### - - - 2AC Case- - -

### 2AC Generic Impact Calc

#### 1. We solve for the systemic problem of racism and classism in the status quo where they are pushed to the side by the white to suffer eternally with no jobs, harsh diseases and barely able to put food on the table unless something is done – only the plan solves by providing mass transit that allows them to get jobs, education and healthier lifestyles this is a moral obligation and a root cause to the ontology that creates war

### 2AC Gentrification Turn

#### 1. Durable FIAT proves mass transit will be built wherever the poor would go continuously

#### 2. Studies show that gentrification doesn’t cause displacement their data is skewed off natural succession

Kiviat 8 Barbara Kiviat Staff Writer for Time Magazine Gentrification: Not Ousting the Poor? June 29, 2008 http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1818255,00.html

A new study by researchers at the University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Pittsburgh and Duke University, examined Census data from more than 15,000 neighborhoods across the U.S. in 1990 and 2000, and found that low-income non-white households did not disproportionately leave gentrifying areas. In fact, researchers found that at least one group of residents, high school–educated blacks, were actually more likely to remain in gentrifying neighborhoods than in similar neighborhoods that didn't gentrify — even increasing as a fraction of the neighborhood population, and seeing larger-than-expected gains in income.? Those findings may seem counterintuitive, given that the term "gentrification," particularly in cities like New York and San Francisco, has become synonymous with soaring rents, wealthier neighbors and the dislocation of low-income residents. But overall, the new study suggests, the popular notion of the yuppie invasion is exaggerated. "We're not saying there aren't communities where displacement isn't happening," says Randall Walsh, an associate professor of economics at the University of Pittsburgh and one of the study's authors. "But in general, across all neighborhoods in the urbanized parts of the U.S., it looks like gentrification is a pretty good thing."? The researchers found, for example, that income gains in gentrifying neighborhoods — usually defined as low-income urban areas that undergo rises in income and housing prices — were more widely dispersed than one might expect. Though college-educated whites accounted for 20% of the total income gain in gentrifying neighborhoods, black householders with high school degrees contributed even more: 33% of the neighborhood's total rise. In other words, a broad demographic of people in the neighborhood benefited financially. According to the study's findings, only one group — black residents who never finished high school — saw their income grow at a slower rate than predicted. But the study also suggests that these residents weren't moving out of their neighborhoods at a disproportionately higher rate than from similar neighborhoods that didn't gentrify.? This study isn't the first to come to that conclusion. A 2005 paper published in Urban Affairs Review by Lance Freeman, an assistant professor of urban planning at Columbia University, looked at a nationwide sample of neighborhoods between 1986 and 1989 and found that low-income residents tended to move out of gentrifying areas at essentially the same frequency they left other neighborhoods. The real force behind the changing face of a gentrifying community, Freeman concluded, isn't displacement but succession. When people move away as part of normal neighborhood turnover, the people who move in are generally more affluent. Community advocates may argue that succession is just another form of exclusion — if low-income people can't afford to move in — but, still, it doesn't exactly fit the popular perception of individuals being forced from their homes.? The new study found that while gentrification did not necessarily push out original residents, it did create neighborhoods that middle-class minorities moved to. The addition of white college graduates, especially those under 40 without children, was a hallmark of gentrifying neighborhoods — that much fit the conventional wisdom — but so was the influx of college-educated blacks and Hispanics, who moved to gentrifying neighborhoods more often than they to did similar, more static areas. Two other groups tended to move more often into upwardly mobile neighborhoods as well: 40-to-60-year-old Hispanics without a high-school degree, and similarly uneducated Hispanics aged 20 to 40 with children — a counterpoint to the common conception of gentrification, if there ever was one. The only group that was less likely to move to a gentrifying area was high school–educated whites aged 20 to 40 with kids.?

#### 3. Gentrification doesn’t displace – government and cheap labor demand checks

Massey 2 Massey, Douglas S. American sociologist. Massey is currently a professor of Sociology at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and is an adjunct professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs, 2002, pp. 174-179

Any discussion of policy responses to gentrification is premature at this? point, since potentially important effects exist outside the housing market.? This discussion simply describes two sets of economic forces that have the? potential to adversely impact renter households of low socioeconomic status? through escalating land values. These forces may or may not cause displacement—? indeed, they may not even cause the neighborhood demographic? changes associated with gentrification—depending on the distribution of moving? costs within the subject population.? Gentrification in General Equilibrium? Low socioeconomic-status households suffer a decrease in utility any t ime? they are forced to increase their bids for housing without receiving any countervailing? local benefit. Gentrification might create these countervailing? benefits in three ways. One channel is the labor market. Gentrification might? create job opportunities for low-status households, or relocate existing opportunities? into areas more accessible to them.21 Second, increases in land values? present property tax–dependent local governments with additional resources,? which might translate into improved services or lower effective tax burdens? for poor residents. Finally, the process of gentrification might improve neigh-? 144 Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs: 2002? 21. A second labor market channel opens up if some low-status households exit the urban? area. This may lead to an increase in wages for low-skilled workers that remain, depending on? the net effect on labor demand. The availability of higher wages in the local labor market will? tend to increase poor households’ willingness to pay for housing in the area. This mechanism? enables households with high moving costs to benefit from the presence of other households? with low moving costs. In some situations, this labor market effect, combined with the reduced? pressure on housing prices caused by outmigration, will be sufficient to preclude any negative? impact on the poor.? borhood quality for poor residents, offsetting the hypothesized negative effects? of middle-class and upper-class abandonment of the central city.22 In the context? of the simple model of a poor household’s choices shown in figure 3, the? first countervailing benefit increases the household’s income, shifting the? budget constraint B1 out and increasing the maximum attainable utility level.? Changes in public service or neighborhood quality shift a household’s indifference? curves, so that a higher level of utility is associated with each given? combination of land and other market-based goods.

#### 4. Even if they do get displaced – they empirically have better lives

Massey 2 Massey, Douglas S. American sociologist. Massey is currently a professor of Sociology at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and is an adjunct professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs, 2002, pp. 174-179

In some cases, researchers have broadened the scope of their work to consider? the housing market outcomes of gentrification-displaced households.? These studies find surprisingly little evidence of declines in living standards.? The 1981 HUD report, in a separate analysis, tracks displacees from San? Francisco’s Hayes Valley neighborhood, comparing their housing market outcomes? with those of voluntary movers out of the neighborhood as well as? households moving into the neighborhood.41 The report states that displacees? “have not experienced severe negative changes in housing characteristics? either absolutely or in comparison with other groups.”42 Those displaced were? less cost-burdened than voluntary movers, experienced a decrease in crowding,? and only a minority reported decreased satisfaction with neighborhood? quality, public services, or housing characteristics. Displacees were actually? more likely to make the transition to home ownership than voluntary movers.? Schill and Nathan report similar findings in their survey of displacement? in five cities, and conclude that “displaced households do not appear to live? in worse conditions following their move.”43 Most of those displaced reported? increased satisfaction with their home and neighborhood. Relative to voluntary? movers, displacees experienced smaller rent increases on average, with? no associated increase in crowding. Their commute times were more likely to? decrease than increase. Schill and Nathan proceed to compare their sample of? displacees to a sample of voluntary movers, and conclude that displacees? were worse off by comparison. It should be noted, however, that the sample? of those who moved voluntarily differs from those who were displaced in? many important respects.44

### 2AC Util/Evaluate Consequences/Fear Nwar

#### 1. Ethical Obligation - We are evaluating consequences leaving the status quo leaves millions of impoverished people suffering without opportunities, jobs or food is systemic and should be evaluated first and outweighs the neg on probability that’s Memmi 2k

#### 2. Ontology - This exclusion and invisible genocide that we impose on these people correlate to an ontology based off exclusion and the justification that violence is okay to wage an “invisible” genocide against minorities that makes all their scenarios of nuclear war possible that’s Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois ‘4 and Cuomo 96

#### 3. Scare Tactics - Evaluating only the microscopic chance of a nuclear war with their long internal link story shows the unlikelihood of our plan directly causing these wars

### 2AC Pure Moral Calculus Bad

#### 1. We incorporate morals and util in our calculus – there is an invisible genocide that goes on that makes millions suffer with no food, job and terrible diseases. Them ignoring morals ignores these issues and just focus on microscopic risk through a long serious of unrelated link story to some big war

### 2AC No Extinction from Nwar

#### No extinction.

Muller 12 [Jonatas, Mendeley member in Philosophy, Analysis of Existential Risks, April 2012, http://www.jonatasmuller.com/x-risks.html]

Direct damage from nuclear blasts with current arsenals could reach at most a very small percentage of the world's population. Nuclear shelters would in the worst case scenario allow people to survive radiation fallout in nearby places, whose worst effects last for some days (Kearny 1987). Some of these shelters could offer protection for a long time, in the case of a nuclear winter, and some countries have strategic food provisions for many years. The effects of a nuclear winter can be compared to those of atmospheric dust caused by big asteroid impacts (Browne 1993), and would be likely smaller than that from volcanic super-eruptions (Bekki et al. 1996), in which case survival of land animals has been quite possible in the short and long term after the events. Estimates of temperature drops fall well within a range that is compatible with life and agriculture at least in the warmer regions of the Earth, with the atmospheric dust clearing up eventually (Turchin 2008). Nuclear wars seem **exceedingly unlikely** to constitute an existential risk, as survival of a substantial number of people would be possible under any of these conditions.

### 2AC Contact theory false

#### 1. We are not solving for contact theory but to help people get out of their terrible conditions and get jobs and improve their lives with education but they can interact and help reduce the tension by strengthening minorities that’s Mann 6 and McCammack 10

### 2AC Employers are Racist

#### 1. Mass Transit allows for minorities to get to the suburbs where low-wage low-labor jobs are available that is symbiotic to both employer and employee that will allow more social progress to overcome employment racism

### 2AC Class crowd out race

#### 1. The plan opportunities that allow them to climb the social ladder

### 2AC Generalization of Race Bad

#### 1. We are not generalizing we are just helping poor minorities that need help

### 2AC Waste Billions on Wars

#### 1. Plan solves the wasteful spending and instead start spending money on more important things as they say like Mass Transit for the poor

### 2AC Urbanism doesn’t solve racism

#### 1. The plan doesn’t isn’t solving all of racism – we are just helping the poor

### 2AC No Transportation Discrimination

#### 1. Multiple studies show that the status quo creates policies that segregate the poor and the rich and depriving the poor any opportunities to education, jobs, and basic services and to extract the little that they have the plan reduces this poverty– that’s Sanchez 3 and Rotker 7

### 2AC TI increases poverty

#### 1. The plan reduces poverty by allowing them to get affordable mass transit so they can get jobs and basic services, the status quo forces expensive transportation that extract the little that they have

### 2AC Gift Turn (Woan)

#### 1. The card talks about how states are racist and prevent the success of solving social problems and says the federal government should use more effort to solve it – that is the aff and a solvency deficit to the states cp

#### 2. We are not simply giving stuff we are toward low income residents which includes them in the decision making and providing opportunities and overturning the white domination that they claim in their card – a starting point is key to progressive action that can solve

### 2AC Still use cars

#### 1. The elite may not shift but the poor that is forced to ride cars would shift to mass transit and weaken the dominance of auto mobility on the poor

### 2AC Can’t afford MT + cars solve

#### 1. In the status quo people have to spend 60% of their income on buying and maintaining cars something that they can’t afford plus mass transit is substantially cheaper and allows access to jobs that they don’t have now

### 2AC Co-Opt by States

#### 1. Federal regulations solve – supremacy clause and empirics from civil rights movements check state/private co-option.

### 2AC Diseases Turn

#### 1. Mass Transit exists now in others and there is no extinction from diseases now

#### 2. All their cards are specific to air travel not transportation between cities and suburbs that already happen with cars now

#### 3. Diseases burn out – no spread

**Morse, 04** (Stephen, PhD, director of the Center for Public Health Preparedness, at the Mailman School of Public Health of Columbia University, May 2004, “Emerging and Reemerging Infectious Diseases: A Global Problem,” http://www.actionbioscience.org/newfrontiers/morse.html, Hensel)

Morse: A pandemic is a very big epidemic. It requires a number of things. There are many infections that get introduced from time to time in the human population and, like Ebola, burn themselves out because they kill too quickly or they don’t have a way to get from person to person. They are a terrible tragedy, but also, in a sense, it is a lucky thing that they don’t have an efficient means of transmission. In some cases, we may inadvertently create pathways to allow transmission of infections that may be poorly transmissible, for example, spreading HIV through needle sharing, the blood supply, and, of course, initially through the commercial sex trade. The disease is not easily transmitted, but we provided, without realizing it, means for it to spread. It is now pandemic in spite of its relatively inefficient transmission. We also get complacent and do not take steps to prevent its spread.

### 2AC Diseases Turn – Evacuations

#### 1. The plan is mass transit that will provide as evacuations from diseases

### - - - 2AC T - - -

### 2ac T – Vehicles

#### 1. We meet – Mass Transit Transportation Infrastructure is the network and routes the vehicles ride on

#### 2. Transportation Infrastructure is the infrastructure that facilitate intermodal transit

Congress ‘11

[The US Senate – the 112th Congress of the United States. “Full Text of S. 652: Building and Upgrading Infrastructure for Long-term Development” 3/17/11 http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/s652/text]

(B) TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT- The term ‘transportation infrastructure project’ means the construction, alteration, or repair, including the facilitation of intermodal transit, of the following subsectors: (i) Highway or road. (ii) Bridge. (iii) Mass transit. (iv) Inland waterways. (v) Commercial ports. (vi) Airports. (vii) Air traffic control systems. (viii) Passenger rail, including high-speed rail. (ix) Freight rail systems.

#### 3. Standards – Limits and predictability – The definition under the federal government is the framer’s definition and is most predictable limiting to only 9 affs

#### 4. Good is good enough competing interpretations create a race to the bottom default to reasonability

###  - - - 2AC Das - - -

### 2AC Jackson Vanik

#### Their case is extremely low risk that this one bill will destroy Obama’s ability to pass Jackson Vanik and without it will collapse russian relations despite cooperation that will prevent some microscopic chance of a possible war even though we have relations and that there would even would be a nuclear war

#### 1. Political capital doesn’t influence the passage of legislation – [issues are compartmentalized and presidential influence is exaggerated by the media]

Dickinson, 9 – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP)

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### 2. A logical policy maker can do both

#### 3. Mutual interests ensure cooperation

Arbatov, 07(Alexei, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs, “Is a New Cold War Imminent,” Russia in Global Affairs, No. 2, July-September 2007, http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1130.html)

First, the present dispute lacks the Cold War’s system-forming element, that is, bipolarity. In addition to the global and transregional centers of economic and military force, such as the U.S., the EU, Japan, Russia and China, the world is witnessing the growth of regional leaders, among them India, Pacific ‘small tigers,’ member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Iran, Brazil, South Africa and Nigeria. Additionally, the mighty currents of globalization and the information revolution are eroding traditional forms of interstate relations. Nor can we discount the ubiquitous growth of nationalism, and the increased role of transnational economic, political and even military actors. Russian-U.S. relations no longer represent the central axis of global politics. It is just one of its many facets – and not the most important one in many issues. Apart from some contradictions, Russia and the West share major common interests. Finally, they have other competitors beside themselves. Thus, a zero-sum game is out of the question. Whatever disagreements may divide Russia and the West, they are on the same side of the barricades in the ongoing international conflicts. In Afghanistan, for example, they act jointly, seeking to prevent a resurgence of Taliban and al-Qaeda activities. On other issues, such as the nuclear programs of North Korea and Iran, and the situations involving Palestine and Nagorno-Karabakh, they are attempting to solve these problems through multilateral negotiations. The once irreconcilable ideological rivalry between the two parties is now relegated to the past. The real ideological divide now lies between liberal-democratic values and Islamic radicalism, between the North and the South, and between the forces of globalization and anti-globalization. Russia may not be fertile ground for liberal values, but it will certainly never embrace radical Islam. Over the last 20 years, Russia has sustained the greatest losses in the struggle against Islamic extremism (the war in Afghanistan, and the wars and conflicts in Chechnya, Dagestan and Tajikistan).With regard to the arms race, despite the current growth in U.S. and Russian defense spending, the present situation is not remotely comparable to what took place during the Cold War. In the period from 1991 to 2012, that is, since the signing in Moscow of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START-I) until the expiry of the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT, also known as the Moscow Treaty), signed in 2002, the strategic and tactical nuclear weapons of the two countries will be reduced by about 80 percent [the Moscow Treaty expires on December 31, 2012].>>

#### 4. Mass transit popular – Villaraigosa proves

Lacter 6/29 (Mark Lacter Staffwriter “Villaraigosa finally gets federal loan program for mass transit work” <http://www.laobserved.com/biz/2012/06/villaraigosa_finally.php>)

Somewhere within a massive transportation bill that Congress approved today is a section that's designed to speed up local transit projects, such as the expansion of L.A.'s subway system. This is the one that the mayor has been pushing for the last two years - a plan that he claims will allow the Westside subway extension to be completed in 10 years instead of 30. The funds would also go toward highways, bus operations and street improvements. From the LAT: Officials say that $20 billion in federal loans could be made available nationally over the next two years under the legislation. Loans to the MTA would be repaid from the half-penny sales tax increase approved by L.A. County voters in 2008. But the loans alone will not be enough. Villaraigosa has proposed a ballot measure in November to extend the half-penny sales tax beyond 2039 to help fund his initiative. The bill's passage was complicated this year by election year politics, divisions within the House GOP ranks over the level of spending and a ban on lawmakers earmarking funds for transportation projects, a practice that in the past helped win votes but drew criticism after the last big transportation bill, in 2005, was filled with thousands of earmarks, including Alaska's "bridge to nowhere.''

#### 5. MAP-21 funded mass transit – shows that it is popular

#### 6. Transportation spending outweighs other issues --- massive support even from the Tea Party.

**Rockefeller Foundation Press Release**, 2/14/**2011** (Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform, p. http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure)

This Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey highlights 4 key findings:

American voters see improvement in transportation infrastructure as a way to improve the economy and their quality of life: With federal unemployment rates hovering at 9%, Americans feel that improvements to transportation and infrastructure will create millions of jobs – eight in ten voters think transportation and infrastructure will boost local economies and create jobs including 64% of Tea Party supporters and 66% of Republicans. American voters are looking for consensus and cooperation in Washington: Americans want their elected officials to work together, especially around the issue of transportation and infrastructure (66% of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground). More than any other issue tested, American voters would like to see compromise on legislation related to transportation and infrastructure (71%). American voters see room for improvement in how government spends money on infrastructure: With a high federal deficit, Americans overwhelmingly say that that current government spending on building and maintaining transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise – 64% overall and 72% of Republicans. Americans support a host of reforms aimed at making spending more efficient while still producing results. For instance, 90% support allowing local regions to have some input on how transportation dollars are used in their area. American voters are open to several funding streams for national transportation projects: With overwhelming support for transportation and infrastructure improvements, Americans are open to several funding streams. Seventy-eight percent ­­­

#### 7. Magnitsky bill blocks passage of repeal.

Julian Pecquet, 7-7-12 (Staff Writer, The Hills, " Time running out for Russia trade bill", http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/russia/236523-time-running-out-for-russia-trade-bill :)

Lawmakers are at odds over whether to link the Magnitsky bill to the legislation normalizing trade relations, which has yet to clear either chamber. Sen. Max Baucus (D-Mont.), whose Senate Finance Committee has jurisdiction over trade, has proposed doing so, but his counterpart on the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. David Camp (R-Mich.), disagrees with the move. Russia's continued support for the regime of Syrian President Bashar Assad has further complicated matters. The top Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Sander Levin (D-Mich.), has called for the House to delay action on the trade bill “for a period of time to determine whether Russia will join our nation and others in steps to address the Assad regime’s horrendous violence against its own people.” The Obama administration's apparent inconsistencies on the issue have added to lawmakers' reluctance. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, in particular, has urged Congress to pass the trade deal — a priority for President Vladimir Putin — while simultaneously calling on other countries to make Russia "pay a price" for supporting Assad.

#### 8. Winners win - passing controversial legislation gives Obama momentum

Singer 9 (Jonathan, JD Candidate at Berkeley and Editor of MyDD, March 3rd, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### 9. Vote no – the round is the push in congress and already used political capital

#### 10. Magnitsky part of the repeal package would counteract any benefits to relations

Interfax, 7-19-12 (News Report, "Russia against replacement of Jackson-Vanik amendment with Magnitsky bill", http://rbth.asia/articles/2012/07/19/russia\_against\_replacement\_of\_jackson-vanik\_amendment\_with\_magnitsky\_15853.html :)

American lawmakers' plans to replace the Jackson-Vanik amendments by the Magnitsky bill would contradict the logic of Russian-American relations over recent years, said Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov. "The first thing we resent is the replacement of the anti-Soviet Jackson-Vanik amendment by anti-Russian legislation. This would go against the entire logic of Russian-American relations for the past few years," he told the media on Wednesday while commenting at Interfax request on American senators' plans to link the abolition of this amendment to the Magnitsky bill. Committee Chairman Max Baucus earlier said that the bill could be combined with the Magnitsky bill. The authors of the bill also proposed introducing other conditions for Russia gaining this status. For instance, the U.S. trade representative would inform the Congress each year about how strictly Russia is observing its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization.

### 2AC Spending

#### Case outweighs –Their da is dumb by saying that getting more people jobs will be the brink point for a downgrade and the downgrade would cause a loss in all investor confidence and that would specifically destroy the world economy.

#### 1. Eurozone collapse crushing US econ now

Nick Beams, a member of the International Editorial Board of the World Socialist Web Site, and an internationally-recognised expert on Marxist political economy, August 6, 2012, “Growing Signs of a Global Economic Slump”, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=32228>

The impact of the continuing crisis of the euro zone is spreading outwards through the global economy, bringing signs of a gathering world slump.¶ In the(US) United States, the announcement that jobs had increased by 163,000 last month was greeted as the sign of an uptick, but the unemployment rate increased from 8.2 to 8.3 percent even as the number of people in the labour force fell by 150,000. In the longer term, even if the economy continues to grow, the rate of expansion will not be sufficient to bring down unemployment levels.¶ In a recent update on the US economy, the International Monetary Fund said it would grow at a “tepid pace” of around only 2 percent. Already the US is experiencing the worst “recovery” of any period since World War II and, according to the IMF, “the outlook remains difficult.”¶ ¶ The IMF warned that the US faced “negative risks” stemming from a “further deterioration of the euro debt crisis,” which would lower the demand for exports and impact on financial markets. The economy would also be hit by any failure to reach an agreement on raising the US debt ceiling.¶ The head of the IMF US team, Gian Maria Milesi-Ferretti, said “fiscal consolidation”—cuts in government spending—combined with a fall in household credit would continue to slow the US “recovery” in the near future, and that the “US contribution to global demand will be lower than what we saw before the financial crisis.”¶ The continued expansion of the Chinese economy played a major role in lifting the world economy out of recession in 2008-2009, but it will not be able to play the same role in the future.¶ Recent data show that the Chinese economy grew by 7.6 percent for the second quarter, the slowest pace in three years, amid numerous indications that the rate could fall further. One of the key factors in sustaining the Chinese economy after the financial crisis of 2008 was the fiscal stimulus provided by the government—estimated to be more than $500 billion—and the increased credit provided by the banks. But these policies are not likely to be repeated.¶ Prior to the financial crisis, the major imbalance in the Chinese economy was its trade surplus. Today the current account surplus is a third of what it was in 2007. However, a new imbalance has emerged, with the economy heavily dependent on investment, which is now running at around 50 percent of gross domestic product, and consumption spending at just 35 percent.¶ The Chinese economy and Asian economies more broadly are being heavily impacted not only by the slow growth in the US but also by the crisis in Europe. “The problems in Asia that are causing the slowdown come predominantly from outside the region,” Rob Subbaraman, chief economist for Asia at Nomura in Hong Kong, told Reuters. “Europe is bigger than the US as an export market for most Asian countries and it’s a bigger investor in the region.”¶ Operating on low profit margins, Chinese firms, especially those in manufacturing, are being hard hit by the slowdown in growth. Chinese steel companies have recorded a 96 percent plunge in their profits for the first half of the year, turning the sector into what one industry newspaper described as a “disaster zone.” Zhu Jimin, chairman of the China Iron and Steel Association, said that the weakening demand for steel had been brought on by “a big drop in investments in property and also in railways, cars and ships” in the first half of the year.¶ The downturn extends throughout manufacturing, with profits at the state-owned enterprises, still a major component of the Chinese economy, falling 11.6 percent in the first six months of the year, the worst showing since the eruption of the global financial crisis in 2008.¶ The official factory purchasing managers’ index (PMI) fell to 50.1 points in July, down from 50.2 in June, the lowest level in eight months. The figures showed that while factory output had expanded slightly—anything above 50 indicates growth—new orders and exports experienced a decline.¶ The slump in manufacturing is steepest in Europe, where the Markit Purchasing Managers’ Index dropped to 44 in July, down from 45.1 in June, to reach its lowest level since June 2009. Significantly, the decline is not confined to the debt-ridden countries. Markit chief economist Chris Williamson said the rates of decline for Germany and France were the fastest for more than three years.¶ Britain has now entered its second recession in four years, with the economy contracting by 0.7 percent in the June quarter, largely due to government spending cuts and the turmoil in the euro zone. The fall in the Markit PMI for the UK to 45.4 in July points to a further decline.¶ Markit economist Rob Dobson commented: “The domestic market shows no real signs of renewed life, while hopes of exports charting the course to calmer currents were hit by our main trading partner, the euro zone, still being embroiled in its long-running political and debt crises.” Companies have scaled back their operations to the levels reached in March 2009 in the midst of the global financial crisis.¶ A measure of the overall global situation was provided by the JPMorgan Global Manufacturing PMI. It fell to 48.4 in July from its level of 49.1 in June. JPMorgan said more jobs losses could be on the way. “Recent cost reductions are providing some respite, but this will be of little long-term benefit if underlying demand fails to pick up,” a spokesman for the company warned.¶ The fall in economic activity to levels not seen since the recession that followed the eruption of the financial crisis in 2008 is significant in itself. But the situation is even more serious given the fact that all the measures aimed at providing economic stimulus since then, including the trillions of dollars handed out to the banks, have failed to provide any lasting solution. In no country do the ruling financial and political elites have any policies capable of bringing about an economic upturn. On the contrary, they are all focused on intensifying their attacks on the social position of the working class.

