pdf) in the number of climate-related deaths over the last century.¶ Given how obsessed America is about climate change (or some intellectuals/politicians want us to be), these facts should be well-known and incorporated into every discussion of industrial policy. Those who claim to care about a livable climate for the future should strive to understand the mechanisms by which industrial capitalism has already created the most livable climate in history.¶ If they did so, they would learn from such thinkers as Ayn Rand and Ludwig Von Mises how capitalism, by permitting only voluntary associations among men, unleashes the individual human mind–and that millions of such minds, free to associate and trade however they choose, will engage in stupendously intricate, collaborative planning for everything from how to make sure they can always get groceries to how to account for nearly any conceivable weather contingency.¶ Armed with an understanding of individual freedom and individual planning, the climate-concerned would suspect that any preventable problem in dealing with weather–such as widespread vulnerability to flooding–is caused by government interference in voluntary trade, such as taxpayer-financed flood insurance that encourages people to live in high-flooding areas.¶ Center for American Regress?¶ Unfortunately, an understanding of capitalism and climate is sorely lacking at the Center for America Progress, the hottest left-wing think-tank today. On its blog, [ThinkProgress](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2012/01/31/414155/climate-action-big-government/), the Center recently ran a piece by Christian Parenti entitled [Climate Action Opponents Are Ensuring the Outcome They Claim to Oppose: Big Government](http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2012/01/31/414155/climate-action-big-government/).¶ A little translation is in order. From an individualistic perspective, “climate action” refers to the actions that free citizens take to make their climate as livable as possible–the kinds of actions that decreased climate vulnerability 99% in the last century.¶ But from the collectivist, statist perspective of CAP, “Climate Action” refers to dramatic caps on energy generated from hydrocarbons–the energy source that runs the industrial capitalist system that has increased our life expectancy from 30 to 80 years.¶ How will banning the vast majority of modern energy production help us oppose “Big Government”? Because otherwise we would face so many catastrophic storms, the article argues, that the government would necessarily become a disaster-recovery Leviathan.¶ After all, Mr. Parenti takes as given, government is the only entity that can adapt to storms: “To adapt to climate change will mean coming together on a large scale and mobilizing society’s full range of resources. In other words, Big Storms require Big Government.”¶ Big Storms Require Limited Government¶ In fact, the larger-scale a problem, the more freedom is essential. As economist George Reisman brilliantly explains in his [landmark essay](http://georgereismansblog.blogspot.com/2007/05/global-warming-is-not-threat-but.html)on global warming economics,¶ Even if global warming is a fact, the free citizens of an industrial civilization will have no great difficulty in coping with it—that is, of course, if their ability to use energy and to produce is not crippled by the environmental movement and by government controls otherwise inspired. The seeming difficulties of coping with global warming, or any other large-scale change, arise only when the problem is viewed from the perspective of government central planners.¶ It would be too great a problem for government bureaucrats to handle (as is the production even of an adequate supply of wheat or nails, as the experience of the whole socialist world has so eloquently shown). But it would certainly not be too great a problem for tens and hundreds of millions of free, thinking individuals living under capitalism to solve. It would be solved by means of each individual

being free to decide how best to cope with the particular aspects of global warming that affected him.¶ Individuals would decide, on the basis of profit-and-loss calculations, what changes they needed to make in their businesses and in their personal lives, in order best to adjust to the situation. They would decide where it was now relatively more desirable to own land, locate farms and businesses, and live and work, and where it was relatively less desirable, and what new comparative advantages each location had for the production of which goods. Factories, stores, and houses all need replacement sooner or later. In the face of a change in the relative desirability of different locations, the pattern of replacement would be different. Perhaps some replacements would have to be made sooner than otherwise. To be sure, some land values would fall and others would rise. Whatever happened, individuals would respond in a way that minimized their losses and maximized their possible gains. The essential thing they would require is the freedom to serve their self-interests by buying land and moving their businesses to the areas rendered relatively more attractive, and the freedom to seek employment and buy or rent housing in those areas.¶ Given this freedom, the totality of the problem would be overcome. This is because, under capitalism, the actions of the individuals, and the thinking and planning behind those actions, are coordinated and harmonized by the price system (as many former central planners of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union have come to learn). As a result, the problem would be solved in exactly the same way that tens and hundreds of millions of free individuals have solved greater problems than global warming, such as redesigning the economic system to deal with the replacement of the horse by the automobile, the settlement of the American West, and the release of the far greater part of the labor of the economic system from agriculture to industry.¶ Conclusion¶ We should be thankful that previous generations were not governed by the “ThinkProgress” philosophy of regarding government coercion as the solution to future changes, whether economic or environmental. Had they followed the near religious state-worship of Center for American Progress, we would have had the equivalent of Barack Obama or Christian Parenti dictating to millions of Americans when, how, or if they could transition to automobiles or go West or leave their farms. If we do indeed face worse weather ahead, then nothing is more important in preparing than more industry and more freedom.