#### 2. Plan gets people to jobs which will help the economy

#### **3. Consumer confidence low now**

Wells Fargo 8/1 Investor confidence slips, Wells Fargo reports Wells Fargo August 1, 2012 http://www.examiner.com/article/investor-confidence-slips-wells-fargo-reports

Investors continue to lose confidence in the U.S. economy, Wells Fargo and Gallup reported Wednesday.? The Investor and Retirement Optimism Index was +16 in July, the company said, compared to +24 in May and +40 in February.? “The decline was driven by increased investor pessimism about the future course of the overall economy,” the report said. “Non-retired investors showed the greatest slide in optimism – down 10 points from May – while retired investor optimism remained flat. Forty-one percent of all investors say now is a good time to invest in the markets as opposed to 48 percent in May and 52 percent in February.”? Investors fear the government will allow itself to fall off a “fiscal cliff,” Wells Fargo reported.? More investors see a divided government as the chief danger, but only slightly more so than other factors.? “When asked to rate the factors affecting the investing climate, investors also rate a ‘politically divided federal government’ as a top factor affecting the investing climate; 69 percent share this view, up from 64 percent in May.” The report said.? “Investors cited divided government as a greater factor affecting the investment climate than the unemployment rate (67 percent) and the federal budget deficit (67 percent).

#### 4. Lack of cooperation in both houses leaves Congress with no solution to the economy

Sahadi (Senior Writer for CNNMoney. Specializing in taxes and deficit spending) 7/16/12 (Jeanne, “Fiscal Cliff Fight is On, and Economy Suffers” LexisNexis)

The inability of Democrats and Republicans to work out their differences on the fiscal cliff is already becoming a problem for the economy. And that problem will grow the longer the standoff lasts. In the latest turn of events, Sen. Patty Murray, a leading Senate Democrat, said Monday that no deal will be cut until Republicans agree to raise taxes on high-income households. "If we can't get a good deal, a balanced deal that calls on the wealthy to pay their fair share, then I will absolutely continue this debate into 2013 rather than lock in a long-term deal this year that throws middle class families under the bus," Murray said in prepared remarks at the Brookings Institution. The cliff represents a host of expiring tax cuts -- including the Bush tax cuts -- and nearly $1 trillion in across-the-board spending cuts that everyone agrees is a terrible way to reduce deficits. Republicans want to replace the scheduled defense cuts with deeper cuts in non-defense domestic programs. And they'd like to extend the Bush tax cuts for everyone. Democrats don't like the spending cuts either -- which will total roughly $110 billion next year. But if they're going to be averted or postponed, Democrats want a package deal. "None of the automatic cuts are good policy. They were packaged together ... and they will be replaced, or not, as a package," Murray said. And Democrats want the portion of Bush tax cuts that apply to high-income households to expire. Economists -- most recently at the International Monetary Fund - have urged lawmakers to ratchet back the effect of the fiscal cliff in 2013, lest it throw the economy back into recession. In 2013 alone, the combination tax increases and spending cuts would be a more than $500 billion hit to the economy. Practically, no one expects Congress to let the fiscal cliff take effect in full. But the uncertainty of how and when lawmakers will resolve the issue is hurting business confidence and weighing heavily on companies' investment and hiring decisions, said Nariman Behravesh, chief economist for IHS Global Insight. It won't kill the economy, Behravesh stressed, but it will curtail growth. "It'll mean growth -- employment growth, GDP growth -- will grind down," Behravesh said. Defense contractors have already indicated they're in a hiring lockdown and could have to send out layoff warning notices this fall. Federal agencies are also likely to put off signing contracts and making new hires. Uncertainty is also likely to cause tumult in the stock market. "Stocks have been under pressure, and will remain this way until there is some resolution," said Alex Hamilton, an analyst at EarlyBirdCapital, a boutique investment bank. Not everyone is worried that Murray's ultimatum - or House Speaker John Boehner's insistence that more spending cuts will be needed before the debt ceiling is raised again - are quite so inflexible. "Both sides will have to dial down tension ... as interest groups and market participants increase pressure for a path forward. ... Any politician who says they are willing to go over the ledge is likely bluffing to build leverage," said Sean West, director of U.S. policy at the Eurasia Group. West believes that if there's no sign of a deal near year's end, they would sign on to a short-term package to avert the cliff temporarily. That may be cold comfort, though, to those actually trying to run a business and hire people.

#### 5. The question of austerity vs. stimulus is strictly time dependent – squo dictates stim

Frankel 7/25 (Jeff, James W. Harpel Professor of Capital Formation and Growth at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, July 25, 2012, “The Procyclicalists: Fiscal Austerity vs. Stimulus,” http://content.ksg.harvard.edu/blog/jeff\_frankels\_weblog/2012/07/25/the-procyclicalists-fiscal-austerity-versus-stimulus/)

The world is in the grip of a debate between fiscal austerity and fiscal stimulus. Opponents of austerity worry about contractionary effects on the economy. Opponents of stimulus worry about indebtedness and moral hazard. Is austerity good or bad? It is as foolish to debate this proposition as it would be to debate whether it is better for a driver to turn left or right. It depends where the car is on the road. Sometimes left is appropriate, sometimes right. When an economy is in a boom, the government should run a surplus; other times, when in recession, it should run a deficit. True, it is hard for politicians to get the timing of countercyclical fiscal policy exactly right. This is the reason, more than any other, why Keynesian policy lost its luster. “Fine-tuning” it was called. Sometimes the fiscal stimulus would kick in after the recession was already over. But this is no reason to follow a pro-cyclical fiscal policy. A procyclical fiscal policy piles on the spending and tax cuts on top of booms, but reduces spending and raises taxes in response to downturns. Budgetary profligacy during expansion; austerity in recessions. Procyclical fiscal policy is destabilizing, because it worsens the dangers of overheating, inflation, and asset bubbles during the booms and exacerbates the losses in output and employment during the recessions. In other words, a procyclical fiscal policy magnifies the severity of the business cycle. Yet many politicians in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the eurozone seem to live by procyclicality. They argue against fiscal discipline when the economy is strong, only to become deficit hawks when the economy is weak. Exactly backwards. Consider the positions taken over the last three decades by some American politicians. First cycle: During a recessionary period, President Ronald Reagan in his 1980 campaign and in his 1981 Inaugural Address urged immediate action to reduce the national debt “beginning today.” (Recession: austerity.) But in 1988, as the economy approached the peak of the business cycle, candidate George H.W. Bush was unconcerned about budget deficits, even though the national debt was rapidly approaching three times the level it had been when Reagan had given his speeches. “Read my lips, no new taxes,” Bush famously said. (Boom: profligacy.) Second cycle: Predictably, the first President Bush and the Congress finally summoned the political will to raise taxes and rein in spending growth at precisely the wrong moment, that is, just as the US was entering another recession in 1990. (Recession: austerity.) Although the timing of the legislation was poor, the action was courageous. The Pay as You Go Rule and other reforms switched government finances back onto a path that eventually was to eliminate the deficits by the end of the decade. But three years later — and even though the most robust recovery in American history had begun — every Republican congressman voted against Clinton’s 1993 legislation to continue Bush’s spending caps, PAYGO, and tax increases. Nor did they change their minds in response to the subsequent success of the policy. Even after seven years of strong growth, with unemployment at the peak of the business cycle dipping below 4% for the first time since the 1960s, George W. Bush based his 2000 campaign on a platform of large long-term tax cuts. (Boom: profligacy.) Third cycle: Even after the Bush fiscal expansion had turned the inherited record budget surpluses into record deficits, the Administration went for a 2nd round of tax cuts in 2003, and continued a rate of growth of spending that was triple the rate under Clinton (both national security and domestic spending). Vice President Richard Cheney said “Reagan proved that deficits don’t matter.” These policies were maintained for five more years, as another $ four trillion was added to the national debt. (Boom: profligacy.) Predictably, when the worst recession since the Great Depression hit in 2007-09, politicians felt constrained from an adequate fiscal response due to the big deficits and debts the government had already been running. Republicans suddenly re-discovered the evil of budget deficits and decided that retrenchment was urgent. They opposed Obama’s initial fiscal stimulus in February 2009, even though GDP growth and employment were much worse than they had been when Reagan and Bush had launched their tax cuts and spending increases. (Recession: austerity.) Subsequently, with a new majority in the House, they succeeded in blocking further efforts by Obama when the stimulus ran out in 2011. The government spending cutbacks of the last two years are the most important reason, in my view, why the economic recovery which began in June 2009 subsequently stalled in 2011. Three cycles. Three generations of politicians who favored expansionary fiscal policies during a boom and then decided after a recession had hit that budget deficits were bad after all. (See the graph below.) This is not to say that the procyclicalist politicians have always succeeded in getting their policies adopted. Clinton had a strong enough congressional majority in August 1993 that he was able to pass his budget balancing legislation (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act) — even though every Republican in Congress voted “no” at a time when the economy was expanding. Similarly, Obama had a strong enough majority in January 2009 that he was able to pass some initial fiscal stimulus (the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act), without a single Republican vote, at a time when the economy was in freefall. But too often the countercyclicalists are overpowered by the procyclicalists. Trying to turn left or right at precisely the wrong points in the road is a worse record than one would get by switching policies randomly. To explain this perverse pattern, let us switch metaphors in mid-stream. It is the old problem of needing to fix the hole in the roof when the sun is shining, rather than waiting for a storm to realize that it is necessary. When the economy is booming, there is no political support for painful spending cuts or tax increases. After all, everything seems fine; why make a change? Then when the deluge comes, sinners suddenly see the evils of their ways and proclaim the necessity of reforming. Of course it is very difficult to fix the roof in the middle of a thunderstorm.

#### 6. **Downgrade doesn’t kill consumer confidence or investments – consumer climate IMPROVED after the S&P downgrade**

Bloomberg 2012 (“Downgrade Anniversary Shows Investors Gained Buying U.S.,” 7/16/2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-16/downgrade-anniversary-shows-investors-gained-buying-u-s-.html> )hhs-ps

Standard & Poor’s lowered the U.S. credit rating after months of wrangling last year between President [Barack Obama](http://topics.bloomberg.com/barack-obama/) and congressional Republicans over whether to raise the federal debt limit. Though the impasse ended with Obama signing a [debt- ceiling](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/PUBLDEBT%3AIND)increase on Aug. 2, S&P downgraded the U.S three days later, citing political gridlock in Washington and the nation’s long-term fiscal challenges. Treasuries responded by staging the biggest rally since December 2008, returning 2.8 percent that month as investors repudiated the decision. Yields on Treasuries due in 10 years have fallen 1.07 percentage point since the downgrade and have touched all-time lows, dropping to 1.44 percent on June 1. U.S. government bond prices, which move in inverse proportion to yields, have soared, such that the securities have gained 7 percent since Aug. 5 after returning 9.8 percent in 2011, their best performance since 2008, Bank of America Merrill Lynch index data show. Big Returns As a result, the naysayers would have earned about $8.59 million on a $100 million investment in Treasuries maturing in five to 10 years had they started a trade the day the U.S. was downgraded, according to the Merrill Lynch index data. Hedge funds worldwide have lost about 5.8 percent during that span, which would amount to a $5.8 million loss on a $100 million investment through the end of June, according to the Bloomberg Global Aggregate Hedge fund [index](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/BBHFUNDS%3AIND). Almost half the time, yields on government bonds fall when a rating action by S&P and Moody’s suggests they should climb, according to data compiled by Bloomberg on 314 upgrades, downgrades and outlook changes going back as far as the 1970s. The rally showed the downgrade “was a mistake,” [Alan Blinder](http://topics.bloomberg.com/alan-blinder/), a [Princeton University](http://topics.bloomberg.com/princeton-university/)professor and former Federal Reserve Board vice chairman, said in a July 2 interview in New York. “The U.S. Treasury is still at the top of the heap.” Consumer Borrowing Consumer borrowing costs have also dropped. Home loan rates for 30-year U.S. mortgages on July 12 fell to a record low for a fourth straight week. The average rate for a 30-year fixed mortgage [declined](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/NMCMFUS%3AIND) to 3.56 percent in the week ended July 12, the lowest in Freddie Mac records dating to 1971. In the week ended Aug. 4, 2011, immediately before the downgrade, the average rate was 4.39 percent. IntercontinentalExchange Inc.’s Dollar Index, which tracks the greenback against the currencies of six major U.S. trading partners, has climbed about 12 percent since S&P’s Aug. 5 downgrade, as of July 13. The S&P 500 stock index has [returned](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/SPX%3AIND) 15.6 percent, including reinvested dividends. The U.S. attraction for global investors has strengthened. In May, 46 percent of international investors chose the U.S. as the market with the most potential during the next year, up from 31 percent a year earlier, according to a Bloomberg poll.

#### 7. The downgrade will not affect the economy nor others countries’ confidence in the US

Gerrity, ‘11

Michael, publisher and CEO of World Property Channel, served on several Boards like Central Florida Technology Partnership’s Digital media Advisory Board, City of Orlando’s Technology board, The Economic Development Commission’s Film and Television Board, founding Board Member of Digital Media Alliance Florida, and member of the National Association of Real Estate Editors (NAREE), 8/8/11, “SPECIAL REPORT: Experts Debate Impact of U.S. Credit Rating Downgrade on Housing Recovery”, http://www.worldpropertychannel.com/us-markets/residential-real-estate-1/standard-poors-rating-agency-us-credit-downgrade-united-states-of-america-credit-rating-sovereign-debt-ratings-federal-reserve-board-banking-system-negative-outlook-mohamed-el-erian-pimco-vanessa-grout-4634.php

According to Roger W. Soderstrom, founder of Orlando-based Stirling Sotheby's International Realty, "The sun did rise again this morning and it is business as usual. I do not feel the downgrade by one of the three rating groups was a total surprise and maybe it will be a wakeup call for Washington and our politicians to start working together on real solutions. As for the U.S. and specifically Florida real estate market, I do not feel we are going to see any major impact. After five challenging years we have become a much more resilient society and I don't feel we will see any overreaction." Billionaire Warren Buffett said in an interview with Bloomberg Television this weekend, "Standard & Poor's erred when it lowered the U.S. credit rating and reiterated his view that the economy will avoid a second recession. The U.S., which was cut Aug. 5 to AA+ from AAA at S&P, merits a 'quadruple A' rating."

### 2AC O Good Elections – EPA

#### Their DA is extremely low risk of assuming that providing affordable transportation will kill Obama’s chances of winning and that Romney would then guarantee the rollback of the EPA and that independently is key to stopping all warming.

#### 2. Warming not real - 30,000 scientists signed a petition saying warming is flat-out nonexistent - their data is skewed

Bell 12 (Larry Bell, Prof at Univ of Houston, Sasakawa International Center for Space Architecture, 7/17/2012, "That Scientific Global Warming Consensus...Not!," Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2012/07/17/that-scientific-global-warming-consensus-not/2/)

Since 1998, more than 31,000 American scientists from diverse climate-related disciplines, including more than 9,000 with Ph.D.s, have signed a public petition announcing their belief that “…there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.” Included are atmospheric physicists, botanists, geologists, oceanographers, and meteorologists. So where did that famous “consensus” claim that “98% of all scientists believe in global warming” come from? It originated from an endlessly reported 2009 American Geophysical Union (AGU) survey consisting of an intentionally brief two-minute, two question online survey sent to 10,257 earth scientists by two researchers at the University of Illinois. Of the about 3.000 who responded, 82% answered “yes” to the second question, which like the first, most people I know would also have agreed with. Then of those, only a small subset, just 77 who had been successful in getting more than half of their papers recently accepted by peer-reviewed climate science journals, were considered in their survey statistic. That “98% all scientists” referred to a laughably puny number of 75 of those 77 who answered “yes”. That anything-but-scientific survey asked two questions. The first: “When compared with pre-1800s levels, do you think that mean global temperatures have generally risen, fallen, or remained relatively constant?” Few would be expected to dispute this…the planet began thawing out of the “Little Ice Age” in the middle 19th century, predating the Industrial Revolution. (That was the coldest period since the last real Ice Age ended roughly 10,000 years ago.) The second question asked: “Do you think human activity is a significant contributing factor in changing mean global temperatures?” So what constitutes “significant”? Does “changing” include both cooling and warming… and for both “better” and “worse”? And which contributions…does this include land use changes, such as agriculture and deforestation?

#### 3. EPA alone doesn’t solve warming – other nations produce way more

#### 4. Romney winning now – swing states and democratic states shift

Kessler 8/6 Ronald Kessler Staff Writer Democrat States Moving to Romney Aug 6 2012 10:18 AM http://www.newsmax.com/Politics/Democrat-States-Romney-Buchanan/2012/08/06/id/447659

Ronald Kessler reporting from Washington, D.C. — States that traditionally have been considered Democrat strongholds are now moving toward Mitt Romney, Bay Buchanan, a senior adviser to Romney, tells Newsmax. “When we came into this general election, it was assumed that the battleground states would be the same ones that they were in the past,” says Buchanan, who was treasurer of the U.S. under President Reagan. “Well what’s happened is a lot of the Democratic states are now looking like Mitt Romney could win them. They are now swing states.” That means that Democrats have to focus on an additional five states: New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, Buchanan says. As it is, Mitt Romney and the Republican National Committee have about $25 million more cash on hand than the Democrats. Based on polls the campaign considers reliable, “Romney is running very, very strong in some traditionally swing states,” Buchanan says. “We feel very good about Indiana now. I don’t think it’s even a swing state. In North Carolina, the numbers show us up as high as five or six percentage points. Florida looks very, very good. It is still within the margin of error, but it’s certainly very strong for us.” While Virginia looks tougher, “We’re in play,” Buchanan says. “That’s clearly going to go down to the wire. But we’re looking strong in Wisconsin. We got some two dozen offices in Wisconsin. We’re all over the state running very strong grass roots. It’s going to be up on TV, and so we’re going to force the Democrats to use some of their money if they want to hold on to Wisconsin. There are a lot of other states that we’re going to be playing in where four months ago most analysts would have said Republicans don’t have any chance.” President Obama’s campaign has poured almost $100 million into ads mainly in swing states. “The ads have gotten him no bump in any poll, and that has to be an alarming thing for the Obama campaign when they can put all of this kind of money in negative ads and have the president of the United States out there talking and trying to build his numbers and to see nothing happen,” Buchanan says. “So I think what is clear is that Obama is unable to move things.” In contrast, “When we put money into a state, we see movement,” Buchanan says. “We see our numbers climb, and now that we’re going to be able to run parity with them on the money, and since we’re now approaching the Tampa convention, we’ll be able to spend as much as they do if not more with a message portraying who Mitt Romney is and what his vision of America is.” Buchanan says Romney will be offering more specifics about his plans to turn the economy around. As noted in my story "[A Winning Slogan for Romney](http://www.newsmax.com/RonaldKessler/Romney-campaign-slogan-believe-in-America/2012/07/30/id/446998)," the GOP presidential candidate needs to offer tangible benefits if he is elected. To boost his appeal, ads are now portraying him in more human terms and outlining why Romney’s financial success means he knows how to fix the national economy. Buchanan says Obama spoke from the heart when he said the private sector is doing fine and businessmen didn’t build their own businesses but instead owe their success to roads, bridges, and teachers. “I think we now know a little bit more about why President Obama imposed the kind of job-killing policies that he did,” Buchanan says. “It fits in with his philosophy that the answer to all of our problems is government, and so everything that he does is to take money from the private sector.” A recent report from the General Accountability Office underscored the difference between the public and private sector. Selling something as basic as food, the government-owned Amtrak has lost $800 million in the past 10 years because of theft and lack of coordination and supervision. Movie theaters make their money selling popcorn and candy bars, but Amtrak loses money selling food, notes Buchanan, who recently came out with her book “Bay and Her Boys: Unexpected Lessons I Learned as a (Single) Mom.” “It just goes to show that the private sector does things efficiently and well because if they don’t, they are going to lose money, and they don't want to lose money,” Buchanan says. “The government doesn’t care because the money they use isn’t theirs.” Buchanan predicts that Romney’s announcement of a vice presidential candidate — which she expects before the convention — will further boost his campaign. “People want to know what they are buying, and right now it’s Mitt Romney, but when you have the whole team together, working together out there and making our case, I think you are going to see real movement,” Buchanan says. “What matters at this point is who has the momentum three months out, and there’s no question that the momentum is with us,” Buchanan says.

#### 5. EPA exists now and warming is still going on

#### 6. Obamacare killing his election chances now --- improving economic conditions key to victory

**Epshteyn**, **7/18**/2012 (Boris – Republican political strategist, investment banker and finance attorney living in New York City, Obama’ Can’t Distract Voters From the Flagging Economy, U.S. News & World Report, p. <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/boris-epshteyn/2012/07/18/obama-cant-distract-voters-from-the-flagging-economy>)

Much of the country has been in successive heat waves for the past month, while President Obama and his campaign have experienced a continued pesky cold streak. Not even a victory in the Supreme Court over Obamacare could shake them out of the doldrums. Why? Because the Obamacare decision was followed by a jobs report a week later containing nothing even close to good news. That jobs report was vital because if it had showed economic improvement, it would have given the Obama campaign something to build momentum on. Instead, it served as a reminder to the American voter that while President Obama may have won in the Supreme Court on healthcare he is losing in the fight for economic recovery. Team Obama's response? First, President Obama asked the American public to not "read too much into" the jobs report. I will let the Labor Department address the ridiculousness of that statement. Second, the Obama campaign unleashed a furious ad onslaught. The advertising push however, was not focused on any of the president's accomplishments (Obamacare obviously didn't fit the bill due to its unpopularity), but on the business background of former Gov. Mitt Romney. Whether one believes the attacks are fair or not, and in my humble opinion they are misguided, the bigger issue for team Obama is that they simply do not work. A quick glance at Real Clear Politics's average of polls shows that on the day after the Obamacare decision, President Obama led Governor Romney by 3.8 percent, whereas the lead now is down to an insignificant 2.0 percent—a statistical tie. The numbers in battleground states also generally mirror the national average and stay within the margin of error. President Obama and his team have, notwithstanding his claims otherwise to Charlie Rose, abandoned any notion of "transcendence" or "hope and change" and in return have received nothing but bad polls. There are four more jobs reports before the election on November 6. The economic community tends to agree that they will not be much better than the last. However, in order to have a shot at re-election, President Obama would be well served to make sure that his response is much improved.