### Libertarianism

#### Libertarianism destroys the environment

Partridge 1997 Ernest Partridge(Mansfield College, Oxford University),“With Liberty for Some”,gadfly.igc.org,“An earlier version presented at a conference of the Russian Chapter of the
International Society for Environmental Economics,
Novgorod, Russia, June 30 - July 4, 1997” <http://gadfly.igc.org/papers/liberty.htm>

The Privatization Ploy. Hardin endorses the Liberal’s remedy: "mutual coercion, mutually agreed upon" - which means, primarily, regulation and control by a legitimate democratic government. However, as we have seen, government interference is anathema to the libertarians. Instead, they propose privatization and legal compensation for damages. We will consider the latter remedy, "courts and torts," shortly. How plausible, then, is the privatization remedy? In many cases, privatization is clearly the ideal remedy for the commons problem. When, in the American West, the common "open range" was fenced and privatized, the costs of over-exploitation fell upon the owners. (In the technical language of economics, the previous "externalities" were "internalized"). Clearly it then became economically prudent for the owners to protect their "land capital" to assure sustainable income. Recent Russian history confirms this conclusion: as the Soviet era came to a close, the peasants' private lots were consistently far more productive than were the collective farms. The libertarian's error resides in their proposal that privatization, which is clearly the correct solution for some commons problems, is to be prescribed for all commons problems. Like Maslow's carpenter, libertarians believe that all commons problems can be fixed with the "hammer" of privatization. Accordingly, they propose the abolition of all national parks, and the privatization of all public lands and utilities, including roads and airports -- everything, that is, except the military, the police and the courts. Presumably, this means that such universal "commonses" as the atmosphere and the oceans are to be carved up and sold to the highest bidder. Not even wildlife is to be allowed to remain free and unowned. Is this an unfair caricature of the libertarian position? Consider the argument of Robert J. Smith who suggests that the absence of privatization explains "why the buffalo nearly vanished, but not the Hereford; ... why the common salmon fisheries of the United States are overfished, but not the private salmon streams of Europe." (32) His solution? "We should explore the possibilities of extending ownership of native game animals and wildlife to property owners." (47). Critics of libertarianism find no end of amusement pointing out the inadequacies of the libertarians' "hammer." How, for example, are we to "privatize" the whaling industry? Are we to "brand" the whales, to validate the ownership of each? And what if "my whale" feeds on "your krill,” which you purchased (from whom?) to feed "your whales”? What courts must we set up to assess damages? What agency will be set up to collect the facts germane to the case, and how is it to be financed? Furthermore, the privatization of oceanic resources suggests that "territories" of ocean will have to be established, which means the end of the centuries-old convention of non-sovereignty of the seas. What country will be the first to claim the North Atlantic, along with the Gulf Stream? If the United States, will Great Britain and Scandinavia then have to pay the US for the use of the Gulf Stream's climatic services? Will the nations of the world accede to this "sea grab" without protest? The military implications are awesome. If we privatize wildlife, then will the owner of the wild insects that pollinate my orchard be entitled to charge me for this service? If someone's flock of migrating birds soils my clothing or pollutes my swimming pool, how am I to locate the responsible owner? The mind boggles. There is worse to come: can we conceivably "privatize" the atmosphere, and with it the hydrological cycle? If so, then who is liable for El Nino or Hurricane Katrina? If I own a "piece" of the atmosphere, is this a defined space, or is it the migrating clouds and molecules within. How is the "owner" to make his claim? Total privatization of the earth is a fantasy -- a reductio ad absurdum, charitably supplied to the critics by the libertarians themselves. The atmosphere, the seas, wildlife, and innumerable ecological services both known and undiscovered, are now and will forever be the "common property" of mankind, not to mention the other species of the earth. And since "privatization" of land and resources can never be the total and final solution to the commons problem, there remains the libertarians' alternative proposal: legal compensation for invasion of property. If that is found to fail, then governmental regulation, endorsed by the liberals and detested by the libertarians, may be the only remaining solution to "the tragedy of the commons."

### Virrilio

#### Technological innovation is vital to humanities livelihood, reduces risk of potential hazards, has positive impacts for the poor and is key to helping farmers overcome climate change

Clements and Haggar 2011 Rebecca Clements(Practical Action Latin America) Jeremy Haggar(University of Greenwich) Alicia Quezada (Practical Action Latin America) Juan Torres(Practical Action Latin America),“Technologies for

Climate Change Adaptation”,tech-action.org,8/2011,<http://tech-action.org/Guidebooks/TNA_Guidebook_AdaptationAgriculture.pdf>

Technology is a vital contributor to people’s livelihoods. It includes physical infrastructure, machinery ¶ and equipment (hardware), knowledge and skills (software) and the capacity to organise and use all of ¶ these (orgware); but also the biological technology with which farmers produce. Biological technology ¶ complemented with advances in crop nutrition and crop protection (such as pesticides), equipment ¶ (hardware) and knowledge (software), have been the primary driver of increased productivity in agriculture.¶ Based on this, it is important to have a people-focused or people-centred definition of technology. ¶ Improvements to technologies can have many positive impacts for poor people’s livelihoods. They can ¶ lower costs, for example labour saving devices such as a draught plough reduce the labour costs required ¶ with hand tools. They can improve quality and output, e.g. improved seeds or cultivation techniques. They ¶ can also help people to reach new markets, for example mobile phone or the internet providing access ¶ to market information. Technologies can also be employed to reduce risks. They can protect people or ¶ assets from potential hazards, for example raised housing or dams can offer protection from floods, and 15¶ vaccinations can protect people and animals from health hazards. They can also be employed to enhance ¶ the early warning of hazards, and used in response activities to reduce hazard impact, for example rescue ¶ boats and life jackets. ¶ This guidebook defines the term technology in a broad sense, including hardware, software and orgware. ¶ These types of technologies complement the biological technology that producers manage.¶ • Hard technologies (hardware) refer to the tangible aspects such as the manufactured objects, the ¶ machinery, the equipment and tools required to produce goods or services. For example, a sprinkler ¶ irrigation system¶ • Soft technologies (software) refer to the processes associated with the production and use of the ¶ hardware, including know-how (such as manuals and skills), experiences and practices (such as ¶ agricultural, management, cooking and behavioural practices). Soft technologies also encompass ¶ elements of awareness-raising, including education and training. For example, capacity building in ¶ animal health¶ • Organisational technologies (orgware) refer to the institutional framework, or organisation, ¶ involved in the adoption and diffusion process of a new technology. Orgware relates to ownership ¶ and institutional arrangements of the community/organisation where the technology will be used. An ¶ example is the establishment of Water User Boards.¶ Appropriate technologies can help farmers and other producers to overcome the physical and environmental ¶ constraints of exposed areas, improve productivity and incomes, and help them to adapt to changes in the ¶ climate. Appropriate technologies are those which can be managed and maintained by them over the long ¶ term, and which integrate environmental, economic and social sustainability principles. Whether modern ¶ or traditional, local or introduced, if producers have access to a wider choice of appropriate technology ¶ options, they are able to innovate and improve their practices. The capacity to differentiate and decide ¶ between technologies is also necessary

#### Climate change destroys agriculture production, we won’t have food that’s the biggest accident

Clements and Haggar 2011 Rebecca Clements(Practical Action Latin America) Jeremy Haggar(University of Greenwich) Alicia Quezada (Practical Action Latin America) Juan Torres(Practical Action Latin America),“Technologies for

Climate Change Adaptation”,tech-action.org,8/2011,<http://tech-action.org/Guidebooks/TNA_Guidebook_AdaptationAgriculture.pdf>

Latin America¶ Agricultural activity is highly sensitive to climate change, largely because it depends on biodiversity and ¶ environmental conditions. Sufficient freshwater supplies, fertile soil, the right balance of predators and ¶ pollinators, air temperature and average weather conditions all contribute to maintaining agricultural ¶ productivity. As agriculture depends directly on environmental conditions, climate change impacts on ¶ agriculture are becoming increasingly evident. Changes in rainfall cycles are impacting on agricultural yields ¶ as water availability is decreasing in already arid zones and water excesses (floods) are being experienced ¶ in other areas. A warmer climate with changes in patterns of drought or increased precipitation, will affect ¶ agricultural production in large parts of Latin America, Asia and Africa. Some agricultural land ,may no ¶ longer be cultivatable, growing seasons will change and productivity will decrease, particularly in Africa. In ¶ the middle and high latitudes of the northern, hemisphere, longer growing seasons could have a positive ¶ effect on crop yields (where rainfall is not negatively affected).¶ Small-scale farmers are among the first to feel the impacts of climate change because of their greater ¶ dependence on the natural environment. Extreme climate variability (drought, floods and frost) can ¶ destroy the economies and welfare of poor rural families because they lack technologies, social protection ¶ mechanisms (such as benefits, insurance and savings) and adequate protection for their crops and animals. Changing amounts and patterns of precipitation is already causing farmers to struggle. It is very likely that ¶ precipitation in high latitudes will increase and it is likely that in most sub-tropical regions precipitation will ¶ decrease in line with recently observed trends; with a high degree of confidence it is projected that by midcentury, annual river runoff and water availability will increase at high latitudes (and in some wet tropical ¶ areas) and decrease in some dry regions at mid-latitudes and in the tropics

### Labor K

#### The perm solves best, a strong military is key U.S. dollar hegemony

 MOC 2012 Military of Chine Force Comment(Chinese Military Program),“Putin under a six-year presidential term there will be action”,9abc.net,7/29/2012, <http://www.9abc.net/archives/82514>