#### 7. Transportation spending will win Obama the election --- perceived as a job creator.

**Cooper**, 1/25/**2012** (Donna – Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to **help the middle class grow and prosper**. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens.

#### 8. Polls show overwhelming public support for infrastructure investment.

Building America’s Future, 1/8/**2009** (Poll: Majority of Americans Ready to Pay for Better Infrastructure but Demand Accountability, p. http://www.bafuture.org/news/press-release/poll-majority-americans-ready-pay-better-infrastructure-demand-accountability)

Today the co‐chairs of Building America’s Future announced the results of a national poll that examines American views on infrastructure, priorities and willingness to pay for it. Conducted by Luntz, Maslansky Strategic Research, the poll shows widespread and bipartisan support for smartinfrastructure investment with accountability measures. Key findings included: • A near unanimous 94% of Americans are concerned about our nation’s infrastructure. • 81% of Americans are prepared to pay 1% more in taxes to rebuild America’s infrastructure. • Accountability is their single highest priority (61%) in rebuilding America’s infrastructure. o Regarding infrastructure spending, Americans care most that projects are on time andon budget (31%), and that they can see exactly where the money is being spent (24%). • Americans understand that infrastructure isn’t just roads and highways. Indeed, energyfacilities are their highest priority. Roads and highways score second, clean water is third. “Americans don’t want their children educated in portable classrooms, and they don’t want to waste millions of gallons of water from leaky old pipes,” said California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. “They want the federal government to smartly invest in our nation’s infrastructure. Now is the perfecttime to put money into public‐works projects because it will help create jobs while pumping up our economy. It's like hitting two homeruns with one swing. This poll confirms that infrastructure is a priority to all Americans, and that they are willing to invest in their own quality of life.” “This poll confirms what many of us believe – the American public understands the importance of investing in a broad range of infrastructure, from the energy grid to roads and transit to clean water. And they understand why infrastructure is so important to them in their daily lives,” said PennsylvaniaGovernor Ed Rendell. “But the public is demanding strong accountability, transparency and oversight of any new investments in infrastructure,” Rendell said. “They want us to set national priorities in infrastructure investment that improve people’s lives, their communities and our economy. They would rather see us take the time to pick the right investments, rather than rush ahead with the same old projects.” "The numbers don't lie: a majority of Americans want to invest in building up our nation's infrastructure, but they want to know that their money is being spent wisely,” said New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg. “They want the government to clean up its act and take responsibility for both success and failure. Any investment made must have benchmarks attached so that we can evaluate what is getting done and what opportunities are being squandered.” “There simply isn't another issue with such widespread support across partisan lines and geographic boundaries,” said Frank Luntz of Luntz, Maslansky Strategic Research. “The public already sees the need and is ready to lend a hand financially to make sure it gets done – but they want it done correctly. This is a major test for government. Accountability is absolutely essential."

#### 9. Transportation spending is not perceived by voters.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

#### 10. Mass transit popular amidst voters

Rockefeller Foundation, 11

(Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure

### 2AC O Good Elections – Iran Strikes

#### 1. Their DA is extremely low risk of assuming that providing affordable transportation will kill Obama’s chances of winning and that the president would do something incredibly stupid like bomb Iran’s nuclear facilities and that they will be willing to then bomb us knowing that they would be wiped off the map in a nuclear war

#### 2. Executives don’t fufill foreign policy campaign promises

Drezner 11 Daniel W. Drezner professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University Everything you ever wanted to know about American foreign policy campaign promises September 13, 2011 http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/09/13/everything\_you\_ever\_wanted\_to\_know\_about\_american\_foreign\_policy\_campaign\_promises

In truth, however, I can't get all that worked up about it, for two reasons. The first is that these debates are an attempt to influence voters -- and, to repeat a theme, the overwhelming majority of voters do not care about foreign affairs. This has been true as a general rule, even during wartime, and is even truer during a down economy. It should be noted that social policy questions have also been on the margins during these debates because this election is about the economy, the economy, and the economy. Foreign-policy wonks will begrudge the lack of globotalk -- that's what we do. I'm not going to begrudge the American people getting more time to hear candidates talk about issues that they think are the most important, however.? The second reason -- and this is more informed speculation than a statement of fact -- is that foreign-policy promises made during campaigns don't matter as much for governing as domestic policy promises. As Ron Paul reminded people last night, George W. Bush won the presidency in 2000 on a platform of "no authority in the Constitution to be the policeman of the world, and no nation-building." I think it's safe to say that's not how he ran his foreign policy.? Similarly, think back to Barack Obama's foreign-policy pledges during the 2008 primary season. He had two highlights. The first was a statement that he'd be happy to sit down without conditions and meet with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. That hasn't happened despite Ahmadinejad's repeated entreaties for an open debate. Obama's other highlight came when he and Hillary Clinton sparred over who would renegotiate NAFTA first. Again … that hasn't happened (and thank goodness for that).? I could go on -- Bill Clinton reversed his campaign pledge to let in Haitian refugees before he even took office. You get the point, however. Stepping back, it's hard to think of any significant foreign-policy campaign promises made in the modern era that actually mattered. I hereby challenge the commenters -- and BA and MA students desperately in search of a thesis -- to provide counterexamples.? To be clear, I'm not saying that foreign-policy issues are completely irrelevant. The contrast between Obama and Hillary Clinton on Iraq clearly affected the 2008 primary, for example. I'm hypothesizing that pronouncements about future foreign policy don't seem to matter. I suspect that this is for two reasons. First, as previously noted, voters don't care about these pledges all that much. Second, the world keeps changing, and so any new president needs to adapt to new circumstances.?

#### 3. Romney winning now – swing states and democratic states shift

Kessler 8/6 Ronald Kessler Staff Writer Democrat States Moving to Romney Aug 6 2012 10:18 AM http://www.newsmax.com/Politics/Democrat-States-Romney-Buchanan/2012/08/06/id/447659

Ronald Kessler reporting from Washington, D.C. — States that traditionally have been considered Democrat strongholds are now moving toward Mitt Romney, Bay Buchanan, a senior adviser to Romney, tells Newsmax. “When we came into this general election, it was assumed that the battleground states would be the same ones that they were in the past,” says Buchanan, who was treasurer of the U.S. under President Reagan. “Well what’s happened is a lot of the Democratic states are now looking like Mitt Romney could win them. They are now swing states.” That means that Democrats have to focus on an additional five states: New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, Buchanan says. As it is, Mitt Romney and the Republican National Committee have about $25 million more cash on hand than the Democrats. Based on polls the campaign considers reliable, “Romney is running very, very strong in some traditionally swing states,” Buchanan says. “We feel very good about Indiana now. I don’t think it’s even a swing state. In North Carolina, the numbers show us up as high as five or six percentage points. Florida looks very, very good. It is still within the margin of error, but it’s certainly very strong for us.” While Virginia looks tougher, “We’re in play,” Buchanan says. “That’s clearly going to go down to the wire. But we’re looking strong in Wisconsin. We got some two dozen offices in Wisconsin. We’re all over the state running very strong grass roots. It’s going to be up on TV, and so we’re going to force the Democrats to use some of their money if they want to hold on to Wisconsin. There are a lot of other states that we’re going to be playing in where four months ago most analysts would have said Republicans don’t have any chance.” President Obama’s campaign has poured almost $100 million into ads mainly in swing states. “The ads have gotten him no bump in any poll, and that has to be an alarming thing for the Obama campaign when they can put all of this kind of money in negative ads and have the president of the United States out there talking and trying to build his numbers and to see nothing happen,” Buchanan says. “So I think what is clear is that Obama is unable to move things.” In contrast, “When we put money into a state, we see movement,” Buchanan says. “We see our numbers climb, and now that we’re going to be able to run parity with them on the money, and since we’re now approaching the Tampa convention, we’ll be able to spend as much as they do if not more with a message portraying who Mitt Romney is and what his vision of America is.” Buchanan says Romney will be offering more specifics about his plans to turn the economy around. As noted in my story "[A Winning Slogan for Romney](http://www.newsmax.com/RonaldKessler/Romney-campaign-slogan-believe-in-America/2012/07/30/id/446998)," the GOP presidential candidate needs to offer tangible benefits if he is elected. To boost his appeal, ads are now portraying him in more human terms and outlining why Romney’s financial success means he knows how to fix the national economy. Buchanan says Obama spoke from the heart when he said the private sector is doing fine and businessmen didn’t build their own businesses but instead owe their success to roads, bridges, and teachers. “I think we now know a little bit more about why President Obama imposed the kind of job-killing policies that he did,” Buchanan says. “It fits in with his philosophy that the answer to all of our problems is government, and so everything that he does is to take money from the private sector.” A recent report from the General Accountability Office underscored the difference between the public and private sector. Selling something as basic as food, the government-owned Amtrak has lost $800 million in the past 10 years because of theft and lack of coordination and supervision. Movie theaters make their money selling popcorn and candy bars, but Amtrak loses money selling food, notes Buchanan, who recently came out with her book “Bay and Her Boys: Unexpected Lessons I Learned as a (Single) Mom.” “It just goes to show that the private sector does things efficiently and well because if they don’t, they are going to lose money, and they don't want to lose money,” Buchanan says. “The government doesn’t care because the money they use isn’t theirs.” Buchanan predicts that Romney’s announcement of a vice presidential candidate — which she expects before the convention — will further boost his campaign. “People want to know what they are buying, and right now it’s Mitt Romney, but when you have the whole team together, working together out there and making our case, I think you are going to see real movement,” Buchanan says. “What matters at this point is who has the momentum three months out, and there’s no question that the momentum is with us,” Buchanan says.

#### 4. Obamacare killing his election chances now --- improving economic conditions key to victory.

**Epshteyn**, **7/18**/2012 (Boris – Republican political strategist, investment banker and finance attorney living in New York City, Obama’ Can’t Distract Voters From the Flagging Economy, U.S. News & World Report, p. <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/boris-epshteyn/2012/07/18/obama-cant-distract-voters-from-the-flagging-economy>)

Much of the country has been in successive heat waves for the past month, while President Obama and his campaign have experienced a continued pesky cold streak. Not even a victory in the Supreme Court over Obamacare could shake them out of the doldrums. Why? Because the Obamacare decision was followed by a jobs report a week later containing nothing even close to good news. That jobs report was vital because if it had showed economic improvement, it would have given the Obama campaign something to build momentum on. Instead, it served as a reminder to the American voter that while President Obama may have won in the Supreme Court on healthcare he is losing in the fight for economic recovery. Team Obama's response? First, President Obama asked the American public to not "read too much into" the jobs report. I will let the Labor Department address the ridiculousness of that statement. Second, the Obama campaign unleashed a furious ad onslaught. The advertising push however, was not focused on any of the president's accomplishments (Obamacare obviously didn't fit the bill due to its unpopularity), but on the business background of former Gov. Mitt Romney. Whether one believes the attacks are fair or not, and in my humble opinion they are misguided, the bigger issue for team Obama is that they simply do not work. A quick glance at Real Clear Politics's average of polls shows that on the day after the Obamacare decision, President Obama led Governor Romney by 3.8 percent, whereas the lead now is down to an insignificant 2.0 percent—a statistical tie. The numbers in battleground states also generally mirror the national average and stay within the margin of error. President Obama and his team have, notwithstanding his claims otherwise to Charlie Rose, abandoned any notion of "transcendence" or "hope and change" and in return have received nothing but bad polls. There are four more jobs reports before the election on November 6. The economic community tends to agree that they will not be much better than the last. However, in order to have a shot at re-election, President Obama would be well served to make sure that his response is much improved.

#### 5. Transportation spending will win Obama the election --- perceived as a job creator.

**Cooper**, 1/25/**2012** (Donna – Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to **help the middle class grow and prosper**. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens.

#### 6. No war and it won’t escalate---cooperation and no nuclear capability

Gelb 12 2/24, -Leslie H. Gelb: President Emeritus and Board Senior Fellow, “Leslie H. Gelb: The Iran-Washington Conspiracy?” http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/02/24/leslie-h-gelb-the-iran-washington-conspiracy.html,

Tehran and Washington have discovered a surprising common bond: to pretend that they might be heading toward serious negotiations to curb Iran’s nuclear capacity. What’s more, they are pretending for the same reason: to ward off an Israeli attack on Iran. Their moves are barely noticeable—vague diplomatic pronouncements, op-eds, lots of behind-the-scenes orchestration by Russia. They don’t want much attention—just enough to persuade Israel to wait on military action, to buy time. The American line is that the economic sanctions are working and weakening Tehran’s will. Iran’s line is we’re willing to compromise, but we’re not going to be pushovers. Of course, there is no actual collusion between Iran and the United States; they don’t trust each other. But both have reached the conclusion that war is worse than continued uncertainty—at least for the time being, as far as the United States is concerned. Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov has been driving the process. Moscow is one of Tehran’s last reliable friends, which makes Russia agreeable to Iran, but suspect in the West. Nonetheless, Lavrov has presented Iran with an unpublished, and perhaps vague, step-by-step proposal with reciprocity at each step. The idea is for both sides to move gradually toward Iran’s limiting (not eliminating) its nuclear capacity, plus extensive inspections and the West’s lifting economic sanctions against Iran plus giving security guarantees. U.S. officials and other sources claim a breakthrough occurred in the Russian-Iranian talks last month. The big concessions, they said, were made by Tehran. Iran would hold its uranium enrichment to 5 percent, well below the threshold needed to make nuclear weapons, maintain only one uranium facility, and allow extensive inspections. These diplomatic mumblings were never spelled out in an official document. Instead, they were followed by a general and short letter sent from Saeed Jalili, head of Iran’s Supreme National Security Council. The addressee was EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton, posting officer for the P-5+1 (the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council plus Germany).

#### 7. Transportation spending outweighs other issues --- massive support even from the Tea Party.

Rockefeller Foundation 11Press Release, 2/14/2011 (Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform, p. http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure)

This Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey highlights 4 key findings:

American voters see improvement in transportation infrastructure as a way to improve the economy and their quality of life: With federal unemployment rates hovering at 9%, Americans feel that improvements to transportation and infrastructure will create millions of jobs – eight in ten voters think transportation and infrastructure will boost local economies and create jobs including 64% of Tea Party supporters and 66% of Republicans. American voters are looking for consensus and cooperation in Washington: Americans want their elected officials to work together, especially around the issue of transportation and infrastructure (66% of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground). More than any other issue tested, American voters would like to see compromise on legislation related to transportation and infrastructure (71%). American voters see room for improvement in how government spends money on infrastructure: With a high federal deficit, Americans overwhelmingly say that that current government spending on building and maintaining transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise – 64% overall and 72% of Republicans. Americans support a host of reforms aimed at making spending more efficient while still producing results. For instance, 90% support allowing local regions to have some input on how transportation dollars are used in their area. American voters are open to several funding streams for national transportation projects: With overwhelming support for transportation and infrastructure improvements, Americans are open to several funding streams. Seventy-eight percent ­­­

#### 8. Mass transit popular amidst voters

Rockefeller Foundation, 11

(Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure

#### 9. Transportation spending is not perceived by voters.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

#### 10. Mass transit popular amidst voters

Rockefeller Foundation, 11

(Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure

### 2AC O Good Elections – China Bashing

#### 1. Their DA is extremely low risk of assuming that providing affordable transportation will kill Obama’s chances of winning and that Romney would then bashing China all the way to the point of intentionally starting a trade war between the US and China that will then somehow lead to a hot war between the nations and then deciding to nuke each other

#### 2. Relations and Romney’s negotiations check trade war and China has been bashed

New York Times 12 The Electoral Math of Romney’s Stance on Trade With China March 22, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/23/us/politics/mitt-romneys-stance-on-china-trade.html?pagewanted=all

“This is directly from him,” said Mr. Weber, a Washington lobbyist and former Republican congressman from Minnesota. “He believes it will strengthen his hand substantially. Mitt Romney is a person who sees himself as a successful negotiator.”? Underpinning Mr. Romney’s argument is his assertion that recent presidents of both parties have been “played like a fiddle” by Chinese leaders. By keeping the yuan’s value lower against the dollar than market forces would dictate, Beijing makes exports to the United States cheaper and imports from the United States more expensive. In a Republican debate last year, Mr. Romney said China’s interest in smooth relations with a mammoth customer like the United States would preclude his actions from backfiring.? “You think they want to have a trade war?” Mr. Romney said. “If you are not willing to stand up to China, you will get run over by China, and that’s what’s happened for 20 years.”? That assertion grates on veterans of the Bush administration, which in 2006 began a “strategic economic dialogue” with China led by Treasury Secretary Henry M. Paulson Jr., a former chairman of Goldman Sachs. The Obama administration has extended that dialogue, pressing Beijing to raise the value of the yuan while stopping short of declaring China a currency manipulator.? “Both the Bush and Obama administrations have been as aggressive as possible while protecting the American people,” said Neel T. Kashkari, a Bush administration Treasury official now at Pimco, the giant bond-trading firm. “Launching a trade war with China would hurt us as much as it would hurt them.”

#### 3. WTO would check trade wars between the US and China

#### 4. Romney winning now – swing states and democratic states shift

Kessler 8/6 Ronald Kessler Staff Writer Democrat States Moving to Romney Aug 6 2012 10:18 AM http://www.newsmax.com/Politics/Democrat-States-Romney-Buchanan/2012/08/06/id/447659

Ronald Kessler reporting from Washington, D.C. — States that traditionally have been considered Democrat strongholds are now moving toward Mitt Romney, Bay Buchanan, a senior adviser to Romney, tells Newsmax. “When we came into this general election, it was assumed that the battleground states would be the same ones that they were in the past,” says Buchanan, who was treasurer of the U.S. under President Reagan. “Well what’s happened is a lot of the Democratic states are now looking like Mitt Romney could win them. They are now swing states.” That means that Democrats have to focus on an additional five states: New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, Buchanan says. As it is, Mitt Romney and the Republican National Committee have about $25 million more cash on hand than the Democrats. Based on polls the campaign considers reliable, “Romney is running very, very strong in some traditionally swing states,” Buchanan says. “We feel very good about Indiana now. I don’t think it’s even a swing state. In North Carolina, the numbers show us up as high as five or six percentage points. Florida looks very, very good. It is still within the margin of error, but it’s certainly very strong for us.” While Virginia looks tougher, “We’re in play,” Buchanan says. “That’s clearly going to go down to the wire. But we’re looking strong in Wisconsin. We got some two dozen offices in Wisconsin. We’re all over the state running very strong grass roots. It’s going to be up on TV, and so we’re going to force the Democrats to use some of their money if they want to hold on to Wisconsin. There are a lot of other states that we’re going to be playing in where four months ago most analysts would have said Republicans don’t have any chance.” President Obama’s campaign has poured almost $100 million into ads mainly in swing states. “The ads have gotten him no bump in any poll, and that has to be an alarming thing for the Obama campaign when they can put all of this kind of money in negative ads and have the president of the United States out there talking and trying to build his numbers and to see nothing happen,” Buchanan says. “So I think what is clear is that Obama is unable to move things.” In contrast, “When we put money into a state, we see movement,” Buchanan says. “We see our numbers climb, and now that we’re going to be able to run parity with them on the money, and since we’re now approaching the Tampa convention, we’ll be able to spend as much as they do if not more with a message portraying who Mitt Romney is and what his vision of America is.” Buchanan says Romney will be offering more specifics about his plans to turn the economy around. As noted in my story "[A Winning Slogan for Romney](http://www.newsmax.com/RonaldKessler/Romney-campaign-slogan-believe-in-America/2012/07/30/id/446998)," the GOP presidential candidate needs to offer tangible benefits if he is elected. To boost his appeal, ads are now portraying him in more human terms and outlining why Romney’s financial success means he knows how to fix the national economy. Buchanan says Obama spoke from the heart when he said the private sector is doing fine and businessmen didn’t build their own businesses but instead owe their success to roads, bridges, and teachers. “I think we now know a little bit more about why President Obama imposed the kind of job-killing policies that he did,” Buchanan says. “It fits in with his philosophy that the answer to all of our problems is government, and so everything that he does is to take money from the private sector.” A recent report from the General Accountability Office underscored the difference between the public and private sector. Selling something as basic as food, the government-owned Amtrak has lost $800 million in the past 10 years because of theft and lack of coordination and supervision. Movie theaters make their money selling popcorn and candy bars, but Amtrak loses money selling food, notes Buchanan, who recently came out with her book “Bay and Her Boys: Unexpected Lessons I Learned as a (Single) Mom.” “It just goes to show that the private sector does things efficiently and well because if they don’t, they are going to lose money, and they don't want to lose money,” Buchanan says. “The government doesn’t care because the money they use isn’t theirs.” Buchanan predicts that Romney’s announcement of a vice presidential candidate — which she expects before the convention — will further boost his campaign. “People want to know what they are buying, and right now it’s Mitt Romney, but when you have the whole team together, working together out there and making our case, I think you are going to see real movement,” Buchanan says. “What matters at this point is who has the momentum three months out, and there’s no question that the momentum is with us,” Buchanan says.

#### 5. Obamacare killing his election chances now --- improving economic conditions key to victory.

**Epshteyn**, **7/18**/2012 (Boris – Republican political strategist, investment banker and finance attorney living in New York City, Obama’ Can’t Distract Voters From the Flagging Economy, U.S. News & World Report, p. <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/boris-epshteyn/2012/07/18/obama-cant-distract-voters-from-the-flagging-economy>)

Much of the country has been in successive heat waves for the past month, while President Obama and his campaign have experienced a continued pesky cold streak. Not even a victory in the Supreme Court over Obamacare could shake them out of the doldrums. Why? Because the Obamacare decision was followed by a jobs report a week later containing nothing even close to good news. That jobs report was vital because if it had showed economic improvement, it would have given the Obama campaign something to build momentum on. Instead, it served as a reminder to the American voter that while President Obama may have won in the Supreme Court on healthcare he is losing in the fight for economic recovery. Team Obama's response? First, President Obama asked the American public to not "read too much into" the jobs report. I will let the Labor Department address the ridiculousness of that statement. Second, the Obama campaign unleashed a furious ad onslaught. The advertising push however, was not focused on any of the president's accomplishments (Obamacare obviously didn't fit the bill due to its unpopularity), but on the business background of former Gov. Mitt Romney. Whether one believes the attacks are fair or not, and in my humble opinion they are misguided, the bigger issue for team Obama is that they simply do not work. A quick glance at Real Clear Politics's average of polls shows that on the day after the Obamacare decision, President Obama led Governor Romney by 3.8 percent, whereas the lead now is down to an insignificant 2.0 percent—a statistical tie. The numbers in battleground states also generally mirror the national average and stay within the margin of error. President Obama and his team have, notwithstanding his claims otherwise to Charlie Rose, abandoned any notion of "transcendence" or "hope and change" and in return have received nothing but bad polls. There are four more jobs reports before the election on November 6. The economic community tends to agree that they will not be much better than the last. However, in order to have a shot at re-election, President Obama would be well served to make sure that his response is much improved.

#### 6. Transportation spending will win Obama the election --- perceived as a job creator.

**Cooper**, 1/25/**2012** (Donna – Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to **help the middle class grow and prosper**. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens.