Putin’s former Soviet-era KGB agent, to deeply understand the collapse of the Soviet Union the throes of the Russian nation. Yeltsin accepted the West’s “shock therapy”, but found that the West did not give Russia to bring revival. Therefore, leaves from the political arena when Putin as his successor. Putin bluntly said to restore Russia’s great power status. The author believes that Putin want to restore Russia’s great power status, mainly shot from the following aspects: First, recovery in the Big Brother in the CIS countries. The present economic structure of Russia’s energy exports and military exports. This pattern is the Soviet-era emphasis on heavy industry contempt light industry, but also the deliberate transformation of the collapse of the Soviet Union and Western. Only Russia into an energy export-oriented countries, in order to firmly limit the rise of Russia. Despite the vast Russian demobilization, export gas and oil is not high-end industries, but not a sustainable industry. Russia’s total resources sold out that day. Russia’s energy export market is the face of Europe, a military is still the north is about the main political but gradually with the EU as the main areas will not allow Russia to bargain asking price of the slightest advantage. Second, Russia’s military-industrial complex also benefited from a strong technical foundation established by the Soviet era. After the collapse of the Soviet Union to join the national disintegration of Russia’s military system is also facing the market erosion and downstream missing even some areas of complete loss of the embarrassing situation of ownership. These years, Russia mainly rely on the sale to the traditional friendship with the detached state-of-the-art products and even technology to maintain the military-industrial complex development. Relying solely on energy exports in exchange for the funds can only flow field of people ‘s livelihood, only to continue to enter the international arms markets to make Russia’s military heroes twilight towards revitalized. Russia’s international status is also fall quickly. Stretched domestic economic ups and downs of oil prices when the good times and bad, it is impossible to let Putin have a lot of money to engage in foreign aid.¶ former allies with the camp most of the backward Europe and the United States, a few relations with Russia in recent addition to selling the resources and the Soviet military technology heritage, there is no other way out of the country. Therefore, the homogenization of the competitive relationship makes this kind of political alliance between some unstable changes. For example, the first issue of the Iraq war, on the question of Libya, even on Iran, Russia at a crucial moment give up. Russia in the future if you want revival to revive its international status, it is necessary to restore a strong influence on the CIS countries. Return to power, Putin called for the CIS countries to strengthen economic cooperation, and even called for the creation of the euro as a unified monetary institutions. This can be seen that the urgency of Russia in the recovery of the Commonwealth of Independent States Big Brother issues.¶ in conjunction with China to jointly deal with the siege of the U.S. and Europe. After the economic crisis, America’s strength is on the decline, the performance of the compression of military spending and debt crisis. The U.S. economy is also a long illness refractory, fiscal imbalance, only by the crumbling U.S. dollar hegemony engage in monetary quantitative easing to slow the national bankruptcy. The hegemony of the dollar is supported by the U.S. military strength. Through the tough times, the United States has taken to return to Asia’s strategic initiative of containment of China in the Middle East, the Arab Spring burn the Sino-Russian sphere of influence, deterioration of Russia in the external layout. The United States is now by the South China Sea and Syria, Iran’s attempt to starve the Sino-Russian strategic attack, complete is the attack on behalf of defense posture. However, the Sino-Russian cooperation was not in depth. If China and Russia have a clear understanding of the U.S. siege, they should be combined with to make more strategic counterattack. For example, Russia to help China to appease India and Vietnam, and China in energy procurement and economic help Russia to expand its influence in the CIS countries. There is a large space for cooperation between the two countries in the treatment of Japanese militarism revival. Russia and combination rule will not be divided by Europe and the United States.¶ is to strengthen the Arctic mainland’s military and economic existence. Russia looks like a strong expansion of new land, with global warming, the Arctic ice is melting of a large area, the land has been demonstrated, most likely busy waterway. Russia’s Arctic strategy is positive, is unmanning expedition. Of course, other countries in the Arctic have not been idle. The United States, Canada and Norway have also announced that parts of the Arctic “sovereignty”. Arctic dispute, the next most likely to take the initiative to detonate or was detonated. Europe and the United States to some extent the evolution of the Syrian government, is to pin down the expansion of Russia in the Arctic and the Pacific. But Russia will not bow to outside pressure, Syria’s Mediterranean military bases and the Arctic, Russia will not yield.

#### U.S. dollar hegemony key to profitability, your evidence sites that as the “major factor in labor exploitation”

 Slechta 2012 Ondrej Slechta(prolific political commentator and analyst specialising in international security),“[Embargo on Iranian oil: A move to save the US Dollar hegemony](http://www.europeanstrategist.eu/2012/02/embargo-on-iranian-oil-a-move-to-save-the-us-dollar-hegemony/)”,Europeanstrategist.com,2/2/2012, <http://www.europeanstrategist.eu/2012/02/embargo-on-iranian-oil-a-move-to-save-the-us-dollar-hegemony/>

Iran will now have to sell to these countries for a lower price. Higher prices will be especially beneficial to Saudi Arabia, which needs expensive oil in order to have sufficient funds for bribing its inhabitans, whose uprising would cause a true Arab spring and large problems to the United States, which are publicly supported by the Saudi regime that also allows them to build strategic military bases on its soil.¶ What really bothers the Americans¶ According to the treaty between the US and Saudi Arabia from the early 70s, the trading in oil with OPEC is concluded exclusively in US dollars (the famous term „petrodollars“ emerged as the result of the treaty). It is quite simple, really: if you ensure that oil will be traded in US dollars only, the countries needing oil for their economy’s development will be forced to obtain your currency. And this is exactly the reason why the American FED can today print dollar banknotes on big scale.¶ In the 30 years of functioning of the petrodollar system, the US has run a semi-monetarist trade regime, which has in practice entailed that in exchange for its goods, a country in question has received printed dollars. Besides being highly profitable to the US, the country’s foreign trade could prioritise import over export, leading to a decreased demand for the production of export goods.¶ This model could predominate only as long as the international political standing of the United States was unshakeable. But as the importance of new seats of power of the East and South increases, the appetite for a new, more just global ordering grows too. Emerging economies that have huge consumption of oil suddenly feel that dollar is detrimental to their growth and want to get rid of it. On the other hand, for the US a breakthrough of euro, juan or yen as the means of exchange would entail that they would have to quickly balance out their trade deficit – and for the largest economic entity in the world this would mean a several years long, painful transition.¶ When mentioning Iran it is useful to remember the fate of its Iraqi neighbour (indeed, among other countries). Since it is highly interesting that the accusation that Iraq own weapons of mass destruction came few months after Saddam Hussein announced that he will sell oil exclusively in euro. The bizarre leader of Libya, Muammar Kaddafi, was on friendly terms with Western politicians for years and no one was concerned too much by repressions against opposition – not until the moment when he announced the plan to create a pan-African oil trading regime, which hoped to force out the US dollar by creating the “African denari”.¶ In the past, Iran tried to weaken the dollar’s influence on trade and minimise the dollar transactions made for its oil, and at the end of 2008 it completely succeeded thanks to the founding of the Iranian oil commodity exchange. Japan pays for oil in yens, while others in euro.¶ To facilitate transactions for oil exports to India, Iran recently concluded a treaty with two important Indian banks. And in order to avoid any disputes with the US, Iran has chosen banks that have no direct engagement with the United States. Russian Gazprombank is expected to play the role of an intermediary. Latest information so far indicate that India has agreed to this unprecedented deal and thus became the first recipeint of Iranian oil who will pay for the supply in gold instead of by dollar.¶ If joined by China, this initiative will have yet unforeseeable consequences. Gold once again starts to fulfill the role of currency and the United States watch this development with unease. Since more than by the alleged Iranian nuclear programme, they are threatened by a collapse of the dollar’s hegemony. The explanation for the present war drumming and dispatching of flotillas to the Persian Gulf can thus also be an effort to get rid of the weakest link on the ‘anti-dollar front’ that would send to Russia and China a first, but resounding warning signal.

## NEPA solves environment

The process of NEPA generates public education and discussion, spillover to better overall policymaking and public awareness of the environment

Wexler 8 [Lesley, Professor of Law – Florida State University and Former Debater – University of Michigan, “Human Rights Impact Assessments: An Immigration Case Study”, Georgetown Immigration Law Journal, 22 Geo. Immigr. L.J. 285, Winter, Lexis]

In theory, review processes such as impact assessments and impact statements serve several important functions. Most obviously, these review processes generate information to educate both the public and policymakers. Supporters of the NEPA suggest that its combination of "information, transparency, and political accountability creates powerful pressures on agency decision-makers to avoid the most environmentally damaging courses of action, and to mitigate environmental harms when it is cost effective to do so." n65 The information created by review processes encourages decision-makers to reject or modify some proposed actions either because (a) these decision-makers' rational, technocratic values allow them to use the new information to come to a better decision or (b) these decision-makers' desire to avoid the ensuing public and interest group pressure encourages them to mitigate potential impacts. n66 The administrative or political burden of the review process may also deter the consideration or alter the contents of proposals likely to be subject to an extensive, contested impact statement. Outside of its influence on a particular government action, the cumulative effect of a review process helps inform the larger policy and public debate about an issue area by providing clear goals and creating easily identifiable and objective metrics to measure the attainment of those goals. n67 The information generated and decisions made can also guide the behavior of outside actors such as corporations and other governments. n68

Continued environmental damage leads to extinction

Diner 94, Major, 94 (Major David N.; Instructor, Administrative and Civil Law Division, The Judge Advocate General's School, United States Army) "The Army and the Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom?" 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161l/n

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." 79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

## Rahul

#### Even if our mechanism is corrupt we can still take beneficial actions –anything else makes the alt fail

**Cole, 3-27-11,**Juan, American scholar, public intellectual, and historian of the modern Middle East and South Asia. He is Richard P. Mitchell Collegiate Professor of History at the University of Michigan. “An Open Letter to the Left on Libya,”<http://www.juancole.com/>, KHaze

I would like to urge the Left to learn to chew gum and walk at the same time. It is possible to reason our way through, on a case-by-case basis, to an ethical progressive positionthat supports the ordinary folk in their travails in places like Libya. If we just don’t care if the people of Benghazi are subjected to murder and repression on a vast scale, we aren’t people of the Left. We should avoid making ‘foreign intervention’ an absolute taboo the way the Right makes abortion an absolute taboo if doing so makes us heartless (inflexible a priori positions often lead to heartlessness). It is now easy to forget that Winston Churchill held absolutely odious positions from a Left point of view and was an insufferable colonialist who opposed letting India go in 1947. His writings are full of racial stereotypes that are deeply offensive when read today. Some of his interventions were nevertheless noble and were almost universally supported by the Left of his day. The UN allies now rolling back Qaddafi are doing a good thing, whatever you think of some of their individual leaders.

**We control uniqueness, war is declining due to globalization—even if wars still happen it’s not because of capitalism**

**Griswold, Masters in economics, 7**—director of the Center for Trade Policy at CATO. He has testified before House and Senate committees and federal agencies on a range of trade and immigration issues. Former editorial page editor of the Colorado Springs Gazette and a congressional press secretary. BA in journalism, U Wisconsin. Diploma in economics and master’s in Politics of the World economy, London School of Economics. (Daniel, “Trade, Democracy and Peace: The Virtuous Cycle,” 20 April 2007,<http://www.freetrade.org/node/681>)