#### 7. Transportation spending outweighs other issues --- massive support even from the Tea Party.

**Rockefeller Foundation Press Release**, 2/14/**2011** (Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform, p. http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure)

This Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey highlights 4 key findings:

American voters see improvement in transportation infrastructure as a way to improve the economy and their quality of life: With federal unemployment rates hovering at 9%, Americans feel that improvements to transportation and infrastructure will create millions of jobs – eight in ten voters think transportation and infrastructure will boost local economies and create jobs including 64% of Tea Party supporters and 66% of Republicans. American voters are looking for consensus and cooperation in Washington: Americans want their elected officials to work together, especially around the issue of transportation and infrastructure (66% of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground). More than any other issue tested, American voters would like to see compromise on legislation related to transportation and infrastructure (71%). American voters see room for improvement in how government spends money on infrastructure: With a high federal deficit, Americans overwhelmingly say that that current government spending on building and maintaining transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise – 64% overall and 72% of Republicans. Americans support a host of reforms aimed at making spending more efficient while still producing results. For instance, 90% support allowing local regions to have some input on how transportation dollars are used in their area. American voters are open to several funding streams for national transportation projects: With overwhelming support for transportation and infrastructure improvements, Americans are open to several funding streams. Seventy-eight percent ­­­

#### 8. Transportation spending is not perceived by voters.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

#### 9. No Trade War – China will try to maintain trade

Qingfen 125/30, -Ding Qingfen (China Daily), “Frictions to 'heat up' over trade,” http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2012-05/30/content\_15418479.htm, AJ

Trade frictions between China and the United States will probably become more heated in the months ahead, but no trade war will break out between the two biggest economies in the world, Pascal Lamy, director-general of the World Trade Organization said on Tuesday. "As Chinese trade with the rest of the world grows, there is a normal statistical proportion of trade frictions, and we believe that the frictions can be handled peacefully," said Lamy. "But nothing like a trade war." Lamy made the remarks in an interview conducted at the Beijing 2012 Round Table on WTO Accession Best Practices for the least developed countries, which was held in the capital city. During the forum, Chen Deming, minister of commerce, said China is willing to help the least developed countries in the world join the WTO. Having them in the organization will be good for the world economy and global trade, as well as for China. China, together with other countries in the WTO, is calling for a simplification of the procedures countries must go through to join the trade organization. Agreements meant to bring about that goal are expected to be signed by July, Chen said. Last week, the Ministry of Commerce wrote on its website about policies used to support wind, solar and other sorts of renewable energy projects in five US states, including Washington, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio and California, saying they violate WTO policies and trade treaties. China also complained to the WTO about the US’ imposition of anti-subsidy duties on $7.29 billion worth of Chinese goods from 22 different categories that were imported to the US last year. The announcements came on the heels of the US Commerce Department's preliminary decision to place anti-dumping tariffs of up to 250 percent on imports of Chinese solar cells. Analysts at home and abroad expressed worries that China's response to that action will provoke a trade war between the two nations. Lamy, though, said a member of the WTO has the right to challenge other members if it thinks they have violated trade rules. "Sometimes, China challenges the US, EU, with anti-dumping or countervailing duties, and sometimes it is other way round," he said. "There are trade frictions, trade disputes, but there are no trade wars." As the US presidential election draws near, the US may take further actions against China and its trade policies in the hope of quieting critics who complain about their country’s trade deficit with China and high unemployment rate, experts said. Obama has announced plans to establish a trans-agency trade enforcement unit that will be charged with investigating the policies and practices of the country’s most important trade partners. In November, China began investigating whether the US was improperly using subsidies to lower the price of US products. That scrutiny came a month after the seven US solar manufacturers filed a complaint with the US International Trade Commission and the Department of Commerce. The Ministry of Commerce said the US has used subsidies in ways that are "inconsistent with the WTO rules and rulings in many regards". "Trade frictions are a normal statistical proportion volume of trade," Lamy said. "As trade grows, the number of trade frictions grows." The Commerce Department is scheduled to make a final determination on solar tariffs in early October. The US agency also announced it would investigate Chinese exports of wind turbines, saying makers of that equipment have received unfair government subsidies. It plans to make an announcement on Wednesday about the duties it will impose on those products. Along with the EU and Japan, the US filed a complaint in March with the WTO to challenge China’s policies governing exports of rare-earth minerals. "We are concerned that during the financial crisis, protectionism is growing," Lamy said. "That's the reality." "But on the whole, there are not dramatic surges of protectionist measures, although there are signs that remain worrying. It's like going to a doctor from time to time. We do checkups, and we tell the patients, 'Be careful'."

#### 10. Mass transit popular amidst voters

Rockefeller Foundation, 11

(Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure

### 2AC O Good Elections – Diseases

#### 1. Their DA is extremely low risk of assuming that providing affordable transportation will kill Obama’s chances of winning and that a disease would one day come up and would be impossible to be stopped

#### 2. Diseases burn out – no spread

**Morse, 04** (Stephen, PhD, director of the Center for Public Health Preparedness, at the Mailman School of Public Health of Columbia University, May 2004, “Emerging and Reemerging Infectious Diseases: A Global Problem,” http://www.actionbioscience.org/newfrontiers/morse.html, Hensel)

Morse: A pandemic is a very big epidemic. It requires a number of things. There are many infections that get introduced from time to time in the human population and, like Ebola, burn themselves out because they kill too quickly or they don’t have a way to get from person to person. They are a terrible tragedy, but also, in a sense, it is a lucky thing that they don’t have an efficient means of transmission. In some cases, we may inadvertently create pathways to allow transmission of infections that may be poorly transmissible, for example, spreading HIV through needle sharing, the blood supply, and, of course, initially through the commercial sex trade. The disease is not easily transmitted, but we provided, without realizing it, means for it to spread. It is now pandemic in spite of its relatively inefficient transmission. We also get complacent and do not take steps to prevent its spread.

#### 3. Romney winning now – swing states and democratic states shift

Kessler 8/6 Ronald Kessler Staff Writer Democrat States Moving to Romney Aug 6 2012 10:18 AM http://www.newsmax.com/Politics/Democrat-States-Romney-Buchanan/2012/08/06/id/447659

Ronald Kessler reporting from Washington, D.C. — States that traditionally have been considered Democrat strongholds are now moving toward Mitt Romney, Bay Buchanan, a senior adviser to Romney, tells Newsmax. “When we came into this general election, it was assumed that the battleground states would be the same ones that they were in the past,” says Buchanan, who was treasurer of the U.S. under President Reagan. “Well what’s happened is a lot of the Democratic states are now looking like Mitt Romney could win them. They are now swing states.” That means that Democrats have to focus on an additional five states: New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, Buchanan says. As it is, Mitt Romney and the Republican National Committee have about $25 million more cash on hand than the Democrats. Based on polls the campaign considers reliable, “Romney is running very, very strong in some traditionally swing states,” Buchanan says. “We feel very good about Indiana now. I don’t think it’s even a swing state. In North Carolina, the numbers show us up as high as five or six percentage points. Florida looks very, very good. It is still within the margin of error, but it’s certainly very strong for us.” While Virginia looks tougher, “We’re in play,” Buchanan says. “That’s clearly going to go down to the wire. But we’re looking strong in Wisconsin. We got some two dozen offices in Wisconsin. We’re all over the state running very strong grass roots. It’s going to be up on TV, and so we’re going to force the Democrats to use some of their money if they want to hold on to Wisconsin. There are a lot of other states that we’re going to be playing in where four months ago most analysts would have said Republicans don’t have any chance.” President Obama’s campaign has poured almost $100 million into ads mainly in swing states. “The ads have gotten him no bump in any poll, and that has to be an alarming thing for the Obama campaign when they can put all of this kind of money in negative ads and have the president of the United States out there talking and trying to build his numbers and to see nothing happen,” Buchanan says. “So I think what is clear is that Obama is unable to move things.” In contrast, “When we put money into a state, we see movement,” Buchanan says. “We see our numbers climb, and now that we’re going to be able to run parity with them on the money, and since we’re now approaching the Tampa convention, we’ll be able to spend as much as they do if not more with a message portraying who Mitt Romney is and what his vision of America is.” Buchanan says Romney will be offering more specifics about his plans to turn the economy around. As noted in my story "[A Winning Slogan for Romney](http://www.newsmax.com/RonaldKessler/Romney-campaign-slogan-believe-in-America/2012/07/30/id/446998)," the GOP presidential candidate needs to offer tangible benefits if he is elected. To boost his appeal, ads are now portraying him in more human terms and outlining why Romney’s financial success means he knows how to fix the national economy. Buchanan says Obama spoke from the heart when he said the private sector is doing fine and businessmen didn’t build their own businesses but instead owe their success to roads, bridges, and teachers. “I think we now know a little bit more about why President Obama imposed the kind of job-killing policies that he did,” Buchanan says. “It fits in with his philosophy that the answer to all of our problems is government, and so everything that he does is to take money from the private sector.” A recent report from the General Accountability Office underscored the difference between the public and private sector. Selling something as basic as food, the government-owned Amtrak has lost $800 million in the past 10 years because of theft and lack of coordination and supervision. Movie theaters make their money selling popcorn and candy bars, but Amtrak loses money selling food, notes Buchanan, who recently came out with her book “Bay and Her Boys: Unexpected Lessons I Learned as a (Single) Mom.” “It just goes to show that the private sector does things efficiently and well because if they don’t, they are going to lose money, and they don't want to lose money,” Buchanan says. “The government doesn’t care because the money they use isn’t theirs.” Buchanan predicts that Romney’s announcement of a vice presidential candidate — which she expects before the convention — will further boost his campaign. “People want to know what they are buying, and right now it’s Mitt Romney, but when you have the whole team together, working together out there and making our case, I think you are going to see real movement,” Buchanan says. “What matters at this point is who has the momentum three months out, and there’s no question that the momentum is with us,” Buchanan says.

#### 4. Obamacare killing his election chances now --- improving economic conditions key to victory.

**Epshteyn**, **7/18**/2012 (Boris – Republican political strategist, investment banker and finance attorney living in New York City, Obama’ Can’t Distract Voters From the Flagging Economy, U.S. News & World Report, p. <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/boris-epshteyn/2012/07/18/obama-cant-distract-voters-from-the-flagging-economy>)

Much of the country has been in successive heat waves for the past month, while President Obama and his campaign have experienced a continued pesky cold streak. Not even a victory in the Supreme Court over Obamacare could shake them out of the doldrums. Why? Because the Obamacare decision was followed by a jobs report a week later containing nothing even close to good news. That jobs report was vital because if it had showed economic improvement, it would have given the Obama campaign something to build momentum on. Instead, it served as a reminder to the American voter that while President Obama may have won in the Supreme Court on healthcare he is losing in the fight for economic recovery. Team Obama's response? First, President Obama asked the American public to not "read too much into" the jobs report. I will let the Labor Department address the ridiculousness of that statement. Second, the Obama campaign unleashed a furious ad onslaught. The advertising push however, was not focused on any of the president's accomplishments (Obamacare obviously didn't fit the bill due to its unpopularity), but on the business background of former Gov. Mitt Romney. Whether one believes the attacks are fair or not, and in my humble opinion they are misguided, the bigger issue for team Obama is that they simply do not work. A quick glance at Real Clear Politics's average of polls shows that on the day after the Obamacare decision, President Obama led Governor Romney by 3.8 percent, whereas the lead now is down to an insignificant 2.0 percent—a statistical tie. The numbers in battleground states also generally mirror the national average and stay within the margin of error. President Obama and his team have, notwithstanding his claims otherwise to Charlie Rose, abandoned any notion of "transcendence" or "hope and change" and in return have received nothing but bad polls. There are four more jobs reports before the election on November 6. The economic community tends to agree that they will not be much better than the last. However, in order to have a shot at re-election, President Obama would be well served to make sure that his response is much improved.

#### 5. Transportation spending will win Obama the election --- perceived as a job creator.

**Cooper**, 1/25/**2012** (Donna – Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to **help the middle class grow and prosper**. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens.

#### 6. The media exaggerates the risk – disease won’t cause extinction

**Lind, 11** (Michael, Policy Director of the Economic Growth Program at the New America Foundation, March/April 2011, “So Long, Chicken Little,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/02/22/so\_long\_chicken\_little?page=0,5, Hensel)

There's nothing like a good plague to get journalists and pundits in a frenzy. Although the threat of global pandemics is real, it's all too often exaggerated. In the last few years, the world has experienced two such pandemics, the avian flu (H5N1) and swine flu (H1N1). Both fell far short of the apocalyptic vision of a new Black Death cutting huge swaths of mortality with its remorseless scythe. Out of a global population of more than 6 billion people, 8,768 are estimated to have died from swine flu, 306 from avian flu. And yet it was not just the BBC ominously informing us that "the deadly swine flu … cannot be contained." Like warnings about the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the good done by mobilizing people to address the problem must be weighed against the danger of apocalypse fatigue on the part of a public subjected to endless Chicken Little scares.

#### 7. Transportation spending outweighs other issues --- massive support even from the Tea Party.

**Rockefeller Foundation Press Release**, 2/14/**2011** (Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Reveals Bipartisan Support for Transportation and Infrastructure Investments and Reform, p. http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/press-releases/rockefeller-foundation-infrastructure)

This Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey highlights 4 key findings:

American voters see improvement in transportation infrastructure as a way to improve the economy and their quality of life: With federal unemployment rates hovering at 9%, Americans feel that improvements to transportation and infrastructure will create millions of jobs – eight in ten voters think transportation and infrastructure will boost local economies and create jobs including 64% of Tea Party supporters and 66% of Republicans. American voters are looking for consensus and cooperation in Washington: Americans want their elected officials to work together, especially around the issue of transportation and infrastructure (66% of voters say this is a time where they would like leaders in Washington to make compromises and seek common ground). More than any other issue tested, American voters would like to see compromise on legislation related to transportation and infrastructure (71%). American voters see room for improvement in how government spends money on infrastructure: With a high federal deficit, Americans overwhelmingly say that that current government spending on building and maintaining transportation infrastructure is inefficient and unwise – 64% overall and 72% of Republicans. Americans support a host of reforms aimed at making spending more efficient while still producing results. For instance, 90% support allowing local regions to have some input on how transportation dollars are used in their area. American voters are open to several funding streams for national transportation projects: With overwhelming support for transportation and infrastructure improvements, Americans are open to several funding streams. Seventy-eight percent ­­­

#### 8. Mass transit popular amidst voters

Rockefeller Foundation, 11

(Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure

#### 9. Transportation spending is not perceived by voters.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

#### 11. Mass transit popular amidst voters

Rockefeller Foundation, 11

(Survey Methodology: From January 29 to February 6, 2011, Hart Research (D) and Public Opinion Strategies (R) conducted a national survey of voters on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>)

But Americans want changes in the way the Federal government invests in infrastructure and makes policy. Two-thirds of respondents favored 9 of 10 reforms tested in the survey, with 90 supporting more accountability and certification that projects are delivered on time and fit into a national plan. In terms of priorities, a vast majority (80 percent) believe the country would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system and 57 percent believe that “safer streets for our communities and children” should be the one of the top two priorities if more money is to be invested in infrastructure

#### 12. Multiple measures prevent spread

Time, 09(Douglas A. McIntyre – staff writer, April 27, 2009, “Swine Flu Unlikely to Affect the Economy,” http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1894052,00.html, Hensel)

Since that pandemic more than 40 years ago, there have been no major events involving the global spread of lethal flu infections. There have been cases of dangerous avian flu outbreaks in Asia for a decade which has caused the deaths of a small number of people. Since these flu infections have not spread globally warnings and concerns about pandemics have not been much seen in the media. At the start of this weekend however the media has been very involved in transmitting the latest information from all the public health organizations and specialists in disease tracking. "We are very, very concerned," World Health Organization spokesman Thomas Abraham said. "We have what appears to be a novel virus and it has spread from human to human ... It's all hands on deck at the moment." Two critical factors should prevent the current outbreak from spreading much further. The first is the sophisticated monitoring systems set up by the CDC in the United States, similar authorities in other countries, and the WHO on a global basis. The SARS outbreak in 2002 ended up killing less than 800 people, in part because of a near shutdown of world travel and minute-by-minute tracking of the progress of the disease around the world. Secondly, there are several theories about why flu viruses do not spread with the rapidity and scale that they once did. One of the probable reasons is is that flu vaccines diminish the spread of the disease in general by cutting down on the spread of specific strains. This even extends to the vaccinations of animals that are the primary carriers of the infectious viruses. In addition, the CDC said that two major flu drugs, Tamiflu and Relenza, appear likely to diminish the severity of symptoms for the new strain, if taken in the first 48-hours of this Swine flu infection. That may be one of the reasons that public health officials, epidemiologists, and infectious disease specialists have indicated that people should not be overly concerned. One expert told NPR, "We've seen swine influenza in humans over the past several years, and in most cases, it's come from direct pig contact. This seems to be different," said Dr. Arnold Monto, from the University of Michigan. "I think we need to be careful and not apprehensive, but certainly paying attention to new developments as they proceed." The odds that tens of thousands of people will die from the flu are low. Advances in medicine and public health policy have made a big difference in the ability to monitor emerging serious illnesses. The fact that the new disease seems not to be terribly virulent outside of Mexico is another factor that supports the opinion that this will not be a major epidemic. However, in the minds of some analysts, the world can still look forward to trillions of dollars in financial losses and an economic depression.

### 2AC O Bad Mandate Elections

#### 1. People would not completely shift their vote if Mass Transit was passed

#### 2. Mandates don’t work – other side too partisan and too many checks

Washington Post 12 The myth of the presidential mandate 06/08/2012 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/the-myth-of-the-presidential-mandate/2012/06/08/gJQA0HvVNV\_blog.html

One common theory is that the two parties are so far apart that this election, finally, will provide a mandate for the winner and shock the losing side into cooperating. “We’re going to have as stark a contrast as we’ve seen in a very long time between the two candidates,” Obama told donors in Minneapolis. “My hope, my expectation, is that after the election, now that it turns out that the goal of beating Obama doesn’t make much sense because I’m not running again, that we can start getting some cooperation again.”? Republican Rep. Paul Ryan, speaking at the Reagan Library, was even more emphatic: “If we make the case effectively and win this November, then we will have the moral authority to enact the kind of fundamental reforms America has not seen since Ronald Reagan’s first year.”? This is conventional wisdom. Elections are arguments about where the country should go next. The candidate who wins the election wins the argument. The opposition party, disappointed as they may be, has little choice but to step aside. After all, they’re out of power.? But can you remember the last time it actually worked that way? The U.S. political system makes winning an election a necessary but very insufficient qualification for governing. The frequent elections in the House and staggered elections in the Senate, the expansion of the filibuster, the influence of the Supreme Court and the polarization of the political parties combine to constrain power. You can win an election and quickly find you lack the support to pass major priorities. Recall President Bill Clinton being stymied on health-care reform, or President George W. Bush’s failed run at Social Security privatization.? If you consider the mechanics of presidential mandates, it’s clear why they don’t amount to much. For one thing, contemporary elections are decided by narrow margins. Had 3.6 percent of the electorate voted the other way in 2008, Sen. John McCain would be president. In 2004, if 1.25 percent of Bush’s voters had switched sides, Sen. John Kerry would have won. In 2000, well, the winner didn’t even win the popular vote. In 1992 and 1996, Clinton won majorities in the Electoral College, but due to Ross Perot’s popularity, he never won the majority of the popular vote. None of these elections produced the kind of Rooseveltian or Reaganite landslides that cow the opposing party into submission.? Nor is it clear what specific policies voters have endorsed when they select a president. Although some go to the ballot box having read every word of their chosen candidate’s agenda, most don’t. A swing voter in Ohio might turn against Romney because of his links to Bain Capital without intending to endorse Obama’s ideas on immigration reform. “In short,” wrote political scientist John Sides in a roundup of academic research on presidential mandates, “we cannot interpret an election outcome as a wholesale endorsement of the winner’s policy proposals (or as a wholesale rejection of the loser’s).”? In addition, members of Congress don’t report to a national electorate. They report to their states or districts. If Obama narrowly wins the election but badly loses Kentucky, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell is carrying out the will of his people in organizing relentless opposition to Obama’s policies.? Worse, members of Congress -- particularly Republicans -- increasingly fear their primary election opponents more than their general election opponents. If you’re a Republican in a reliably Republican district or state, you’re probably more likely to lose to a far-right primary challenger than to a Democrat. (Just ask Bob Bennett, the former senator of Utah, or Richard Lugar, who just lost the Republican Senate primary in Indiana.) As a result, the voters you’re most eager to assuage aren’t just Republicans but also hard-core conservatives. They definitely don’t want you standing down out of obeisance to some abstract notion of “mandates.”? Finally, when a party does lose an election, it turns its attention to regaining power in the next cycle. In Robert Draper’s book “Do Not Ask What Good We Do: Inside the U.S. House of Representatives,” he reports on a strategy dinner attended by top Republicans, including Rep. Eric Cantor, Sen. Jim DeMint, Rep. Kevin McCarthy and Ryan, on the eve of Obama’s inauguration. “If you act like you’re the minority, you’re going to stay in the minority,” Draper quotes McCarthy saying. “We’ve gotta challenge them on every single bill and challenge them on every single campaign.”? McCarthy, of course, was right. Minorities don’t become majorities by helping the other party govern successfully. When things go well, voters reward the party in charge. More often, minorities become majorities by grinding the gears of government to a halt, amping up partisanship and doing everything they can to make sure voters are disgusted with Washington. Given such incentives, the belief that minority politicians will clap their majority colleagues on the back, mutter “good game” and get out of the way is fantasy.

#### 3. The Election is too far away – prediction is extremely unlikely

#### 4. Transportation spending is not perceived by voters.

**Rubinstein**, 3/27/**2012** (Dana – reporter for Capital, When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower moment?, Capital, p. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/03/5524547/when-obama-going-have-his-eisenhower-moment>)

And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself.

#### 5. Everyone is already decided – a close election is inevitable

Abramowitz 7/26 Alan Abramowitz Professor of Political Science, Emory University Is There Really An Enthusiasm Gap Between Democrats and Republicans? Huffington Post 07/26/2012 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-abramowitz/is-there-really-an-enthus\_b\_1706368.html

The fact that Democrats feel less enthusiastic than four years ago and Republicans feel more enthusiastic than four years ago does not necessarily mean that Democrats are now less enthusiastic than Republicans in any absolute sense. To determine whether that is the case, we would need to ask a question that focuses on respondents' absolute level of enthusiasm, not their enthusiasm compared with 2008. Fortunately, the Gallup poll asked just such a question one month ago and the results present a very different picture of the relative enthusiasm of Democrats and Republicans.? In a national survey conducted on June 25-26, Gallup asked Americans to rate their enthusiasm about voting this year on a five-point scale. The choices offered were extremely enthusiastic, very enthusiastic, somewhat enthusiastic, not too enthusiastic or not at all enthusiastic. On this question there was almost no difference between the responses of Democratic identifiers and leaners and those of Republican identifiers and leaners: 43 percent of Republicans were extremely or very enthusiastic compared with 39 percent of Democrats. On the other hand, 34 percent of Republicans were not too enthusiastic or not at all enthusiastic compared with 32 percent of Democrats. On a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 is the highest enthusiasm score and 5 is the lowest, the average score was 2.87 for Democrats and 2.88 for Republicans.? These results indicate that Democrats are just as enthusiastic about voting this year as Republicans. And other evidence from Gallup's national tracking poll suggests that there is unlikely to be an unusually large Republican turnout advantage in November. In Gallup's most recent three-week compilation of their tracking poll results from July 3-22, 83 percent of registered Democrats said that they would definitely vote in November compared with 87 percent of registered Republicans.? One important point to bear in mind when it comes to turnout is that Republicans almost always turn out at a higher rate than Democrats, regardless of enthusiasm. So the 4 point gap in the Gallup tracking poll is nothing unusual. In fact, according to evidence from the highly respected American National Election Study surveys, Republicans turned out at a higher rate than Democrats in both 2004 and 2008 despite the supposed Democratic advantage in enthusiasm in those elections.? Republicans will almost certainly enjoy an advantage in turnout this year but it won't be because of their greater enthusiasm. It will be because Republicans identifiers are disproportionately white and affluent and find it easier to overcome numerous obstacles that make it difficult for many lower income and minority citizens to register and vote including, increasingly, voter identification laws enacted by Republican legislatures.