The good news does not stop there. Buried beneath the daily stories about suicide bombings and insurgency movements is an underappreciated but encouraging fact: **The world has somehowbecome a more peaceful place.**  A little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story a while back reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." In 2006, a survey by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute found that the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century. Since the early 1990s, **ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 17, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries**. The Institute's latest report found that 2005 marked the second year in a row that no two nations were at war with one another. What a remarkable and wonderful fact.  **The death toll from war has also been falling**. According to the Associated Press report, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number."Current estimates of people killed by war are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War.  Many causes lie behind the good news--the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them--but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author argued in a forgettable book, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war. I would argue that free trade and globalization have promoted peace in three main ways.  First, as I argued a moment ago, **trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy,** and democracies tend not to pick fights with each other. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies--a record high. Some studies have cast doubt on the idea that democracies are less likely to fight wars. While it's true that democracies rarely if ever war with each other, it is not such a rare occurrence for democracies to engage in wars with non-democracies. We can still hope that has more countries turn to democracy, there will be fewer provocations for war by non-democracies.  A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by promoting more economic integration**. As national economies become more intertwined with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out.** War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war.  The 2005 Economic Freedom of the World Report contains an insightful chapter on "Economic Freedom and Peace" by Dr. Erik Gartzke, a professor of political science at Columbia University. Dr. Gartzke compares the propensity of countries to engage in wars and their level of economic freedom and concludes that economic freedom, including the freedom to trade, significantly decreases the probability that a country will experience a military dispute with another country. Through econometric analysis**, he found that, "Making economies freer translates into making countries more peaceful. At the extremes, the least free states are about 14 times as conflict prone as the most free**."  By the way, Dr. Gartzke's analysis found that economic freedom was a far more important variable in determining a countries propensity to go to war than democracy.  A third reason why free trade promotes peace is because it allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than conquest of territory and resources. As economies develop, wealth is increasingly measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Such assets cannot be easily seized by armies. In contrast, hard assets such as minerals and farmland are becoming relatively less important in a high-tech, service economy. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. In short, globalization and the development it has spurred have rendered the spoils of war less valuable.  Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. Any relationship involving human beings will be messy and non-linier. There will always be exceptions and outliers in such complex relationships involving economies and governments. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. The global trends we've witnessed in the spread of trade, democracy and peace tend to reinforce each other in a grand and virtuous cycle. **As trade and development encourage more representative government, those governments provide more predictability and incremental reform, creating a better climate for trade and investment to flourish.** And **as the spread of trade and democracy foster peace, the decline of war creates a more hospitable environment for trade and economic growth and political stability**.  We can see this virtuous cycle at work in the world today. The European Union just celebrated its 50th birthday. For many of the same non-economic reasons that motivated the founders of the GATT, the original members of the European community hoped to build a more sturdy foundation for peace. Out of the ashes of World War II, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable.  In East Asia, the extensive and growing economic ties among Mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping to keep the peace. China's communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its "renegade province," but the economic cost to their economy would be staggering and could provoke a backlash among its citizens. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war.  In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade *A*greement with the United States. As the Stockholm Institute reported in its 2005 Yearbook, "Since the 1980s, the introduction of a more open economic model in most states of the Latin American and Caribbean region has been accompanied by the growth of new regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and a reduction in intra-state conflicts***."  Much of the political violence that remains in the world today is concentrated in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa--the two regions of the world that are the least integrated into the global economy***. Efforts to bring peace to those regions must include lowering their high barriers to trade, foreign investment, and entrepreneurship.



**Capitalism cannot be subverted – the comfort it provides prevent even the most oppressed from joining a movement against it.**Adrian**Johnston**, Interdisciplinary Research Fellow in Psychoanalysis at Emory University, **2004** ("The Cynic's Fetish," Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture & Society, Dec 2004 v9 i3 p259(25), Infotrac)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Zizek's recent writings isn't a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Zizek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance (Zizek, 2001d, pp 22-23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Zizek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a fonn of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of "magic," that is, the belief in money's social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance's powers. The "external" obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, "internally" believe in it--capitalism's life-blood, money, issimply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others' belief in the socio­performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism's frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic's fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism., makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Zizek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the "desert of the real"): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full  well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction ("Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth?  I choose fetishism").

BAB’s will default

Wall Street Journal 2010 (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704648604575621062239887650.html)

But the BAB program hasn't been the unqualified success its advocates claim. While the original municipal bond crisis in late 2008 was attributed to the meltdown of other credit markets, it has since become clear that investors retreated from municipal debt as much because of the poor fiscal practices of many local governments. BABs have only contributed to the problem, increasing state and local debt even when the market has signaled that it considered some municipal borrowers overextended. One sure signal has been the sharp rise in the cost for investors to insure against default. In June, the price of a contract protecting an investor from a default by Illinois on its bonds rose to a record high of $309,100 on $10 million of debt over five years, according to CMA Datavision. The national average for states is $190,000 per $10 million in debt. At that point, Illinois surpassed California as the worst credit risk among U.S. states. A more telling signal was that, based on the cost of insurance contracts, CMA Datavision listed both states in June among the 10 biggest government default risks in the world. Illinois was at greater risk of default than Iraq. Yet thanks to the BAB subsidy, Illinois was still able to borrow some $300 million in bonds by offering a 7.1% interest rate. Meanwhile, investors are realizing that states and localities face long-term costs in addition to their muni debt, especially retirement obligations. Joshua Rauh of Northwestern University and Robert Novy-Marx of the University of Rochester assess the 50 states' unfunded pension bill at $3 trillion, and they say that the municipal tab for pensions could reach $500 billion. That is on top of some $2.8 trillion in outstanding state and local borrowing, according to the Federal Reserve. The Securities and Exchange Commission drew an explicit link between pension liabilities and municipal debt in August, when it charged New Jersey with fraud in its municipal bond offerings. The SEC cited the state for not revealing the true extent of its pension woes in its bond offerings—a clear indication the agency thinks growing pension debt may impede the ability of some states to meet other obligations. The governments that have made the most use of BABs have been those with the greatest fiscal problems.

#### Conservatives hate BABs – perceived as wasteful spending

Eizenga and Hanlon, 11 - Eizenga is a Policy Analyst with the Economic Policy team at the Center for American Progress AND Hanlon is the Director of Fiscal Reform for CAP’s Doing What Works project (Jordan Eizenga and Seth Hanlon, April 2011 “Bring Back BABs A Proposal to Strengthen the Municipal Bond Market with Build America Bonds” http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/build\_america\_bonds.pdf)//KX

The backlash against Build America Bonds

The Build America Bonds program provides federal payments to state and local governments to offset borrowing costs. Those subsidy payments appear as an outlay in the federal budget. Tax-exempt bonds, in contrast, involve no federal outlay because the equivalent government subsidy is delivered as a tax expenditure—or forfeited revenue. Since the Build America Bonds program generates a cost on the spending side of the ledger, it has drawn criticism from conservatives with an ideological aversion to spending.

Sen. Charles Grassley (R-IA) said the Build America Bonds program “increases the size of the already bloated federal government because it takes what used to be a tax-cutting program, namely, [tax-exempt] municipal bonds, and converts that into Build America Bonds.” Columnist David Reilly of The Wall Street Journal called the bonds a state budget “bailout” that should be scrapped.

#### BABs fail --- hurts economy and states and costs jobs

Maloney, 11 [CJ, Author, Blogger, Liberty and Power on the History News Network, DailyKos, April 22, <http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2011/04/22/good_riddance_to_build_america_bonds_98979.html>, “Good Riddance to Build America Bonds”, Accessed July 9, //SH]

The mark of sound economic thinking is that one take into account also what is not seen, and by using deductive reasoning we can see that the BABs program did not "create" jobs, it merely moved them around. Since, as Frederick Engels told us in his The Role of Force In History "force, however, cannot make any money; at most it can only take away money that has already been made." The "public" funds used to power the BABs program must, by necessity, have first been taken out of private hands. For every union job "created" by the BABs program, there was at least one private sector job taken away elsewhere. At best it was a wash, and, judging by the historical inefficiency of government run programs, it likely cost more jobs than it created. BAB type programs have been tried before, without success, to "stimulate" an economy. Not surprising (as President Obama greatly admires FDR) infrastructure programs flourished under the New Deal, all to no avail. By 1939, Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau confided to his diary, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work...we have never made good on our promises. I say after eight years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started. And enormous debt to boot." In a recent column in the Wall Street Journal David Reilly wrote, "Temporary government programs hatched during a crisis can easily become permanent. That is the danger with Build America Bonds." He is correct. The program was barely a year old when President Obama was already floating the idea of making it permanent.

 The New Deal was a series of "emergency" programs made permanent, and many exist to this day still. Do we need yet another one? BABs were a subsidy, and like all subsidies they distorted the market, pushed scarce capital where it otherwise would not have gone, and (in its worst effect) created a dependent relationship where none should ever exist. We should never lose sight over something more important than the mere dollars and cents of this issue - we need to take into account the effects of the BABs program on the political structure of our nation. For our safety we were specifically designed as a republic, each individual state, sovereign in its own right, is tasked to be a check on federal power. How much of a check can they be, though, when they are constantly sending emissaries to D.C., hat in hand, begging for money? For that reason alone, I am relieved that the Build America Bonds program has been relegated to history's dustbin, and I hope that's where it will stay.

Economic decline causes protectionism and war – their defense doesn’t assume accompanying shifts in global power.

Royal 10 – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crisis could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavious of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations, However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crisis could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. P. 89) Economic decline has been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increase incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlated economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crisis and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

The alt increases the risk of their turns

Rosen 2003, Stephen, “An Empire, If You Can Keep It,” National Interest, Spring

Rather than wrestle with such difficult and unpleasant problems, the United States could give up the imperial mission, or pretensions to it, now. This would essentially mean the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from the Middle East, Europe and mainland Asia. It may be that all other peoples, without significant exception, will then turn to their own affairs and leave the United States alone. But those who are hostile to us might remain hostile, and be much less afraid of the United States after such a withdrawal. Current friends would feel less secure and, in the most probable post-imperial world, would revert to the logic of self-help in which all states do what they must to protect themselves. This would imply the relatively rapid acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Iran, Iraq and perhaps Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Indonesia and others. Constraints on the acquisition of biological weapons would be even weaker than they are today. Major regional arms races would also b e very likely throughout Asia and the Middle East. This would not be a pleasant world for Americans, or anyone else. It is difficult to guess what the costs of such a world would be to the United States. They would probably not put the end of the United States in prospect, but they would not be small. If the logic of American empire is unappealing, it is not at all clear that the alternatives are that much more attractive.

No link- modernity

Lieber 9 (Robert J, Professor of Government at Georgetown University, “Persistent primacy and the future of the American era”, International Politics (2009) 46, 119–139. doi:10.1057/ip.2008.44)

There is ample reason to identify the deep causes of radical jihadism and its manifestations of apocalyptic nihilism as a product of the failure to cope successfully with the challenges of modernity and globalization as well as the humiliation experienced, especially by parts of the Arab-Muslim world, over the past four centuries. These reactions have been expressed at both individual and societal levels. For example, in an implied reference to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and thus the end of the Muslim Caliphate which had extended back some thirteen centuries to the time of the Prophet, Osama bin Laden’s October 2001 video invoked eighty years of Muslim “humiliation” and “degradation” at the hands of the West. 11 In turn, the 2002 UN Arab Human Development Report has described the contemporary Arab world as afflicted by profound deficits in freedom, in empowerment of women, and in knowledge and information, and in political freedom. These failures have, in some cases, been amplified by the experiences of individuals who have become detached from one world and yet have been unable to integrate into another. 12 It is noteworthy too that the 9/11 attacks took place prior to the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, and that terrorist attacks against American targets abroad were carried out in 1990s when the Israel-Arab peace process seemed to be making real progress. Suicide terrorism elsewhere has had little or nothing to do with “occupation” by the West or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Attacks in Bali, Istanbul, Jakarta, Tunisia, Casablanca, Amman, the murder of the Dutch film-maker Theo Van Gogh, the effort to blow up the Indian parliament, the destruction of the Shiite golden dome mosque in Samara, deadly Sunni-Shiite violence in Iraq, mass casualty attacks on public transportation in London and trains in Madrid, and numerous interrupted plots are among multiple indications not only of the wider threat posed by radical jihadism, but of a deep-seated and fundamental rage against modernity.