#### 6. Other issues overshadow social issues – a close election is inevitable

Manduca 8/5 Anthony Manduca US election race too close to call August 5, 2012 http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20120805/opinion/US-election-race-too-close-to-call.431514

In reality Obama has had a mixed record on the economy. He inherited a very difficult situation when he took office in January 2009 with America going through its worst economic and financial crisis since the Great Depression. The US economy contracted by 3.1 per cent in 2009, and then experienced modest economic growth of 2.4 per cent and 1.8 per cent over the next two years. This year the economy grew by two per cent in the first quarter and then by only 1.5 per cent in the second quarter.? America’s jobless rate and which candidate is best suited to preside over job creation will likely be the determining factor in this election. When Obama took office the unemployment rate stood at 7.8 per cent. As the economic situation worsened this increased to 10 per cent and it now stands at 8.3 per cent which is still far too high for a President seeking re-election. It is important to keep in mind that no US President since World War II has been re-elected with a jobless rate above eight per cent. The fact, however, that the two candidates are stick neck and neck in the polls, despite the high unemployment rate, is positive for Obama.? Further good news for the President is that the latest unemployment figures show that private employers created 163,000 jobs in July, the best rate of hiring in five months. Romney, on the other hand is insisting his economic programme and tax cuts would create 12 million jobs in the next four years. In response Obama told voters in Florida recently that his rival favours “trickle-down tax cut fairy dust” that has failed to fix the economy in the past.? “When I hear Governor Romney say his 25 years in the private sector gives him a special understanding of how the economy works, my question is, why are you running with the same bad ideas that brought our economy to the brink of disaster,” Obama said, adding that Romney’s proposed tax cuts for high income earners would mean higher tax bills for the middle class.? Obama and the Democratic Party have rather successfully portrayed Romney as a super rich out of touch businessman who pays less taxes than the average middle class American – since his earnings are taxed largely as capital gains rather than income. Romney has not yet released his 2011 tax returns, something that voters are not comfortable with.? The latest national polls are indeed close. The Rasmussen Reports daily Presidential Tracking Poll for last Thursday shows Romney attracting 46 per cent of the vote, while Obama earns support from 44 per cent. On the other hand a Gallup opinion poll shows Obama leading Romney by 47 per cent to 45 per cent.? However, a Quinnipiac University/CBS News/New York Times poll released on Thursday shows Obama leading Romney among voters in Ohio, Florida and Pennsylvania – three important battleground states with a high number of Electoral College votes.? The poll, conducted from July 24-30, shows Obama beating his Republican challenger 53 per cent to 42 per cent in Pennsylvania, 50 per cent to 44 per cent in Ohio and 51 per cent to 45 per cent in Florida. It is important to note that Ohio has not backed a losing presidential candidate since 1960 – Ohio is regarded as a ‘mini America’ – so just like in 2008 all eyes will be on the state again this year to see if Obama can hold on to his lead.? Another key issue in this presidential campaign is the deficit, forecast to hit $1.65 trillion this year, which led to Obama’s Democrats suffering heavy losses in the 2010 congressional elections. Romney has accused Obama of being a big-spending liberal, while the President has blamed the Republicans for creating the deficit under former President George W. Bush and has accused Romney of wanting want to cut spending on important areas such as education.? Although Obama’s historic health care law is one of the proudest achievements of his legacy – something we in Europe all agree is a good thing – it has proven to be controversial and divisive in America. Conservatives oppose what they call ‘Obamacare’ because they regard it as an example of government interference in their lives. Romney has promised to repeal the President’s health reform law which will definitely be a major issue in this campaign.? Although foreign policy is not a major issue in this campaign, Republicans have signalled they intend to make Obama’s ‘weak global leadership’ an issue this November. On balance I feel that Obama has done a good job in foreign policy, repairing America’s image abroad, getting US troops out of Iraq, going for the diplomatic option on Iran and responding well to the revolution in Libya.? On the other hand his failure to get the Middle East peace process moving is certainly disappointing as is his lack of action on Syria – although the Russians and Chinese are to blame for this stalemate.? Romney, on the other hand, has so far failed to impress most foreign policy observers. He called Russia “without question our number one geopolitical foe”, he offended the Palestinians by drawing an unfavourable contrast between the economic performance of Israel and the Palestinian territories and he also upset his British hosts by questioning the level of preparedness of the Olympics.? Social issues will also be debated in this campaign, such as abortion and gay rights, but are not expected to play a major part in the election. Obama’s support for gay marriage, however, may cost his some votes among Catholics, Hispanics and African-Americans, most of who supported him in 2008. Some observers believe that considering the election is bound to be so close, Obama took an unnecessary risk in supporting gay marriage which is a very divisive issue in America.

#### 7. Too many obstacles make democrat comeback impossible

Washington Post 12 Handicappers say Democrats have little chance of taking back House 06/29/2012 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/post/handicappers-say-democrats-have-little-chance-of-taking-back-house/2012/06/29/gJQAIdYkBW\_blog.html

“The Cook Political Report is adjusting its House forecast from a Democratic gain of between five and 15 seats to a minimal net partisan change, most likely between two seats for Republicans and eight for Democrats,” Cook wrote.? Democrats need 25 seats to win back the House. Given that President Obama is headed into a very close reelection fight in a bad economy, and Republican control of redistricting in many key states helped the party shore up vulnerable members, both Stuart Rothenberg and Cook Political Report argue that a “wave” like the one that swept Republicans into power two years ago is unlikely.? Even if Democrats won the 25 seats Cook classifies as lean or likely Democratic, along with all 24 toss-up races, they would still need to win 13 out of 18 lean Republican seats to take control.? Generic congressional ballots show Democrats with a slim lead over Republicans. In 2010, the GOP did not develop a major lead in that polling until mid-August. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has himself said that Democrats have a “one-in-three” chance of taking his gavel away.? “In the latest congressional generic ballot voters prefer Democrats over Republicans for Congress and three quarters of our Red to Blue candidates outraised their Republican opponent so the Republican Majority is in jeopardy,” said Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee spokesman Jesse Ferguson.? Democrats definitely have the advantage in this cycle; Republicans have more members period and more vulnerable members. Redistricting did not give them many new opportunities. But right now, 25 looks like too steep a hill to climb.

#### 8. Defense spending and peace are unrelated – 25% cuts prove no impact

Fettweis 10 (Christopher, Assistant professor IR @ Tulane, Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy, Survival (00396338); Apr/May, Vol. 52 Issue 2, p59-82, 24p)

One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly: US actions do not seem to have contributed much. The limited evidence suggests that there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is no relation between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defence spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.29 To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible ‘peace dividend’ endangered both national and global security. ‘No serious analyst of American military capabilities’, argued neo-conservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1996, ‘doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace’.30 And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain: the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilising presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in US military capabilities. Most of all, the United States was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.

### //1AR Elections Uq overwhelms the link

#### Obama will dominate the elections – studies from growth shows

Booton 8/2 Jennifer Booton Betting on a Romney Win? Check the S&P 500 First August 02, 2012 http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2012/08/01/betting-on-romney-win-check-sp-500-first/

However, a quick look at the history books shows a rising market ahead of a presidential election actually signals the victory of the incumbent. That would mean that the market’s recent gain could be reflecting an Obama victory, not a loss, as well as broader sentiment about the market and economy -- or simply hopes the Federal Reserve soon provides new help.? “Either we have a tremendous situation of being fooled by randomness or we have an interesting stock market phenomenon.”? - Sam Stovall, chief equity strategist at S&P Capital IQ.? Of the 28 presidential elections since 1900, an improvement in the S&P 500 prior to an election preceded an incumbent victory 80% of the time, or 16 of 20 of times. The S&P 500’s direction during that period carried an accuracy rate of 82%, according to S&P Capital IQ data.? “Either we have a tremendous situation of being fooled by randomness or we have an interesting stock market phenomenon,” said Sam Stovall, chief equity strategist at S&P Capital IQ.? Of the three out of the four times the incumbent lost following an S&P 500 upswing, outside factors such as third-party candidates were involved, like when Teddy Roosevelt created his own conservative political party ahead of the 1912 election, taking away votes from incumbent William Howard Taft and ultimately leading to the election of Democrat Woodrow Wilson.? When the market fell ahead of a presidential election, the incumbent was overthrown 88% of the time. The only time this predictor failed was in 1956, when Adalai Stevenson failed to overthrow incumbent President Dwight Eisenhower, which could have been a reflection of macro political pressures such as the Suez Canal crisis or Soviet headaches. ? The modern era has its own macroeconomic and political pressures, such as revolts in Syria and eurozone turmoil, as well as weaker-than-expected economic growth in the U.S. that could all add up to an election result that sways from the historical norm. Stovall notes that while history often repeats itself, an 80% accuracy rate is certainly not foolproof.? Still, analysts say that the optimism that has caused the S&P 500, Dow Jones Industrial Average and Nasdaq to all climb more than 7% since January more likely reflects much broader sentiment than just who investors are betting on to win November’s election. ? “I can answer why the market is up in two words: anticipated stimulus,” Stovall said. “I think investors, if they don’t have the history in front of them, may look at things in a different perspective.”? It wouldn’t be surprising if the Fed introduced some fiscal easing over the next few months, as it has raised or lowered interest rates four times in August, five times in September and four times in October in election years since 1976, according to S&P Capital IQ data.? Marc Pado, U.S. market strategist at Dowbull, said recent market gains are more a reflection that uncertainty is coming to a close. The election, no matter the outcome, will answer key question about pending issues like the Bush Tax Cuts and health care, he said.? “

#### Major shift to Obama victory concerning the economy happening now

Washington Post 12 Mitt Romney losing ground on economy? 07/12/2012 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/post/mitt-romney-losing-ground-on-economy/2012/07/12/gJQAGIWvfW\_blog.html

The job situation remains the number-one issue for voters in this campaign. Neither candidate has a clear advantage on this issue: 46% say Romney and 42% say Obama can do a better job improving the job situation.? More generally, Mitt Romney has lost ground over the past month on the issue of the economy. The eight-point advantage he held in June as the candidate better able to improve the economy has now flipped, with 48% saying Obama can better improve economic conditions, while 42% favor Romney. ? Last month, Romney held an eight point advantage on who can best improve the economy; now Obama holds a six point advantage. Among independents, there’s also been a big swing.? In June, Romney led Obama by 23 points, 54-31, among independents on the economy. That lead has dwindled down to four points; Romney now leads among them on the issue by 43-39.? And this is even more interesting: The swing on the economy has been bigger in the dozen battleground states than it has been nationally, though the difference is within the margin of error.? Pew sends over some numbers: In June, Romney led Obama in those dozen states by eight points on the economy, 49-41. Now Obama leads Romney in those same states by nine points, 50-41. Interestingly, there’s been no shift in the horse race numbers in those states — Obama leads 51-44, similar to last month — but clearly, Romney has lost real ground on the economy in them, even though he has been relentlessly pounding Obama’s economic stewardship as a disastrous failure.?

### //1AR Israel won’t strike Iran

#### Romney would negotiate and heg solves

Turkish Weekly 7/30 Netanyahu Says 'Strong, Credible' Threat Needed to Stop Iran Nukes 30 July 2012 http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/139421/netanyahu-says-39-strong-credible-39-threat-needed-to-stop-iran-nukes.html

"We have to be honest and say that all the sanctions and diplomacy so far have not set back the Iranian program by one iota," he said. "And that's why I believe that we need a strong and credible military threat, coupled with the sanctions, to have a chance to change that situation."? Netanyahu's comments came during a meeting with the U.S. Republican presidential hopeful Mitt Romney, who earlier signaled he would support an Israeli preemptive military strike on Iran.? Romney's senior national security aide, Dan Senor, told reporters in Israel that Romney would "respect" a decision by Israeli officials to use military force against Iran to stop work on its nuclear program, which Israel believes could be used to launch a missile attack on the Jewish state.? Speaking during his meeting with Netanyahu, Romney said he looked forward to further discussions on curbing Iran's nuclear activity.? "Your perspectives with regards to Iran and its efforts to become a nuclear-capable nation are ones which I take with great seriousness," Romney said. "And I look forward to chatting with you about further actions that we could take to dissuade Iran from their nuclear folly."? He also said that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel.? Romney, who is on the second leg of a three-country tour aimed at boosting his foreign-policy credentials ahead of the U.S. presidential vote this November, went on to meet with Israeli President Shimon Peres.? He was also due to visit the West Bank city of Ramallah, although he had no meeting scheduled with Palestinian leader Mahmud Abbas.? Romney's visit comes as Israel's "Haaretz" newspaper has published a report claiming President Barack Obama's national security adviser has already informed Netanyahu of a U.S. plan to attack Iran if diplomatic efforts fail to convince Tehran to curb its nuclear program.? U.S. officials have yet to comment on the "Haaretz" report, which quotes an unnamed U.S. official as saying the adviser, Thomas Donilon, described the plan over dinner with Netanyahu earlier in July.? The Obama administration has traditionally urged restraint on Iran issues, calling on Israel to back diplomatic efforts to resolve the nuclear standoff.? On a visit to Jerusalem this month, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Israel and Washington were "on the same page" with respect to Iran and said the United States "will use all elements of American power to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.? Iran says its program is solely for peaceful purposes.

#### No war – its and bluff and heg solves

Ogorodnev 8/4 Igor Ogorodnev Phony war: Is Netanyahu's tough talk on Iran just a front? 04 August, 2012 http://www.rt.com/news/israel-iran-netanyahu-octet-870/

Israel’s threats that it could attack Iran at any time appear to be a tactical ploy, after a government insider revealed that no military plans against Tehran have been discussed by Israel's top ministers for “months.”? The information was leaked to news agency Reuters by a highly-placed official who has been briefed on all the meetings of the octet – an inner council of the top eight Israeli ministers, presided over by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.? "The octet hasn't held a proper discussion of Iran for months – since October, as far as I can recall," claims the insider.? "It's possible that, since then, Iran came up during other sessions, but I wouldn't count those as serious discussions. You can't make any concrete decisions or policy advances in an hour-long chat on the sidelines of a different agenda."? The insider also confirmed rumors that the octet had factionalized, with hawkish Netanyahu held back by top military and security officials who are “entirely against” an Israel-led attack on Tehran’s nuclear program, believing the country does not have the necessary resources for a war with its much bigger rival.? "It is very, very difficult to see a situation where a prime minister will go against the advice not just of the former heads of Mossad and Shin Bet, but most of the military commanders," commented Uzi Rabi, director of Tel Aviv’s Moshe Dayan Centre for Middle Eastern Studies.? The information is in sharp contrast to the belligerent rhetoric displayed by Netanyahu, who chided Washington’s softly-softly approach to Iran as he stood next to US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta during a press conference in Jerusalem earlier this week.? "Neither sanctions nor diplomacy have yet had any impact on Iran’s nuclear weapons program," boomed a visibly agitated Netanyahu, who at one point banged his fist on the lectern.? Netanyahu also claimed that he would take responsibility for any attack on Iran, which Jerusalem believes is trying to acquire nuclear weapons. He claimed that he has, in fact, held bi-weekly meetings to discuss war-with-Iran scenarios.? A reluctant ally? There are several explanations for the discrepancy between the public sable-rattling, and the private caution in Jerusalem.? "The Iranians' math is off if they think they have open-ended immunity," Netanyahu said during the same press conference.? Yet, the bombastic rhetoric could be intended as a message to the Iranian leadership, to create what the prime minister has called a “strong and credible threat” that will force Tehran to the negotiating table, where the West has placed heavy incentives for it. But only if the Islamic Republic gives up its dalliance with the atom.? A second theory, widely circulated in the Israeli media, suggests that the war veteran prime minister is trying to rally the hawks, papering over the cracks in the cabinet and military by shouting out loudest – speaking as with one voice, when in fact, there are dozens of different views on the issue within Israel.? But the most likely explanation seems to be that Israel is forcing the hand of its closest ally, the US. By saying that it will strike without consultation, it may force the US to intervene to avoid a bloody conflict in which Iran is likely to retaliate against Israel.? In fact, during the press conference with Panetta, the US Defense Chief was forced into making strongly supportive comments after Netanyahu’s provocations, all the while looking uncomfortable at the US being cast as the soft one.? "We will not allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon, period," insisted Panetta.? Nonetheless, Washington may well call Israel’s bluff, partly because of the havoc any large military operation would cause to the prospects of President Barack Obama’s re-election in November’s presidential poll.? "It would not be healthy for Israeli-US relations to carry out such a significant attack that might influence the election. So my guess is they won't do it before early November, because it might embarrass the US administration," says Ephraim Kam, Deputy Director of the Institute for National Security Studies.? What could happen after that is anybody's guess. While Obama has been the very model of caution, his Republican rival Mitt Romney has adopted a hard-line stance.? “We must not delude ourselves into thinking that containment is an option,” he said during a recent visit to Israel, while his senior foreign policy aide promises Romney will not condemn any Israeli strike on Iranian facilities.

### 2AC Buy American DA

#### 1. Agreement on reciprocal bidding means normal means of the plan avoids “Buy America” constraints

Morton (their card), 5/9/2012 (Peter, Buy American provisions could block Canadian bidders, Torstar News, p. http://www.thespec.com/print/article/721511)

Canada and the U.S. have long butted heads on various Buy America laws dating as far back as 1933. The various Buy America provisions try to create U.S. jobs through restrictions on imported construction materials, mostly steel and iron. Canada thought it bought some peace in February 2010 when the two governments agreed on reciprocal bidding in each other’s countries on infrastructure projects such as bridges and roads after President Barack Obama brought in a $787-billion economic stimulus bill.

#### 2. Canada’s econ resilient – large exports despite buy American and Europe collapse

Isfeld 12 Gordon Isfeld, Canada's economy shows surprising resilience, Financial Post May 16, 2012 http://www.vancouversun.com/business/Canada+economy+shows+surprising+resilience/6633199/story.html#ixzz22he5jhKp

Canada's economy is showing surprising signs of resilience, but the outlook for sustained growth is still clouded by events outside our borders.? The latest evidence that a recovery could indeed be gathering strength came Wednesday from the manufacturing sector. Shipments of factory goods increased far more than expected in March, bouncing back from an equally surprising contraction in the previous month.? But the finance minister tempered that optimism Wednesday, warning the debt crisis in Europe could yet "create a shock that will affect Canada."? "Our banks are strong but we're not completely immune from the state of the global economy," Jim Flaherty told a Senate's banking committee, as Greece's never-ending debt crisis held sway over financial markets yet again.? The European Union is Canada's largest trading partner after the United States, with the United Kingdom the No. 3 destination for our exports.? "No one can say for sure what will happen ... if Greece ultimately leaves the eurozone," said Douglas Porter, deputy chief economist at BMO Capital Markets. "No one is really sure what the fallout from that will be. Suffice it to say, it won't be pretty."? In its report, Statistics Canada said factory shipments rose 1.9 per cent to $49.7 billion in March. That was the largest advance since September 2011 and followed two consecutive monthly declines. Many economists had expected factory sales to grow by a meagre 0.3 per cent in March.? "Not much to rant about with this report," said Jimmy Jean, an economist at Desjardins Securities. "While it is still early to pinpoint March GDP (gross domestic product), this gain supports the view for a strong rebound during the month."? Canada's economy contracted by 0.2 per cent in February. It's still unlikely that growth will match the Bank of Canada's forecast for a 2.5 per cent gain for the first quarter of 2012.? But the manufacturing report "does indeed suggest that the economy bounced back nicely in March after that surprising dip in February GDP," said Porter.? Wednesday's factory data from was the second upbeat report in the past week, following on strong job gains Friday that marked the biggest two-month employment gain in more than 30 years.? BEGIN OPTIONAL TRIM? Meanwhile, a report released Wednesday suggested that Canada's increased reliance on oil exports is not hollowing out Central Canada's manufacturing base — a phenomenon known as Dutch disease.? The report, from the Institute for Research on Public Policy, found that cyclical factors and global competition is mostly to blame for the decline in factory production in Canada over the past decade, as opposed to commodity exports driving up the currency and hurting manufacturing.? March's rebound doesn't settle the question, but suggests the recent softness was due to temporary factors.? END OPTIONAL TRIM? BEGIN OPTIONAL END? In its report Wednesday, Statistics Canada said March factory sales were up in 13 of 21 industries tracked by the federal agency, with gains in seven of 10 provinces, accounting for more than three-quarters of the manufacturing sector.? Sales of petroleum and coal products rose 4.5 per cent to $7.5 billion — the highest level since July 2008 — mainly due to higher sales volumes at many oil refineries.? In the chemical industry, sales were up 3.2 per cent to $3.9 billion, with most manufacturers reporting higher sales. The transportation sector was also stronger, with motor vehicle sales rising 2.3 per cent and aerospace increasing 9.9 per cent.?

#### 3. Their Morton card only talks about slightly hindering the Canadian economy not collapsing it

#### 4. Buy American doesn’t violate trade agreements and don’t damage Canadian economy

Blanchfield 11 Mike Blanchfield Buy American policy ultimately good for Canada, envoy says Oct. 18 2011 http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/buy-american-policy-ultimately-good-for-canada-envoy-says/article558797/

Mr. Jacobson exhorted his audience to look at the bigger picture of the Canada-U.S. trading relationship – the largest in the history of the world.? Two-way trade between the two countries hit $526-billion last year, he says, or more than $1-million a minute.? The Buy American provisions are only a small part of the bill dealing with infrastructure repairs and the rebuilding of schools, he said. Most of the those expenditures would be for land and labour, which is not something that Canada could supply any way.? “When you contrast the consequences of the Buy America provision on Canadian commerce ... with the benefits to the Canadian economy of the bill as a whole – including the Buy America provision and all of the rest of it – I suspect the vast majority of Canadian economists would tell you that they'd take the bad with the good.”? Mr. Jacobson also moved to reassure his audience the jobs bill ensures the Buy American provisions will conform to the U.S. government's trade obligations under the World Trade Organization and the North American free-trade agreement.? “No two countries on earth have a better track record of working together to try to resolve trade differences than the United States and Canada,” the ambassador said to muted applause.

#### 5. MAP 21 should’ve triggered the link – Buy America Provisions were in MAP-21

Ichniowski 7/31 Tom Ichniowski MAP-21 Toughens 'Buy America' Requirements, U.S. Industry Says 7/31/2012 http://enr.construction.com/policy/washington\_observer/2012/0731-map21-alters-buy-america-requirements.asp

The newly enacted MAP-21 transportation bill has provisions that their advocates say will fortify "Buy America" requirements for highway and transit projects. But those policy changes drew criticism from a leading Canadian industry official.? The highway title of the statute, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, has one key "Buy America" change: It states that if a road or bridge project is split into multiple contracts and at least one of those contracts receives federal funding, all contracts on that project must abide by "Buy America" mandates.? The underlying requirement for federal-aid highway projects is that they must use “steel, iron and manufactured products [that] are produced in the United States.”? Prior to MAP-21’s enactment on July 6, if an individual contract on a multi-contract highway or bridge project did not use federal funds, ""Buy America" mandates did not apply to that segment.

#### 6. Canada is only the 9th biggest economy – its collapse won’t cause any major impact

#### 7. 2013 EPA funding bill will trigger the impact

Lothian 6/25 Derek Lothian Canada cannot tolerate new June 25, 2012'Buy American' amendment in Congress: CME http://www.cme-mec.ca/?lid=JCKNC-E742G-1W6JA&comaction=show&cid=M9D4U-BK1VE-UI6R6

The Government of Canada must take immediate action to derail a new Buy American amendment expected to be introduced later this week in the United States Congress, and work towards a joint content rule for all future procurement spending, according to Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters (CME).? ? The provision will be attached to the 2013 funding bill for the US Environmental Protection Agency and, if passed, would apply to all water and wastewater projects encompassed under the bill, including those at the state level. More than $100 billion is currently available for related infrastructure initiatives; however, the amendment would require all projects use only US-made steel, iron and manufactured goods in the construction or maintenance process.? ? “This protectionist legislation sets a dangerous precedent at a time when neither country can afford it,” explains CME President & CEO, Jayson Myers. “We’ve been down this road before and know how dire the economic consequences can be on both sides of the border. Ottawa must take prompt and aggressive steps to deter the US from pursuing such harmful policy, and be ready to respond with reciprocal provisions for Canadian procurement opportunities.”

### 2AC Cars Good

#### Auto Industry not long term, won’t recover fully

Smitka 12 (Michael Smitka, April 26, 2012, professor of economics at Washington and Lee University, has conducted research on the auto industry for more than two decades, Washington and Lee University, http://news.blogs.wlu.edu/2012/04/26/the-auto-industry-and-the-economy/ “The Auto Industry and the Economy”, KA)

But looked at from another angle, the news remains grim. Sales may be up sharply but are still 2.5 million units below the 16.3 million average pace of the previous 15 years. In the mid-2000s, the industry employed 3 million workers. Despite the recent gains, we are still more than 500,000 jobs below peak. On the employment front, the glass is not yet half full. Will recovery add back all these jobs? On the negative side, the U.S. is now the third-largest car market, behind China and the European Union. As the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) and other economies grow, sales will rise and investment to assemble cars locally will increase. Over time, design and engineering jobs will follow. We face long-term, and not just short-term, challenges as the industry continues to globalize. China, for example, is serious about electric cars. But in the face of an outcry by Congress over a failed solar panel venture, the U.S. has pulled the plug on electric vehicle startups, refusing to disburse funds for firms that have finished the engineering stage to hire the workers and buy the parts needed to commence production. If the Chinese market grows, we can expect to see technology — high-tech jobs — flow to where the money is. It's not just batteries, either. For the first time ever, more than half of the finalists for the Automotive News PACE supplier innovation competition were based outside the U.S. As an independent judge for the competition, one firm I visited this year was Continental, a German company launching a new telematics system that will facilitate hands-free services outside the luxury segment. The first company to adopt the system is GM — but it will be on Chevys sold in China, not in the U.S. That's where the growth is. The hardware was developed at Continental's telematics R&D center outside Chicago, but the software engineering was done in Shanghai, where the electronics "black box" is also assembled. We're a player, but with globalization, we're not as big a player as in the past. On the flip side, there is encouraging news: BMW and Mercedes chose to base plants in the U.S. to make key global products, while Korean and Japanese assemblers and suppliers continue to move jobs here: Production follows sales, and Toyota, Honda and Nissan — the Japanese Big Three — now have full-fledged vehicle engineering capabilities in the U.S. Given current exchange rates, we remain an attractive production base, with a wide array of suppliers and specialized engineering firms, good infrastructure, stable politics and a robust ability to overcome shocks. But the slower the recovery, the more we will see new technologies and the accompanying skilled jobs shift to where the sales are. On net, I doubt we'll ever fully recover.

#### Poor People can’t afford cars now – no transition

#### Structural issues in Europe hurt the auto industry

NYT 6/28/12 Ford Motor, Citing Europe’s Woes, Says Foreign Losses to Triple in Quarter By BILL VLASIC Published: June 28, 2012

DEARBORN, Mich. — Europe’s economic woes are taking a much bigger bite out of the profits of Ford Motor, which until now has largely avoided the hefty losses that have dragged down the profits of many of its rivals. The company said on Thursday that its total international losses would triple in the second quarter, with Europe accounting for the most of the loss. Ford lost $190 million in the first quarter in its international operations, which include Europe, South America and the Asia-Pacific region. **Europe was responsible for $149 million of the total**. The company’s chief financial officer, Robert Shanks, said in an interview that conditions in Europe were “getting tougher,” as manufacturers stepped up discounts to jump-start sales, which are at their lowest level in more than a decade. “We lost $190 million in the first quarter, and it will be three times greater than that” in the second quarter, Mr. Shanks said in the interview, held at Ford’s world headquarters. A loss on international operations of $500 million to $600 million in the quarter, which will end on Saturday, would depress Ford’s overall earnings for the period. The company previously forecast that international losses in the second quarter would be roughly the same as in the first quarter. “We have good results in North America and solid results at Ford Credit,” Mr. Shanks said. However, “the overall company profits will be substantially lower.” Ford shares, which were flat in regular trading on Thursday, fell about 3 percent after hours after online publication of the weaker forecast. Ford has suffered less from the downward spiral in European vehicle sales than has General Motors, which is planning to close at least one assembly plant on the Continent. But now Ford appears to be facing the same hard choices about plant capacity as G.M., Fiat and other carmakers. Mr. Shanks said the company had “excess capacity” in Europe but declined to reveal specifics of any potential plans for reorganization. “It’s too soon to say what we are going to do,” Mr. Shanks said. When asked if Ford would consider closing one of its five assembly plants to better align supply with demand, he said, “We’re going to have to develop a plan that gives us an opportunity to do that.” Ford has an 8 percent market share in Europe, and last year it broke even in the region, where about 15.3 million total vehicles were sold. But with industry sales in Europe now running at a 14 million rate, Ford cannot make money, Mr. Shanks said. “As we look ahead, this is not a cyclical issue,” he said. “**It’s a structural issue**.”

#### Their IL is from a center for learning has no date and only says car exports are key to economy not domestic sales

#### The question of austerity vs. stimulus is strictly time dependent – squo dictates stim

Frankel 7/25 (Jeff, James W. Harpel Professor of Capital Formation and Growth at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, July 25, 2012, “The Procyclicalists: Fiscal Austerity vs. Stimulus,” http://content.ksg.harvard.edu/blog/jeff\_frankels\_weblog/2012/07/25/the-procyclicalists-fiscal-austerity-versus-stimulus/)

The world is in the grip of a debate between fiscal austerity and fiscal stimulus. Opponents of austerity worry about contractionary effects on the economy. Opponents of stimulus worry about indebtedness and moral hazard. Is austerity good or bad? It is as foolish to debate this proposition as it would be to debate whether it is better for a driver to turn left or right. It depends where the car is on the road. Sometimes left is appropriate, sometimes right. When an economy is in a boom, the government should run a surplus; other times, when in recession, it should run a deficit. True, it is hard for politicians to get the timing of countercyclical fiscal policy exactly right. This is the reason, more than any other, why Keynesian policy lost its luster. “Fine-tuning” it was called. Sometimes the fiscal stimulus would kick in after the recession was already over. But this is no reason to follow a pro-cyclical fiscal policy. A procyclical fiscal policy piles on the spending and tax cuts on top of booms, but reduces spending and raises taxes in response to downturns. Budgetary profligacy during expansion; austerity in recessions. Procyclical fiscal policy is destabilizing, because it worsens the dangers of overheating, inflation, and asset bubbles during the booms and exacerbates the losses in output and employment during the recessions. In other words, a procyclical fiscal policy magnifies the severity of the business cycle. Yet many politicians in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the eurozone seem to live by procyclicality. They argue against fiscal discipline when the economy is strong, only to become deficit hawks when the economy is weak. Exactly backwards. Consider the positions taken over the last three decades by some American politicians. First cycle: During a recessionary period, President Ronald Reagan in his 1980 campaign and in his 1981 Inaugural Address urged immediate action to reduce the national debt “beginning today.” (Recession: austerity.) But in 1988, as the economy approached the peak of the business cycle, candidate George H.W. Bush was unconcerned about budget deficits, even though the national debt was rapidly approaching three times the level it had been when Reagan had given his speeches. “Read my lips, no new taxes,” Bush famously said. (Boom: profligacy.) Second cycle: Predictably, the first President Bush and the Congress finally summoned the political will to raise taxes and rein in spending growth at precisely the wrong moment, that is, just as the US was entering another recession in 1990. (Recession: austerity.) Although the timing of the legislation was poor, the action was courageous. The Pay as You Go Rule and other reforms switched government finances back onto a path that eventually was to eliminate the deficits by the end of the decade. But three years later — and even though the most robust recovery in American history had begun — every Republican congressman voted against Clinton’s 1993 legislation to continue Bush’s spending caps, PAYGO, and tax increases. Nor did they change their minds in response to the subsequent success of the policy. Even after seven years of strong growth, with unemployment at the peak of the business cycle dipping below 4% for the first time since the 1960s, George W. Bush based his 2000 campaign on a platform of large long-term tax cuts. (Boom: profligacy.) Third cycle: Even after the Bush fiscal expansion had turned the inherited record budget surpluses into record deficits, the Administration went for a 2nd round of tax cuts in 2003, and continued a rate of growth of spending that was triple the rate under Clinton (both national security and domestic spending). Vice President Richard Cheney said “Reagan proved that deficits don’t matter.” These policies were maintained for five more years, as another $ four trillion was added to the national debt. (Boom: profligacy.) Predictably, when the worst recession since the Great Depression hit in 2007-09, politicians felt constrained from an adequate fiscal response due to the big deficits and debts the government had already been running. Republicans suddenly re-discovered the evil of budget deficits and decided that retrenchment was urgent. They opposed Obama’s initial fiscal stimulus in February 2009, even though GDP growth and employment were much worse than they had been when Reagan and Bush had launched their tax cuts and spending increases. (Recession: austerity.) Subsequently, with a new majority in the House, they succeeded in blocking further efforts by Obama when the stimulus ran out in 2011. The government spending cutbacks of the last two years are the most important reason, in my view, why the economic recovery which began in June 2009 subsequently stalled in 2011. Three cycles. Three generations of politicians who favored expansionary fiscal policies during a boom and then decided after a recession had hit that budget deficits were bad after all. (See the graph below.) This is not to say that the procyclicalist politicians have always succeeded in getting their policies adopted. Clinton had a strong enough congressional majority in August 1993 that he was able to pass his budget balancing legislation (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act) — even though every Republican in Congress voted “no” at a time when the economy was expanding. Similarly, Obama had a strong enough majority in January 2009 that he was able to pass some initial fiscal stimulus (the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act), without a single Republican vote, at a time when the economy was in freefall. But too often the countercyclicalists are overpowered by the procyclicalists. Trying to turn left or right at precisely the wrong points in the road is a worse record than one would get by switching policies randomly. To explain this perverse pattern, let us switch metaphors in mid-stream. It is the old problem of needing to fix the hole in the roof when the sun is shining, rather than waiting for a storm to realize that it is necessary. When the economy is booming, there is no political support for painful spending cuts or tax increases. After all, everything seems fine; why make a change? Then when the deluge comes, sinners suddenly see the evils of their ways and proclaim the necessity of reforming. Of course it is very difficult to fix the roof in the middle of a thunderstorm.

#### 08 near collapse of auto industry proves no impact to auto industry collapse

#### Turn – roads and cars cause congestion

Davis and Dower 08 Tom Davis and Rick Dower The San Diego Union-Tribune December 29, 2008 “Envisioning city's transportation future Regarding "San Diego's transportation future" (Opinion, Dec. 19):” SECTION: OPINION; Pg. B-5

Duncan McFetridge's commentary is a study in physiological button-pushing and dogged distortion of information. First, the automobile is the transportation method of choice for the region because it fills the public need to get to places the public wants to go at a cost that is perceived to be reasonable. The mantra that enough roads for cars can never be built is a distortion that, when forced to become public policy, is a self-fulfilling reality. Public transportation, particularly the touch-stone panacea of light rail, is enormously expensive, filled with irresolvable compromises that produces a system that doesn't go where and when the public wants, is forever fixed in place, and has a significant energy burden that is never factored into the public transportation argument. The public transportation fixation should be set to music and staged as a tragic-comedic opera where those interested in fantasy and unreality could go for laughs and a few tears and no one would suffer from wasted tax dollars… Duncan McFetridge makes a mighty persuasive argument for better public transit options, as opposed to more massive highway programs for our region as apparently envisioned by the San Diego Association of Governments' planners eager for an infusion of federal billions. Been there, done that. He's certainly right about the folly of trying to build our way out of traffic congestion. If it actually worked any more, cities such as Los Angeles -- not to mention our once-lovely hometown -- that have been all but destroyed for cars should be heaven for drivers. Obviously, they aren't. As much of the enlightened world gears up to try to reduce its carbon footprint, create more livable cities and develop bold new ideas for public transportation aimed at getting people out of their cars, as existing infrastructure collapses from want of attention, it no longer makes the slightest sense to pour scarce resources into new highway construction. According to the California Air Resources Board, approximately 75 percent of diesel particulate emissions in California are related to goods movement. Freight transportation is still largely driven by fossil fuel combustion. With that combustion comes emission of greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and particulate matter. In addition, CARB has attributed thousands of premature deaths to diesel emissions and estimates that the cumulative health costs of diesel emissions are tens of billions of dollars. We need to find ways to reduce congestion and alleviate transportation bottlenecks even as our population continues to grow, placing new and greater demands on existing transportation systems. Transit will be a vital part of the solution. According to the most recent Texas Transportation Institute report on congestion, public transportation saved travelers 541 million hours in travel time and 340 million gallons of fuel in 2005.

**Staving off inevitable congestion through infrastructure is crucial to saving the economy**

Staley 07

(Sam, economic development policy analyst for the New York Times, November 25, 2007, “A Congested Economy”, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/25/opinion/nyregionopinions/25CIstaley.html?pagewanted=all)

But if congestion continues, eventually it will eat away at economic productivity in the region. Congestion reduces the pool of resources available to businesses and workers by reducing access to jobs and employees. A 30-minute commute to work might become 45 minutes or an hour, pushing the job outside a worker’s “opportunity circle,” which is the amount of time a typical worker is willing to travel to a job. Productivity can compensate for the economic drag of congestion but only to a certain point. If congestion becomes too severe, the economy begins to fragment, which means that businesses drawing on a large metropolitan labor pool will be forced to tap into only those who live within a certain time and distance to the job. A fragmented economy hurts productivity. It’s already happening in the region. The Partnership for New York City, a business group, estimates that eliminating excess traffic congestion would add as much as $4 billion and 52,000 jobs to the regional economy. Congestion drains the region’s manufacturing sector of $2 billion in revenue and 8,674 jobs. Wholesale trade takes a congestion hit worth $1.3 billion in increased operating costs.

### - - - 2AC Ks - - -

### 2AC Capitalism

#### 1. Framework – evaluate the plan versus the status quo or a competitive policy option

#### a. Ground- we can never garner offense against a utopian alt

#### b. Education- we never learn any policy making education

#### c. Fairness – Kritik frameworks destroy affirmative ground by mooting the 1AC

#### d. Allow us to defend our impacts in comparison to theirs

#### 3. Even if capitalism created the structural inequalities – we physically change and fix the system pragmatically

#### 4. Perm - monolithic presentation of capitalism makes resistance impossible

Gibson-Graham, 6 – Professor of Geosciences at University of Massachusetts, PhD; Feminist Economic Geographer and Professor at the Australian National University, PhD

(J.K. Gibson-Graham, “The End of Capitalism as We Knew It,” pg. 255-257)

Through its architectural or organismic depiction as an edifice or body, Capitalism becomes not an uncentered aggregate of practices but a structural and systemic unity, potentially co-extensive with the national or global economy as a whole. 11 As a large, durable, and self-sustaining formation, it is relatively impervious to ordinary political and cultural interventions. It can be resisted and reformed but it cannot be replaced, except through some Herculean and coordinated struggle. Understood as a unified system or structure, Capitalism is not ultimately vulnerable to local and partial efforts at transformation. Any such efforts can always be subverted by Capitalism at another scale or in another dimension. Attempts to transform production may be seen as hopeless without control of the financial system. Socialisms in one city or in one country may be seen as undermined by Capitalism at the international scale. Capitalism cannot be chipped away at, gradually replaced or removed piecemeal. It must be transformed in its entirety or not at all. Thus one of the effects of the unity of Capitalism is to present the left with the task of systemic transformation. Singularity If the unity of Capitalism confronts us with the mammoth task of systemic transformation, it is the singularity and totality of Capitalism that make the task so hopeless. Capitalism presents itself as a singularity in the sense of having no peer or equivalent, of existing in a category by itself; and also in the sense that when it appears fully realized within a particular social formation, it tends to be dominant or alone. As a sui generis economic form, Capitalism has no true analogues. Slavery, independent commodity production, feudalism, socialism, primitive communism and other forms of economy all lack the systemic properties of Capitalism and the ability to reproduce and expand themselves according to internal laws. 12 Unlike socialism, for example, which is always struggling to be born, which needs the protection and fostering of the state, which is fragile and easily deformed, Capitalism takes on its full form as a natural outcome of an internally driven growth process. Its organic unity gives capitalism the peculiar power to regenerate itself, and even to subsume its moments of crisis as requirements of its continued growth and development. Socialism has never been endowed with that mythic capability of feeding on its own crises; its reproduction was never driven from within by a life force but always from without; it could never reproduce itself but always had to be reproduced, often an arduous if not impossible process. 13

#### 6. Total rejection of capitalism will be met with transition wars

Trainer 3

[Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, “The Simpler Way”, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/02-The-Simpler-Way.html , February 13]

"When corporations rule the world" This heading, the title of a recent book by David Korten, sums up the situation that has arisen over the last 20 years. A tiny corporate super-rich class has risen to extraordinary wealth and power and are now able to more or less run the world in the ways that suit it. (About 1% of the world’s people now control more than half the capital; Note 7.) They run the transnational corporations, the media and especially the World Bank, IMF and World Trade Organisation. Their wealth funds the think tanks, foundations, universities, journals etc which pump out the message that the neo-liberal way is the best and the only way. Governments eagerly comply with this agenda. . They have routed the working class. The Left has been eliminated as a political force. Above all the rich have crushingly won the ideological battle establishing neo-liberalism as the only way. Rich world military power is likely to be used ruthlessly against nations which interfere with this agenda of free access for corporations and integration of all regions into the one global market (e.g., Yugoslavia, Iraq.) Much of the literature on globalisation is alarmed at this situation of corporate rule; (see especially Chussudowsky, 1996, Fotopolous, 2002, and many of the works by Chomsky.) There are good reasons for thinking that it is now too late to do anything about this rapid surge to world domination by the super-rich, especially since the "war on terrorism" has provided a perfect pretext for crushing dissent.

#### 7. Alt fails. Capitalism is too ingrained to be wished away

Wilson 2K (John K., coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People, pg 15- 16)

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested

### 2AC Capitalism Vishay

#### 1. Framework – evaluate the plan versus the status quo or a competitive policy option

#### a. Ground- we can never garner offense against a utopian alt

#### b. Education- we never learn any policy making education

#### c. Fairness – Kritik frameworks destroy affirmative ground by mooting the 1AC

#### d. Allow us to defend our impacts in comparison to theirs

#### 2. Perm - Unmasking the oppression allows for alliances and broad-based resistance to capitalism

Hahn, ’87, Professor of political science at USC (Harlan, Advertising the Acceptably Employable Image: Disability and Capitalism, Policy Studies Journal, 15:3 (l987:Mar.) p.55l, ebsco)

There seems to be little doubt that the mass imagery emanating from advertising and the media has played a major role in perpetuating discrimination against citizens with disabilities as well as other oppressed groups. In assessing the factors that have consigned disabled adults to the ranks of the industrial reserve army in an adaptable environment, public perceptions and attitudes may deserve greater Attention that the functional Impairment of a disability. Moreover, this type of bias could be at least partially remediated by the rigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws to promote impartial treatment lor women and men with visible disabilities in employment as well as other public activities. The quest for civil rights need not be con- sidered a bourgeoisie instrument designed to forestall revolution. On the contrary, this goal may be viewed as a necessary historical process In which oppressed groups seek to mitigate the impact of prejudice imposed upon them by the idealized standards of appearance promulgated by the unfolding dynamics of a capitalist system. In fact, the pervasive effects of media images on portions of society which were prevented from meeting by physical characteristics such as gender. skin color. ethnicity, aging. or disability might even be interpreted as a significant dimension of the social structure that has inhibited the emergence of class struggle in modern society. For people with visible disabilities, the Imagery which promoted their exclusion from common forms of social and economic participation may have been so powerful that they never became a serious threat to the iobs of other workers. And yet the tact that numerous disadvantaged peoples--including women, black Americans. ethnic groups, and aging persons--share the same terms of oppression as visibly disabled citizens seems to employ a potential for coalitions that could yield both a realignment in the structure of society and a corresponding tendency for conflict to reflect class rather than other sorts of divisions.

#### 3. Even if capitalism created the structural inequalities – we physically change and fix the system pragmatically

#### 4. The ‘root cause’ approach is blind and false

Martin 90 Brian Martin, Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Wollongong, Australia, Uprooting War, 1990 edition http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/90uw/uw13.html

The discussion so far concerns capitalist firms within a particular state. The wider question is, what role does the world capitalist system play in the war system? When examining particular wars, the immediate role of profit and accumulation are often minimal. Examples are World War Two, the Indochinese War and the many Middle East wars. Even in many colonial empires, immediate economic advantages for the capitalist class have played a minor role compared to issues of expansion and maintenance of state power. The role of capitalism mainly entered through its structuring of economic relations which are supervised separately and jointly by capitalist states. The main military service of the state to capitalists in the international system is to oppose movements which threaten the viability of capitalist economic relations. This includes state socialism and all movements for self-management. At the same time, the way this state intervention operates, namely through separate and potentially competing state apparatuses, can conflict with the security of capitalism. Wars and military expenditures can hurt national economies, as in the case of US government expenditures for fighting in Vietnam. Only some struggles against capitalism have potential for challenging the war system. Efforts to oppose capital by mobilising the power of the state do little in this direction. In particular, promotion of state socialism (the destruction of capitalism within a state mode, with the maintenance of bureaucratic control and military power) does little to address the problem of war. The trouble here is that much of the socialist left sees capitalism as the sole source of evil in the world. This approach is blind to the roots of social problems that do not primarily grow out of class domination, including racism, sexism, environmental degradation and war. Because of this blindness, even the struggle against capitalism is weakened, since attention is not paid to systems of power such as patriarchy and bureaucracy which are mobilised to support capitalism as well as other interests.

#### 5. Totalizing representation of capitalism as the root cause of problems is a self-fulfilling prophecy—it overlooks the complexities within capitalism and destroys non-capitalist thought

Gibson-Graham 96 (Julie Graham, professor, U Massachusetts, and Katherine Gibson, professor, Monash U, The End of Capitalism (As We Know It), p 2-4, AG)

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes "capitalism" as an economic and social descriptor. Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term - passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism - as well as systematic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of "capitalist hegemony" deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelihood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, "capitalist hegemony" operates not only as a constituent of, but also as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imaginations. What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted? If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate that world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem). The discursive artifact we call "capitalist hegemony" is a complex effect of a wide variety of discursive and nondiscursive conditions. In this book we focus on the practices and preoccupations of discourse, tracing some of the different, even incompatible, representations of capitalism that can be collated within this fictive summary representation. These depictions have their origins in the diverse traditions of Marxism, classical and contemporary political economy, academic social science, modern historiography, popular economic and social thought, western philosophy and metaphysics, indeed, in an endless array of texts, traditions and infrastructures of meaning. In the chapters that follow, only a few of these are examined for the ways in which they have sustained a vision of capitalism as the dominant form of economy, or have contributed to the possibility or durability of such a vision. But the point should emerge none the less clearly: the virtually unquestioned dominance of capitalism can be seen as a complex product of a variety of discursive commitments, including but not limited to organicist social conceptions, heroic historical narratives, evolutionary scenarios of social development, and essentialist, phallocentric, or binary patterns of thinking. It is through these discursive figurings and alignments that capitalism is constituted as large, powerful, persistent, active, expansive, progressive, dynamic, transformative; embracing, penetrating, disciplining, colonizing, constraining; systemic, self-reproducing, rational, lawful, self-rectifying; organized and organizing, centered and ce

.0.ntering; originating, creative, protean; victorious and ascendant; self- identical, self-expressive, full, definite, real, positive, and capable of conferring identity and meaning.

#### 6. Can’t destroy cap, must reform it

Rupert 7’ [British Columbia, April 4, 7’’ Wednesday, Final Edition, LOCAL NEWS; Green Justice; Pg. 16, 561 words, Charles Justice, The Daily News]

We can try and regulate capitalism but we have another problem which global warming has demonstrated: when faced with the facts about global warming the most powerful government in the world was influenced by corporations to suppress the science and minimize the extent of the problem to the public. This set back the cause of prevention at least 10 years - at an incalculable cost to humanity and the Earth's ecosystems. In short, global warming demonstrates not only market failure but also "government failure". It's not as if we haven't had forwarning of this. History is full of examples of empires like the Romans and the Babylonians, that grew because they were able to extract resources efficiently but destroyed themselves because the were not able to extract resources sustainably. And in almost every case no-one saw it coming. This time it's different because we can see it coming and we can prevent it. We know that we need to be able to reform capitalism if we are to survive, but how to go about it? Both our economies and our ecosystems need to stay healthy. We know trying to destroy capitalism doesn't work. We know tinkering with reforming capitalism doesn't work because we've spent the last century doing that and things have only gotten worse. Suppose we use the analogy of a computer operating system. Capitalism needs an upgrade. Just as Microsoft upgrades from Windows 95’ to Windows XP, we need to upgrade the "economic software" to keep the system from crashing. That's what Peter Barnes discusses in his intriguing book, Capitalism 3.0, published 2006 and also available on the internet. Basically, the solution is to change the rules so that the "commons sector" becomes an economic power to balance the power of corporations and governments. More next week.

#### 7. Alt fails – elite backlash

Perry Anderson, Professor of Sociology at UCLA, Marxist Scholar, ’84

(In the tracks of historical materialism, p. 102-103)

That background also indicates, however, what is essentially missing from his work. How are we to get from where we are today to where he point us to tomorrow? There is no answer to this question in Nove. His halting discussion of “transition” tails away into apprehensive admonitions to moderation to the British Labor Party, and pleas for proper compensation to capitalist owners of major industries, if these are to be nationalized. Nowhere is there any sense of what a titanic political change would have to occur, with what fierceness of social struggle, for the economic model of socialism he advocates ever to materialize. Between the radicalism of the future end-state he envisages, and the conservatism of the present measures he is prepared to countenance, there is an unbridgeable abyss. How could private ownership of the means of production ever be abolished by policies less disrespectful of capital than those of Allende or a Benn, which he reproves? What has disappeared from the pages of The Economics of Feasible Socialism is virtually all attention to the historical dynamics of any serious conflict over the control of the means of production, as the record of the 20th century demonstrates them. If capital could visit such destruction on even so poor and small an outlying province of its empire in Vietnam, to prevent its loss, is it likely that it would suffer its extinction meekly in its own homeland? The lessons of the past sixty-five years or so are in this respect without ambiguity or exception, there is no case, from Russia to China, from Vietnam to Cuba, from Chile to Nicaragua, where the existence of capitalism has been challenged, and the furies of intervention, blockade and civil strife have not descended in response. Any viable transition to socialism in the West must seek to curtail that pattern: but to shrink from or to ignore it is to depart from the world of the possible altogether. In the same way, to construct an economic model of socialism in one advanced country is a legitimate exercise: but to extract it from any computable relationship with a surrounding, and necessarily opposing, capitalist environment—as this work does—is to locate it in thin air.