Terrorists couldn’t use nuclear weapons even if they got them.

Kamp, 96 (Karl-Heinz, Head of the Foreign and Security Policy Section of the Konrad-Adenhauer Foundation, July 1996, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, p.30)

The security of nuclear weapons and their protection against abuse or unauthorized use are guaranteed by extensive measures by every current member of the nuclear club. The idea that any state – rogue nation or not – would hand over the control of nuclear weapons to criminals or religious zealots is nearly inconceivable. […] Even if a terrorist organization managed – perhaps by working with illegal arms dealers – to obtain a complete nuclear weapon from, say, ex-Soviet stocks it could not necessarily detonate that weapon. Apart from their size and the difficulty of transporting them, nuclear weapons have a series of built-in technical and security safeguards, including self-destruct mechanisms that be overridden only by a small and specially trained circle of technicians. […] For terrorist organizations, the problems of production and detonation of nuclear explosive devices represents a threshold that, while it may have been lowered by the uncontrolled movement of some nuclear capabilities from the former Soviet Union, is still extremely difficult to cross.

4. No impact- perceived weakness of international standards leads to local justice systems which solve

Donnelly, 2003, Jack, PhD in Political Science from the University of California at Berkeley, “Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice”, Google Books, p.137-138, KH

In addition, the extreme sensitivity of human rights practices makes the very subject intensely threatening to many states. National human rights practices often would be a matter for considerable embarrassment should they be subject to full international scrutiny. In a number of cases, such as Iraq, North Korea, Zimbabwe, and Cuba, compliance with international human rights standards would mean a removal of those in power. Finally, human rights- at least in the Universal Declaration model- are ultimately a profoundly national, not international, issue. As I will argue in Chapter 10, international action usually can be, at best, an impetus, toward support for national action to implement and enforce human rights. If international regimes arise primarily because of international interdependence- the inability to achieve important national objectives by independent national action- how can we account for the creation, and even modest growth, of the human rights regime? First and foremost, by the persisting relevance of the “moral” concerns that brought it into being in the first place. Butchers such as Pol Pot and the genocidaires of Rwanda still shock the popular conscience and provoke a desire to reject them as not merely reprehensible but also prohibited by clear, public, authoritative, international norms. Even governments with dismal human rights records seem to feel compelled to join in condemning the abuses of such rulers. Although cynics might interpret such condemnations as craven abuse of the rhetoric of human rights, they are just as easily seen as expressions of a sense of moral interdependence. States- not only government, but frequently citizens as well- often are unwilling to translate this perceived moral interdependence into action, let alone into an international regime with strong decision-making powers. But they also are unwilling (or at least politically unable) to return to treating national human rights practices as properly beyond international scrutiny and evaluation. A weak global human rights regime also may contribute, in a way acceptable to states, to improved national practice. For example, new governments with a commitment to human rights may find it helpful to be able to draw on and point to the constraints of authoritative international standards. We can see this, perhaps, in the case of the Alfonsin government, which took power after the Dirty War in Argentina, and in post-Soviet regimes in Central Europe. Likewise, established regimes may find the additional check provided by an international regime a salutary supplement to national efforts, as seems to be the case for many smaller Western powers. And most states, even if only for considerations of image and prestige, are likely willing to accept regime norms and procedures that do not appear immediately threatening. An international regime reflects states’ collective vision of a problem and its solutions and their willingness to “fund” those solutions. In the area of human rights, this vision does not extend much beyond a politically weak moral interdependence. States are willing to “pay” very little in diminished national sovereignty to realize the benefits of cooperation. The result is a regime with extensive, coherent, and widely accepted norms but extremely limited international decision-making power- that is, a strong promotional regime.

**And the plan is normal means, NEPA has already approved DAR in other places with no changes**

**DOT 08 (http://www.vamegaprojects.com/downloads/pdf/FHWA\_I-95\_DAR\_Ramps\_ANNOUNCE\_WITH\_FIGURES.pdf)**

The project is being proposed as part of the DoD’s nationwide Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities, which call for locating 8,500 new DoD employees within the EPG site area. These new ramps are proposed as improvements to anticipated traiffic low on the Fairfax County Parkway and provide ei cient access and egress for the EPG and direct access and egress with I-95. This undertaking is currently in the preliminary design, environmental review and public/agency review stage. Should this project move forward it is anticipated that construction would begin in early 2010 and construction completed later in 2011. Funding for the project is anticipated to be provided by DoD’s Defense Access Road Program. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) the FHWA has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for this undertaking. The EA describes the project’s purpose and need, the range of alternatives considered including the Preferred Alternatives, the ef ects of the alternatives upon the surrounding environments, and the agency coordination and public involvement activities conducted. Comments on the EA as well as those received at the public hearing will be included in the i nal environmental decision document. Submission of comments and expression of concerns related to possible impacts upon the natural and built environment as well as consideration for cultural resources covered by the National Historic Preservation Act are encouraged from attendees. Critical components of meeting the requirements of NEPA include soliciting public input and the consideration of such input in the documentation and decision making process.