### 2AC Capitalism Jaly

#### 1. Framework – evaluate the plan versus the status quo or a competitive policy option

#### a. Ground- we can never garner offense against a utopian alt

#### b. Education- we never learn any policy making education

#### c. Fairness – Kritik frameworks destroy affirmative ground by mooting the 1AC

#### d. Allow us to defend our impacts in comparison to theirs

#### 2. Even if capitalism created the structural inequalities – we physically change and fix the system pragmatically

#### 3. The ‘root cause’ approach is blind and false

Martin 90 Brian Martin, Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Wollongong, Australia, Uprooting War, 1990 edition http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/90uw/uw13.html

The discussion so far concerns capitalist firms within a particular state. The wider question is, what role does the world capitalist system play in the war system? When examining particular wars, the immediate role of profit and accumulation are often minimal. Examples are World War Two, the Indochinese War and the many Middle East wars. Even in many colonial empires, immediate economic advantages for the capitalist class have played a minor role compared to issues of expansion and maintenance of state power. The role of capitalism mainly entered through its structuring of economic relations which are supervised separately and jointly by capitalist states. The main military service of the state to capitalists in the international system is to oppose movements which threaten the viability of capitalist economic relations. This includes state socialism and all movements for self-management. At the same time, the way this state intervention operates, namely through separate and potentially competing state apparatuses, can conflict with the security of capitalism. Wars and military expenditures can hurt national economies, as in the case of US government expenditures for fighting in Vietnam. Only some struggles against capitalism have potential for challenging the war system. Efforts to oppose capital by mobilising the power of the state do little in this direction. In particular, promotion of state socialism (the destruction of capitalism within a state mode, with the maintenance of bureaucratic control and military power) does little to address the problem of war. The trouble here is that much of the socialist left sees capitalism as the sole source of evil in the world. This approach is blind to the roots of social problems that do not primarily grow out of class domination, including racism, sexism, environmental degradation and war. Because of this blindness, even the struggle against capitalism is weakened, since attention is not paid to systems of power such as patriarchy and bureaucracy which are mobilised to support capitalism as well as other interests.

#### 4. If their Gonzalez card is true then the plan wouldn’t prevent the revolution or if we solve it becomes good enough

#### 5. Totalizing representation of capitalism as the root cause of problems is a self-fulfilling prophecy—it overlooks the complexities within capitalism and destroys non-capitalist thought

Gibson-Graham 96 (Julie Graham, professor, U Massachusetts, and Katherine Gibson, professor, Monash U, The End of Capitalism (As We Know It), p 2-4, AG)

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes "capitalism" as an economic and social descriptor. Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term - passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism - as well as systematic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of "capitalist hegemony" deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelihood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, "capitalist hegemony" operates not only as a constituent of, but also as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imaginations. What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted? If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate that world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem). The discursive artifact we call "capitalist hegemony" is a complex effect of a wide variety of discursive and nondiscursive conditions. In this book we focus on the practices and preoccupations of discourse, tracing some of the different, even incompatible, representations of capitalism that can be collated within this fictive summary representation. These depictions have their origins in the diverse traditions of Marxism, classical and contemporary political economy, academic social science, modern historiography, popular economic and social thought, western philosophy and metaphysics, indeed, in an endless array of texts, traditions and infrastructures of meaning. In the chapters that follow, only a few of these are examined for the ways in which they have sustained a vision of capitalism as the dominant form of economy, or have contributed to the possibility or durability of such a vision. But the point should emerge none the less clearly: the virtually unquestioned dominance of capitalism can be seen as a complex product of a variety of discursive commitments, including but not limited to organicist social conceptions, heroic historical narratives, evolutionary scenarios of social development, and essentialist, phallocentric, or binary patterns of thinking. It is through these discursive figurings and alignments that capitalism is constituted as large, powerful, persistent, active, expansive, progressive, dynamic, transformative; embracing, penetrating, disciplining, colonizing, constraining; systemic, self-reproducing, rational, lawful, self-rectifying; organized and organizing, centered and ce

.0.ntering; originating, creative, protean; victorious and ascendant; self- identical, self-expressive, full, definite, real, positive, and capable of conferring identity and meaning.

#### 6. America is a democracy and the government change can’t just assume racist if racist in past

#### 7. Capitalism concedes the possibility of real reform

Genovese, 2K [Eugene Genovese, scholar in residence at University Center in Georgia, 2000, “The Collapse of Socialism,” AEI, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.17952,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp]

World-historic events compel a reassessment of first principles as well as political and social policies. For those on the Left, that need not lead to a retreat from our lifelong struggle for social justice--our struggle against economic exploitation, racism, male supremacy, and the atomization of social life. But this struggle has often blinded us to the historic achievements of capitalism, upon w0hich any civilized society must build, and not the least of those achievements has been an economic performance that has created expanded possibilities for individual freedom and political democracy for enormous numbers of people throughout the world. The Left wishes to forget Marx's materialist premise--and promise--namely, that a socialist society would outproduce its capitalist rival and thereby provide the material foundations for an unprecedented human liberation. The woeful failure of socialism as an economic system has laid bare the delusive nature of the dream. For better and worse, capitalism, not socialism, has once again emerged as the world's greatest revolutionary--and self-revolutionizing--system, and, in so doing, it has established its claims to being immeasurably more congruent with human nature. But it has not thereby refuted the charge of its also being an economic system that undermines the foundations of civilized life by atomizing individuals, and undermines the inspiring concept of citizenship that it created in the first place. Rather, when considered in the light of the failure of socialism, capitalism today poses anew the challenge to construct a decent social order.

#### 8. Perm - unmasking the oppression allows for alliances and broad-based resistance to capitalism

Hahn, ’87, Professor of political science at USC (Harlan, Advertising the Acceptably Employable Image: Disability and Capitalism, Policy Studies Journal, 15:3 (l987:Mar.) p.55l, ebsco)

There seems to be little doubt that the mass imagery emanating from advertising and the media has played a major role in perpetuating discrimination against citizens with disabilities as well as other oppressed groups. In assessing the factors that have consigned disabled adults to the ranks of the industrial reserve army in an adaptable environment, public perceptions and attitudes may deserve greater Attention that the functional Impairment of a disability. Moreover, this type of bias could be at least partially remediated by the rigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws to promote impartial treatment lor women and men with visible disabilities in employment as well as other public activities. The quest for civil rights need not be con- sidered a bourgeoisie instrument designed to forestall revolution. On the contrary, this goal may be viewed as a necessary historical process In which oppressed groups seek to mitigate the impact of prejudice imposed upon them by the idealized standards of appearance promulgated by the unfolding dynamics of a capitalist system. In fact, the pervasive effects of media images on portions of society which were prevented from meeting by physical characteristics such as gender. skin color. ethnicity, aging. or disability might even be interpreted as a significant dimension of the social structure that has inhibited the emergence of class struggle in modern society. For people with visible disabilities, the Imagery which promoted their exclusion from common forms of social and economic participation may have been so powerful that they never became a serious threat to the iobs of other workers. And yet the tact that numerous disadvantaged peoples--including women, black Americans. ethnic groups, and aging persons--share the same terms of oppression as visibly disabled citizens seems to employ a potential for coalitions that could yield both a realignment in the structure of society and a corresponding tendency for conflict to reflect class rather than other sorts of divisions.

#### 9. Their rejection only rejects state – can’t solve

#### 12. They embrace anti-politics – this dooms their project, creates atrocity, and cedes politics to the Right recreating the status quo problems

Boggs ’97

(CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent **problems** that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved -- perhaps even unrecognized -- only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context diseases, technological displacement of workers) of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites -- an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise -- or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec- tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

#### Can’t destroy cap, must reform it

Rupert 7’ [British Columbia, April 4, 7’’ Wednesday, Final Edition, LOCAL NEWS; Green Justice; Pg. 16, 561 words, Charles Justice, The Daily News]

We can try and regulate capitalism but we have another problem which global warming has demonstrated: when faced with the facts about global warming the most powerful government in the world was influenced by corporations to suppress the science and minimize the extent of the problem to the public. This set back the cause of prevention at least 10 years - at an incalculable cost to humanity and the Earth's ecosystems. In short, global warming demonstrates not only market failure but also "government failure". It's not as if we haven't had forwarning of this. History is full of examples of empires like the Romans and the Babylonians, that grew because they were able to extract resources efficiently but destroyed themselves because the were not able to extract resources sustainably. And in almost every case no-one saw it coming. This time it's different because we can see it coming and we can prevent it. We know that we need to be able to reform capitalism if we are to survive, but how to go about it? Both our economies and our ecosystems need to stay healthy. We know trying to destroy capitalism doesn't work. We know tinkering with reforming capitalism doesn't work because we've spent the last century doing that and things have only gotten worse. Suppose we use the analogy of a computer operating system. Capitalism needs an upgrade. Just as Microsoft upgrades from Windows 95’ to Windows XP, we need to upgrade the "economic software" to keep the system from crashing. That's what Peter Barnes discusses in his intriguing book, Capitalism 3.0, published 2006 and also available on the internet. Basically, the solution is to change the rules so that the "commons sector" becomes an economic power to balance the power of corporations and governments. More next week.

### 2AC Biopower

#### Their K oversimplifies—Biopower is not a one-way street—The aff strategically reverses the application of power from regulation to inclusion – Solves value to life

Campbell 98 (David, Intl Politics, Newcastle, “Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity,” pg. 204-205)

The political possibilities enabled by this permanent provocation of power and freedom can be specified in more detail by thinking in terms of the predominance of the “bio-power” discussed above. In this sense, because the governmental practices of biopolitics in West­ern nations have been increasingly directed toward modes of being and forms of life — such that sexual conduct has become an object of concern, individual health has been figured as a domain of discipline, and the family has been transformed into an instrument of govern­ment— the ongoing agonism between those practices and the free­dom they seek to contain means that individuals have articulated a series of counterdemands drawn from those new fields of concern. For example, as the state continues to prosecute people according to sexual orientation, human rights activists have proclaimed the right of gays to enter into formal marriages, adopt children, and receive the same health and insurance benefits granted to their straight coun­terparts. These claims are a consequence of the permanent provoca­tion of power and freedom in biopolitics, and stand as testament to the “strategic reversibility” of power relations: if the terms of governmental practices can be made into focal points for resistances, then the “history of government as the ‘conduct of conduct’ is interwoven with the history of dissenting ‘counterconducts.”’39 Indeed, the emer­gence of the state as the major articulation of “the political” has in­volved an unceasing agonism between those in office and those they rule. State intervention in everyday life has long incited popular col­lective action, the result of which has been both resistance to the state and new claims upon the state. In particular, “the core of what we now call ‘citizenship’ consists of multiple bargains hammered out by rulers and ruled in the course of their struggles over the means of state action, especially the making of war.” In more recent times, constituencies associated with women’s, youth, ecological, and peace movements (among others) have also issued claims on society. These resistances are evidence that the break with the discursive/nondiscursive dichotomy central to the logic of interpretation undergirding this analysis is (to put it in conventional terms) not only theoretically licensed; it is empirically warranted. Indeed, expanding the interpretive imagination so as to enlarge the categories through which we understand the constitution of “the political” has been a necessary precondition for making sense of Foreign Policy’s concern for the ethical borders of identity in America. Accordingly, there are manifest political implications that flow from theorizing identity. As Judith Butler concluded: “The deconstruction of identity is not the deconstruction of politics; rather, it establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated.”

### 2AC Security (BioP Link)

#### 1. Framework – evaluate the plan versus the status quo or a competitive policy option

#### a. Ground- we can never garner offense against a utopian alt

#### b. Education- we never learn any policy making education

#### c. Fairness – Kritik frameworks destroy affirmative ground by mooting the 1AC

#### d. Allow us to defend our impacts in comparison to theirs

#### 2. The plan does not securitize we only provide assistance for the poor to get jobs and food

#### 3. Their monolithic depiction of security is incoherent. They securitize themselves *against security*, which re-affirms the worst manifestations. Only the affirmative attempts to engage security from within

Roe, 12 (Paul Roe, Associate Professor in the Department of International Relations and European Studies at Central European University, Budapest, “Is securitization a ‘negative’ concept? Revisiting the normative debate over normal versus extraordinary politics,” Security Dialogue vol. 43 no. 3, June 2012)

Although for Aradau, the solution to security’s barred universality lies not in desecuritization – the Copenhagen School’s preferred strategy – in does lie, nevertheless, in avoiding security’s Schmittian mode of politics.24 However, as Matt McDonald (2008: 580) pertinently recognizes, avoiding securitization neglects the potential to contest its very meaning: desecuritization is made ‘normatively problematic’ inasmuch as a preference for it relies on ‘the negative designation of threat’, which ‘serves the interest of those who benefit from … exclusionary articulations of threat in contemporary international politics, further **silencing voices** articulating alternative visions for what security means and how it might be achieved’. That is to say, the recourse of always viewing securitization as negative must be resisted: instead, **contexts should be revealed in which utterances of security can be subject to a politics of progressive change.**

In keeping with McDonald, Booth’s understanding of security as emancipation criticizes (security as) securitization for its essentialism in fixing the meaning of security into a state-centric, militarized and zero-sum framework. Rejecting outright securitization’s necessarily Schmittian inheritance, Booth (2007: 165) points instead to a more positive rendering:

Such a static view of the [securitization] concept is all the odder because security as a speech act has historically also embraced positive, non-militarised, and non-statist connotations…. Securitisation studies, like mainstream strategic studies, remains somewhat stuck in Cold War mindsets.

For Booth, therefore, securitization is not always about the ‘expectation of hostility’. A positive securitization embraces the potential for **human equality unhampered by the closure of political boundaries** that Aradau postulates. Boothian emancipatory communities are constituted by the recognition of individuals as possessing multiple identities that cut across existing social and political divides. In this sense, Others are also selves in a variety of ways. Through this interconnectedness, the recognition of us all as human makes salient the values that bind, such as compassion, reciprocity, justice and dignity (Booth, 2007: 136–40).

#### 4. Security means the potential for emancipation, not mere survival. Safety is the only foundation for human flourishing

Ken Booth, Prof. of IR @ Wales, ‘5 [*Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, p. 22]

The best starting point for conceptualizing security lies in the real conditions of insecurity suffered by people and collectivities. Look around. What is immediately striking is that some degree of insecurity, as a life determining condition, is universal. To the extent an individual or group is insecure, to that extent their life choices and chances **are taken away**; this is because of the resources and energy they need to invest in seeking safety from domineering threats - whether these are the lack of food for one’s children or organizing to resist a foreign aggressor. The corollary of the relationship between insecurity and a determined life is that **a degree of security creates life possibilities**. Security might therefore be conceived as synonymous with **opening up space in people’s lives.** This allows for individual and collective **human becoming** - the capacity to have some choice about living differently - consistent with the same but different search by others. Two interrelated conclusions follow from this. First, security can be understood as an instrumental value; it frees its possessors to a greater or lesser extent from life-determining constraints and so allows different life possibilities to be explored. Second, security is synonymous simply with survival. One can survive without being secure (the experience of refugees in long-term camps in war-torn parts of the world, for example). Security is therefore **more than mere** animal survival (basic animal existence). It is survival-plus, the plus being the **possibility to explore human becoming**, As an instrumental value, security is sought because it frees people(s) to some degree to do other than deal with threats to their human being. The achievement of a level of security - and security is always relative - gives to individuals and groups some time, energy, and scope to chose **to be or become**, **other than merely survival as human biological organisms**. Security is an important dimension of the process by which the human species can reinvent itself beyond the merely biological.

#### 5. The aff is a good form of security that allows people to have a happy sustainable healthy lifestyle

#### 6. Our scenario-evaluations are crucial for ethically responsible politics. A theoretical kritik is insufficient—we need realistic *as if* stories to generate changes in practice.

Michael C. WILLIAMS International Politics @ Wales (Aberystwyth) ‘5 The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations p.165-167

Moreover, the links between sceptical realism and prevalent post-modern themes go more deeply than this, particularly as they apply to attempts by post-structural thinking to reopen questions of responsibility and ethics. In part, the goals of post-structural approaches can be usefully characterised, to borrow Stephen White's illuminating contrast, as expressions of 'responsibility to otherness' which question and challenge modernist equations of responsibility with a 'responsibility to act'. A responsibility to otherness seeks to reveal and open the constitutive processes and claims of subjects and subjectivities that a foundational modernism has effaced in its narrow identification of responsibility with a 'responsibility to act?' Deconstruction can from this perspective be seen as a principled stance unwilling to succumb to modernist essentialism which in the name of responsibility assumes and reifies, subjects and structures, obscures forms of power and violence which are constitutive of them, and at the same time forecloses a consideration of alternative possibilities and practices.? Yet it is my claim that the wilful Realist tradition does not lack an understanding of the contingency of practice or a vision of responsibility to otherness. On the contrary. its strategy of objectification is precisely an attempt to bring together a responsibility to otherness and a responsibility to act within a wilfully liberal vision. The construction of a realm of objectivity and calculation is not just a consequence of a need to act - the framing of an epistemic context for successful calculation. It is a form of responsibility to otherness, an attempt to allow for diversity and irreconcilability precisely by - at least initially - reducing the self and the other to a structure of material calculation in order to allow a structure of mutual intelligibility, mediation, and stability. It is, in short, a strategy of limitation: a wilful attempt to construct a subject and a social world limited - both epistemically and politically - in the name of a politics of toleration: a liberal strategy that John Gray has recently characterised as one of modus vivendi. If this is the case, then the deconstructive move that gains some of its weight by contrasting itself to a non- or apolitical objectivism must engage with the more complex contrast to a sceptical Realist tradition that is itself a constructed, ethical practice. This issue becomes even more acute if one considers Iver Neumann's incisive questions concerning postmodem constructions of identity, action, and responsibility. 83 Neumann points out, the insight that identities are inescapably contingent and relationally constructed, and even the claim that identities? Inescapably indebted to othemess, do not in themselves provide a foundation for practice, particularly in situations where identities are 'sedimented' and conflictually defined. In these cases, deconstruction alone will not suffice unless it can demonstrate a capacity to counter in practice (and not just in philosophic practice) the essentialist dynamics it confronts)44 Here, a responsibility to act must go beyond deconstruction to consider viable alternatives and counter-practices.? To take this critique seriously is not necessarily to be subject yet again to the straightforward 'blackmail of the Enlightenment' and a narrow 'modernist' vision of responsibility." While an unwillingness to move beyond a deconstructive ethic of responsibility to otherness for fear that an essentialist stance is the only (or most likely) alternative expresses a legitimate concern, it should not license a retreat from such questions or their practical demands. Rather, such situations demand also an evaluation of the structures (of identity and institutions) that might ***viably*** be mobilised in order to offset the worst implications of violently exclusionary identities It requires. as Neumann nicely puts it, the generation of compelling 'as if' stories around which counter-subjectivities and political practices can coalesce. Wilful Realism, 1 submit, arises out of an appreciation of these issues, and comprises an attempt to craft precisely such 'stories' within a broader intellectual and sociological analysis of their conditions of production, possibilities of success, and likely consequences. The question is, to what extent are these limits capable of success-and to what extent might they be limits upon their own aspirations to responsibility? These are crucial questions, but they will not be addressed by retreating yet again into further reversals of the same old dichotomies.

#### 7. Sovereignty Provides the Most Realistic Hope for Reconciling Competing Human Wills - The Alternative Results in Either International Exploitation or Renewed Elitism

Jean Bethke Elshtain, Prof. of Social and Political Ethics @ U-Chicago, ‘5 [*Ethics & International Affairs*, “Against New Utopianism: Response to “Against the New Internationalism,” p. 94-5]

Burke's prescriptive argument is not only improbable but also impossible as a course for a world of human beings organized presently within hundreds of entities called states. His indictment of the state is relentless. Indeed, reading Burke you would never know that states have carried human aspirations and hopes; that much of the dignity and purpose of human beings derives from their location in **particular communities** with **particular histories** and traditions and stories and languages. States, at their best, help to protect and to nourish certain goods. As the late, great Hannah Arendt put it, "No one can be a citizen of the world as he [and she] is a citizen of a particular country." Burke wants "collective decision-making," a world beyond states. When one thinks of the challenges of representation and transparency in contemporary states—none of which is any longer monocultural—the notion that anything that would meaningfully count as representation could pertain in a world body defies common sense. One would likely wind up with a small group of elites, claiming to be something like a Hegelian class of disinterested persons, dictating policy. How could it be anything else in the absence of any concrete account by Burke of the principles of authority and legitimacy that are to characterize his proposed global order? Or without any compelling account of how politics is to be organized? What would be the principle of political organization? What, indeed, would be the purview of citizenship—conspicuous by its absence in his account? Burke criticizes my ethic as being allegedly based on a "narrow dialogue between government elites," ignoring thereby the "profound problem of accountability to citizens inherent in all security policy-making." I cotild not agree more that accountability is a "profound problem" and that to deal with it requires certain sorts of domestic institutional arrangements. And of course in endorsing democracy I thereby endorse citizen participation. The term "domestic" already signals a distinction between a particular set of arrangements culminating in states and arrangements beyond that level. It is states that can be pressured to take responsibility for aberrant behavior—for example, the U.S. mihtary courts-martial of the out-ofcontrol rogues who enacted their own sordid pornographic fantasies with prisoners in Abu Ghraib. One doesn't court-martial people for carrying out faithfully an official policy. There is most certainly fault to be found here—whether in ambiguous statements about what is permitted or in insufficient training of those guarding prisoners, admittedly in a difficult situation over which the U.S. military was just beginning to take control. We rightly judge a military by whether it indicts and punishes perpetrators of wrong: Why is nothing said about this by Burke? Surely Burke owes us an account of a **coherent set of institutional arrangements** to carry out such a role in a world characterized by ethnic revisionists, murderous jihadists, one party dictatorships, child soldiering, rape campaigns, human trafficking, genocides, corruption, exploitation, and all the rest. It is through states and through the national contingents of international bodies—whether of churches or the Red Cross or human rights groups or guilds of various professional organizations—that persons can try to act **and to organize.** Once they do, such entities based in one state connect up to other such entities to form international networks that can put pressure simultaneously on particular states and on relevant international or transnational bodies. To assume a world beyond this sort of politics is to assume what never was and never will be—namely, that there will no longer be a need to "reconcile **competing human wills**." Defending, as Burke claims to be doing, a "liberal ethic of war and peace" (p. 82) means, surely, to think of rules and laws and responsibility and accountability. Liberalism is premised on a world of states and, depending on whether one is a Kantian or some other sort of liberal, a world in which the principle of state sovereignty can be overridden under some circumstances.

#### 8. Perm do both - Critique Alone is not adequate to alter the current security environment – Political Action is Necessary to Promote Emancipation Over Security

Pinar Bilgin, Prof. of IR @ Bilkent Univ, ‘5 [*Regional Security in The Middle East*, p. 60-1]

Admittedly, providing a critique of existing approaches to security, revealing those hidden assumptions and normative projects embedded in Cold War Security Studies, is only a first step. In other words, from a critical security perspective, **self-reflection, thinking and writing are not enough in themselve**s. They should be compounded by other forms of **practice** (that is, action taken on the ground). It is indeed crucial for students of critical approaches to re-think security in both theory and practice by pointing to possibilities for **change immanent in world politics** and suggesting emancipatory practices if it is going to fulfil the promise of becoming a 'force of change' in world politics. Cognisant of the need to find and suggest alternative practices to meet a broadened security agenda without adopting militarised or zero-sum thinking and practices, students of critical approaches to security have suggested the imagining, creation and **nurturing of security** communities **as emancipatory practices** (Booth 1994a; Booth and Vale 1997). Although Devetak's approach to the theory/practice relationship echoes critical approaches' conception of theory as a form of practice, the latter seeks to go further in shaping global practices. The distinction Booth makes between 'thinking about thinking' and 'thinking about doing' grasps the difference between the two. Booth (1997: 114) writes: Thinking about thinking is important, but, more urgently, so is **thinking about doing** .... Abstract ideas about emancipation **will not suffice:** it is important for Critical Security Studies to engage with the real by **suggesting policies**, agents, and sites of change, **to help humankind,** in whole and in part, to move away from its structural wrongs. In this sense, providing a critique of existing approaches to security, revealing those hidden assumptions and normative projects embedded in Cold War Security Studies**, is only a first** (albeit crucial) step. It is vital for the students of critical approaches to re-think security in both theory and **practice**.

### 2AC Nietzsche

#### 1. Framework – evaluate the plan versus the status quo or a competitive policy option

#### Allow us to simulate the effects of the plan versus the alt

#### a. Ground- we can never garner offense against a utopian alt when they just ignore the effects of the plan

#### b. Education- we never learn any policy making education when its only about some implications

#### 2. We don’t destroy value to life – even if suffering is inevitable so is the desire to combat it

Baxi 98, Law Professor at Warwick, ’98 (Upendra, 8 Transnat’l L. & Contemp. Probs. 125, lexis)

Even so, one may distinguish here the pursuit of suffering as an aspect of a self-chosen exercise of human rights norms and standards (that is, practices of sado-masochism within the human right to "privacy," assuring a right to self-exploitation by way of "victimless crime") from non-consensual and therefore illegitimate orders of pain and suffering imposed by the civil society and the state. Responsible and responsive relativism must be confronted with a human rights ethic that teaches us that the buying and selling of women as chattels in the marketplace, harnessing children in blood sports (like camel riding), or the conscription of children into state armies or mercenary forces is not justified by any serious understanding of culture or tradition. What we need, is a human rights-responsive and responsible relativism, one that interrogates the "contemporary" human rights paradigm in its endless renegotiations of its own foundations. **[98](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=0d2195b40e75597e7e88b8f213d36bbd&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=cd42fa5ee7edefc190eb0ab254e20c5f&focBudTerms=AUTHOR%20%28Baxi%29AND%20right%21&focBudSel=all" \l "n98" \t "_self)** This is, as yet, not in sight. The moral invention of the past half-century of human rights theory and practice consists in contesting human suffering here-and-now, and the nirvana that contemporary human rights seek is therefore sometimes said to suffer from a relatively impoverished cosmology. However, human rights activism has its own dharma, which is the performance of righteous deeds (karma) which, too, earn merit (punnya) to redeem the "soul."? The lack of rights for the dark underclasses brings us to the principal theme of The Genealogy of Morals: The morality of "good and evil" has been invented out of hatred and resentment by the defeated and subjugated races, especially the Jews. People who love Nietzsche for his celebration of creativity and his dismissal of the [moralism](http://www.friesian.com/poly-1b.htm#moralism) of traditional religion, mainly meaning Christianity, usually seem to think of going "beyond good and evil" as merely legitimizing homosexuality, drugs, abortion, prostitution, pornography, and the other desiderata of progressive thinking. They don't seem to understand that Nietzsche wasn't particularly interested in things like that, but, more to the point, legitimizing rape, murder, torture, pillage, domination, and political oppression by the strong. The only honest Nietzschean graduate student I ever met frankly stated, "To be creative, you must be evil." We get something similar in the recent Sandra Bullock movie, Murder by Numbers [2002], where the young Nietzschean student simply says, "Freedom is crime." The story of the movie is more or less that of Leopold and Loeb, the Chicago teenagers who in 1924 murdered a young boy (Bobby Franks) to prove that they were "beyond good and evil." Leopold and Loeb understood their Nietzsche far better than most of his academic apologists. ? And we are the first to admit that anyone who knew these "good" ones [nobility] only as enemies would find them evil enemies indeed. For these same men who, amongst themselves, are so strictly constrained by custom, worship, ritual, gratitude, and by mutual surveillance and jealousy, who are so resourceful in consideration, tenderness, loyality, pride and friendship, when once they step outside their circle become little better than uncaged beasts of prey. Once abroad in the wilderness, they revel in the freedom from social constraint and compensate for their long confinement in the quietude of their own community. They revert to the innocence of wild animals: we can imagine them returning from an orgy of murder, arson, rape, and torture, jubilant and at peace with themselves as though they had committed a fraternity prank -- convinced, moreover, that the poets for a long time to come will have something to sing about and to praise. Deep within all the noble races there lurks the [blond] beast of prey, bent on spoil and conquest. This hidden urge has to be satisfied from time to time, the beast let loose in the wilderness. This goes as well for the Roman, Arabian, German, Japanese nobility as for the Homeric heroes and the Scandinavian vikings. The noble races have everywhere left in their wake the catchword "barbarian." .....their utter indifference to safety and comfort, their terrible pleasure in destruction, their taste for cruelty -- all these traits are embodied by their victims in the image of the "barbarian," and "evil enemy," the Goth or the Vandal. The profound and icy suspicion which the German arouses as soon as he assumes power (we see it happening again today [i.e. [1887](http://www.friesian.com/francia.htm#second)]) harks back to the persistent horror with which Europe for many centuries witnessed the raging of the blond Teutonic [germanischen] beast (although all racial connection between the old Teutonic tribes [Germanen] and ourselves has been lost). [pp.174-175, boldface added, note the terms, "blond" and "German," deleted or altered in the Golffing translation]? The "noble races" are thus ennobled by no restraint or consideration shown for the persons or possessions, let alone feelings, of those helpless strangers who come within their power. "Spoil and conquest," rape and torture, are fun. Kaiser Wilhelm got in the spirit of things by telling German troups to act like the "Huns of Attila" on their mission to Peking in 1900. No Nietzschean has any business, for example, damning Christopher Columbus for enslaving the Caribs. While Nietzsche actually seems to think that the "blond Teutonic beast" was gone from Germany, and Hitler, as noted, hardly fills the bill, there is actually no lack of blonds in the "Nordic" nations, and Nietzsche himself here seems to have a relatively expansive notion of racial superiority. While he apparently thought of the Roman nobility as themselves of Aryan extraction, he can hardly have thought the same of the Arabians or Japanese. This acknowledgment would have been of material advantage in World War II, when many Arabs preferred the Germans to the British (or to the [Zionist](http://www.friesian.com/outremer.htm#israel) Jews of Palestine) -- while the Japanese, even today, often think of themselves as a pure and superior race. As actual German Allies in World War II, the Japanese were in close competition with Germany for atrocities against civilians and prisoners-of-war (though the Germans were relatively considerate of American and British prisoners, while brutal to Russians and others, as the Japanese were to all). ? But, one might think, violence and oppression are unjust! How could any progressive person not see that expoitation and abuse are wrong! We have Nietzsche's answer: ? No act of violence, rape, exploitation, destruction, is intrinsically "unjust," since life itself is violent, rapacious, exploitative, and destructive and cannot be conceived otherwise. Even more disturbingly, we have to admit that from the biological [i.e. Darwinian] point of view legal conditions are necessarily exceptional conditions, since they limit the radical life-will bent on power and must finally subserve, as means, life's collective purpose, which is to create greater power constellations. To accept any legal system as sovereign and universal -- to accept it, not merely as an instrument in the struggle of power complexes, but as a weapon against struggle (in the sense of Dühring's communist cliché that every will must regard every other will as its equal) -- is an anti-vital principle which can only bring about man's utter demoralization and, indirectly, a reign of nothingness. [p.208, boldface added] ? Nietzsche is certainly life affirming, but then violence, rape, exploitation, and destruction are intrinsic to his view of life. Attempts to protect the weak, see that justice is done, and mitigate suffering are "anti-vital" projects that, being adverse to life itself, actually tend towards "a reign of nothingness." Thus, if we actually care about others and are not just interested in asserting power over them and using them for our own pleasure, then we can look forward to extinction.

#### 3. Perm do both

#### 4. Nietszche’s denial of being leads to nihilism – Removing all meaning in life – This leads to an endless search for power which never is successful

Hicks 3, Prof and Chair of Philosophy @ Queens College of the CUNY, 2003 (Steven V., “Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Foucault: Nihilism and Beyond,” *Foucault and Heidegger: Critical Encounters*, Ed. Alan Milchman and Alan Rosenberg, P. 109, Questia)

Here again, one might raise objections to Heidegger's equating of Nietzsche's doctrine of will to power with the metaphysics of subjectivity. After all, Nietzsche often attacked Descartes's “ego cogito” as a logical or linguistic fiction (cf. BGE, §§ 16, 54). Yet according to Heidegger, Nietzsche still follows Descartes's lead in making human beings the subject or foundation of things. Unlike Descartes, however, Nietzsche's subject is not a fixed mental substance, but the body interpreted as a center of instincts, drives, affects, and sublimations, i.e., as will to power. Heidegger claims that this “body as given” idea still involves Nietzsche in a “fixity” that brings him into the philosophy of presence: “Nietzsche argues that being is as fixated, as permanent” (N, 2:200). And this forced sense of presence, Heidegger thinks, leads to the dangers of “radical objectifiability” and to the “disposability of beings, ” i.e., treating beings as nothing but objects of use, control, and management. 32 Moreover, like its Cartesian counterpart, the Nietzschean subject reins supreme over the whole of beings and posits “the measure for the beingness of every … being” (N, 4:121). 33 In claiming that “truths are illusions” and that “Being is an empty fiction, ” Nietzsche “fashions for the subject an absolute power to enjoin what is true and what is false” and hence to define what it means “to be” or “not to be” a being (N, 4:145). According to Nietzsche, what is true—what has being—is that which serves the interest of the subject whose essence is will to power (in the mode of existence of eternal recurrence; cf. N, 2:203). Being is thus reduced to the status of a value or a “condition of the preservation and enhancement of the will to power” (N, 4:176). This is why Heidegger considers Nietzsche the “consummation, ” and not the overcoming, of Western metaphysics: by reducing Being to a value, the doctrine of will to power makes the nihilism of the metaphysical tradition (the assumption that Being itself is nothing and the human will everything) a matter of philosophical principle. 34 Thus Nietzsche's “counter-ideals” of will to power and eternal recurrence, far from overcoming nihilism, actually express or exemplify the loss of any sense of Being, or the withdrawal of Being itself, in favor of beings (i.e., products of human will). As Heidegger reads him, Nietzsche understands Being in terms of value (or what is useful for enhancing the human will) because Being itself has totally withdrawn in default. And this brings to completion traditional metaphysics, which, according to Heidegger, is the history of Being in its withdrawal. As Heidegger sees it, Nietzsche's metaphysics of will to power is “the most extreme withdrawal of Being” and thus “the fulfillment of nihilism proper” (N, 4:204, 232). So Nietzsche brings to completion, in his denial of Being, the very nihilism he wanted to overcome. Far from twisting free of the ascetic ideal, Heidegger claims, Nietzsche 's doctrine of will to power actually provides the basis for its most complete expression in the modern “secularized” ascetic “will-tocontrol” everything. In other words, instead of seeking salvation in a transcendent world by means of ascetic self-denial—the aspect of metaphysics that Nietzsche most obviously rejects—salvation is now, Heidegger claims, sought “exclusively in the free self-development of all the creative powers of man” (N, 4:89). This unlimited expanding of power for power's sake parallels in many ways what Nietzsche characterized as the most terrifying aspect of the ascetic ideal: the pursuit of “truth for truth's sake.” It is, according to Heidegger, the “hidden thorn” in the side of modern humanity (cf. N, 4:99). This “hidden thorn” expresses itself variously in the Protestant “work ethic” and in the “iron cage” of bureaucratic-technological rationality (discussed in the works of Max Weber); it also expresses itself in the various power aims of modern scientific/technological culture as well as in the frenzied impulse to produce and consume things at ever faster rates. Heidegger even suggests that Nietzsche's own figure of the Overman (Ubermensch) foreshadows the calculating, technological attitude of modern secularized asceticism: “His Overman [stands] for the technological worker-soldier who would disclose all entities as standingreserve necessary for enhancing the ultimately aimless quest for power for its own sake.”35 This emerging technological human, grounded in a control-oriented anthropocentrism, compels entities to reveal only those one-dimensional aspects of themselves that are consistent with the power aims of a technological/productionist culture. Instead of dwelling and thinking in a world unified by what Heidegger metaphorically terms the “fourfold of earth and sky, gods and mortals, ” impoverished modern technocrats occupy a world “bereft of gods” in which thinking becomes calculating, and dwelling becomes tantamount to the “technological domination of nature” and what Nietzsche calls “the common economic management of the earth” in which “mankind will be able to find its best meaning as a machine in the service of this economy” (WP, § 866). Thus citizens come to be viewed primarily as consumers, wilderness is looked upon in terms of “wildlife management areas, ” and genuine human freedom is “replaced by the organized global conquest of the earth, and the thrust into outer space” (N, 4:248). As Heidegger sees it, “our era entertains the illusion that man, having become free for his humanity, has freely taken the universe into his power and disposition” (N, 4:248). In summary, Nietzsche tried to combat the nihilism of the ascetic ideal (e.g., the collapse of the Christian table of values) by bringing forth new nonascetic values that would enhance rather than devalue humanity's will to power. According to Heidegger, however, instead of overcoming nihilism, Nietzsche simply reinforced it. By characterizing Being as an “empty fiction” and “the last smoke of a vaporized reality ” (TI, 2:2, 481), and by degrading it to the status of a value for enhancing the subject's will to power, Nietzsche loses any sense of Being as such. For him it is a mere nothing, a “nihil.” And this brings to completion the “fundamental movement” of history in the West, which is nihilism: the withdrawal of Being itself and the consequent focus on beings as objects for “consolidating the power of Will and for expanding it out beyond itself” in an ever-increasing spiral. 36 As Heidegger sees it, this “eternally recurring” will to power, or “will to will, ” is a will-to-control that only reinforces the nihilism Nietzsche feared: the loss of meaning or direction, the devaluation of the highest values, the “constructs of domination, ” and the devotion to frenzied consumption and production.

#### 5. If life requires suffering it turns their alt by destroying the basis for truth and their alt

#### 7. Allowing suffering and inaction to stop any of them – makes extinction inevitable

#### 8. AUTHENTICITY FETISHIZATION AND ITS FEAR OF REASON forces a retreat from the political while GAS CHAMBERS ARE BUILT

Bewes ‘97

[Timothy, doctorate in English Literature at the University of Sussex, *Cynicism and Postmodernity*, New York City: Verso, 1997,146-7//uwyo-ajl]

If it is unreasonable to suppose that the Final Solution was potentiated or even necessarily facilitated by Schmitt's theories, it is certainly the case that this metaphysical structure of domination in the Third Reich, whereby the status of public citizens is reduced to a level determined entirely in the 'natural' or biological realm of necessity, is foreshadowed in his 1927 essay. In an abstract and insidious way Schmitt introduces the idea that the 'transcendent' realm of the political, as a matter of course, will not accommodate a people with insufficient strength to ensure its own participation, and that such a fact is ipso facto justification for its exclusion. 'If a people no longer possesses the energy or the will to maintain itself in the sphere of politics, the latter will not thereby vanish from the world. Only a weak people will disappear.'130 Schmitt's concept of the 'political', quite simply, is nothing of the sort - is instead weighed down by necessity, in the form of what Marshall Berman calls German-Christian interiority - by its preoccupation with authenticity, that is to say, and true political 'identity'. Auschwitz is a corollary not of reason, understood as risk, but of the fear of reason, which paradoxically is a fear of violence. The stench of burning bodies is haunted always by the sickly aroma of cheap metaphysics.

#### 9. Political action necessary to give life meaning – we make space for recognition of plurality

Saurette, Political Science Professor at Ottawa, ’96 (Paul, March 1, “I Mistrust all Systematizers and Avoid Them’: Nietzsche, Arendt and the Crisis of the Will to Order in International Relations Theory” Millenium Journal of International Studies, Vol 25 No 1)

The Human Condition and Political Action While Nietzsche traces the historical influence of the dominant philosophical foundations of the Will to Truth/Order, Arendt's thought can be interpreted as a sustained examination of the consequences of this tradition for our notions of political action. Like Nietzsche, Arendt traces the origin of the `modern' understanding of politics to the interpretative framework inaugurated by Socrates and Plato. Therefore, in order to understand Arendt's conception and critique of the traditional Western definition of politics, it is necessary to examine several of the classical distinctions through which she explores the nature and role of politics. In The Human Condition, Arendt characterises human activity and political life (the vita activa) as being composed of three distinct types of activity. The first of these, labour, is activity which directly responds to the need for biological survival. As such, Arendt states that the `human condition of labour is life itself." Labour is the automatic cycle of production and consumption which ends only with death and is therefore universal to all humanity. In contradistinction to labour, Arendt suggests that the activity of work involves the production of the `human artifice' and the durable material world where humans live." The primary characteristic of work is that it is the realm of violence in which force is used to manipulate natural material. It is a process of fabrication guided from start to finish by an idea or model, whose goal is simply the realisation of this form in the human physical world of appearance. The worker is the master of the entire process and conceives of a definite beginning and end through which the ideal is realised. As opposed to labour, then, work is the realm of mastery and control. Moreover, by erecting a durable, `objective', and relatively stable world of human artifacts, `homo faber rescues animal lahorans from the endless flow of biological life and transcends his own subjectivity by constructing a durable world of his own which stands apart from both the maker and the natural world'." Through homo faber, humanity both affirms and escapes the inexorable cycle of birth and death by fabricating a realm of objects in which the communal reification of memory is possible. Work is therefore a critical human activity which allows action to give human existence a sense of immortality, of `endurance in time, deathless life on this earth', and of meaning beyond simple survival. Despite the necessity of both labour and work, action is the most uniquely human activity because only through action can humanity realise the fundamental universality and individuality of human existence. According to Arendt, action is the activity that allows humanity to comprehend and reproduce the existential and irreducible human condition of plurality and natality. As Arendt suggests, `the new beginning inherent in birth can make itself felt in the world only because the newcomer possesses the capacity of beginning something anew, that is, of acting. In this sense of initiative, an element of action, and therefore of natality, is inherent is all human activities'." This inherent individuality creates human plurality as `the condition of human action because we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else who ever lived, lives or will live'.` While action is only possible because of the `human condition' of plurality and natality, action also reproduces it. In other words, only action can realise the potential plurality and natality of the human world. As James Knauer suggests, plurality is a potential given by the fact of natality, the birth of new human individuals, but it can be realized only through political association. It is in their acting and speaking together that unique individuals emerge out of the sameness and eternal recurrence of the species. And it is only when living together as acting beings in political association that human beings encounter other human beings, that plurality is realised 21 According to Arendt, then, the purpose of a public sphere is to create the condition of unmediated human interaction as the realisation of the human condition through political action.

### 2AC Anthro

#### 1. Framework – evaluate the plan versusthe status quo or a competitive policy option

#### Allow us to simulate the effects of the plan versus the alt

#### a. Ground- we can never garner offense against a utopian alt when they just ignore the effects of the plan

#### b. Education- we never learn any policy making education when its only about some implications

#### 2. Anthropocentrism is inevitable and good—the alternative links to the critique and makes it impossible to protect the biosphere.

Grey 93 — William Grey, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Queensland, 1993 (“Anthropocentrism and Deep Ecology,” Australiasian Journal of Philosophy, Volume 71, Number 4, Available Online at http://www.uq.edu.au/~pdwgrey/pubs/anthropocentrism.html, Accessed 07-27-2011)

The attempt to provide a genuinely non-anthropocentric set of values, or preferences seems to be a hopeless quest. Once we eschew all human values, interests and preferences we are confronted with just too many alternatives, as we can see when we consider biological history over a billion year time scale. The problem with the various non-anthropocentric bases for value which have been proposed is that they permit too many different possibilities, not all of which are at all congenial to us. And that matters. We should be concerned to promote a rich, diverse and vibrant biosphere. Human flourishing may certainly be included as a legitimate part of such a flourishing. ? The preoccupations of deep ecology arise as a result of human activities which impoverish and degrade the quality of the planet's living systems. But these judgements are possible only if we assume a set of values (that is, preference rankings), based on human preferences. We need to reject not anthropocentrism, but a particularly short term and narrow conception of human interests and concerns. What's wrong with shallow views is not their concern about the well-being of humans, but that they do not really consider enough in what that well-being consists. We need to develop an enriched, fortified anthropocentric notion of human interest to replace the dominant short-term, sectional and self-regarding conception. ? Our sort of world, with our sort of fellow occupants is an interesting and engaging place. There is every reason for us to try to keep it, and ourselves, going for a few more cosmic seconds [10].

#### 3. Plan reduces auto mobility which is a major factor that damages our environment

#### 4. Only the permutation enables tough decision-making—the alternative alone results in policy and ethical paralysis.

Grey 93 — William Grey, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Queensland, 1993 (“Anthropocentrism and Deep Ecology,” Australiasian Journal of Philosophy, Volume 71, Number 4, Available Online at http://www.uq.edu.au/~pdwgrey/pubs/anthropocentrism.html, Accessed 07-27-2011)

There are a number of problems with such a permissive criterion of moral considerability. One is that there are conflicts of interest between goal-directed entities, and something needs to be said about how these are to be resolved. Smallpox and HIV no doubt have their own viral autonomy (as well as being the products of natural historical processes), but for all that it is perfectly legitimate to disregard their interests when they conflict with our own. Yet it is hard to see how a decision to deny them a place in the scheme of things can be defended except by appeal to a value system which favours human interests. Plumwood allows that in casting the moral net widely we will have to "make distinctions for appropriate treatment within each class of items" (p. 147). It seems reasonable to suspect that human standards of appropriateness will be brought to bear to settle cases where such conflicts arise. Another difficulty with this approach is that goal-directedness is a very general and very pervasive characteristic of both organic and inorganic systems. It is implausible to suppose that we have any obligation to respect the equilibrium states of inorganic systems, goal directed though they may be. Energy moves in the direction of increasing entropy (downhill all the way); planets have stable and predictable paths which are the outcomes of continuing processes. Teleology is just too pervasive and too indiscriminate a characteristic to provide a plausible foundation for moral considerability. It may be prudent to reflect on the consequences of perturbing inorganic systems which have a natural direction, but it is not at all plausible to construe this as an obligation to those systems. Moreover as Thompson (1990, pp. 152f.) has pointed out, the criterion of goal-directedness is problematic even when restricted to the organic world. Parts of organisms, such as kidneys, as well as populations of organisms, can be characterized teleologically, but it is implausible to suppose that this fact carries any moral clout. Plumwood is right in responding to Thompson to say that what is wrong is that this objection ignores the importance of different organic levels of orga.nization (Plumwood 1991, p. 146), but choosing the right level of organization is an interest-sensitive matter.

#### 5. Perm do both

#### //6. Life in some form is inevitable but human life is uniquely good—radical ecology makes extinction inevitable.

Grey 93 — William Grey, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Queensland, 1993 (“Anthropocentrism and Deep Ecology,” Australiasian Journal of Philosophy, Volume 71, Number 4, Available Online at http://www.uq.edu.au/~pdwgrey/pubs/anthropocentrism.html, Accessed 07-27-2011)

A great deal of hyperbole has been deployed in articulating the claims of deep ecology. It is common, for example, to encounter claims that destructive human activity—and in particular human technology—is threatening life on the planet; that we are disrupting the delicate fabric of the ecosphere, and driving it towards collapse. Such claims are exaggerated. There have been far more traumatic disruptions to the planet than any we can initiate. From a long-term planetary perspective, this is alarmist nonsense. However from an anthropocentric point of view such fears may be well founded.

If the concerns for humanity and nonhuman species raised by advocates of deep ecology are expressed as concerns about the fate of the planet, then these concerns are misplaced. From a planetary perspective, we may be entering a phase of mass extinction of the magnitude of the Cretaceous. For planet earth that is just another incident in a four and a half billion year saga. Life will go on—in some guise or other. The arthropods, algae and the ubiquitous bacteria, at least, will almost certainly be around for a few billion years more. And with luck and good management, some of the more complex and interesting creatures, such as ourselves, may continue for a while longer as well. Of course our present disruptive and destructive activities are, or should be, of great concern to us all. But that is a quite properly human concern, expressing anthropocentric values from an anthropocentric perspec- <469> tive. Life will continue; but we should take steps to maintain and preserve our sort of living planet; one that suits us and, with a few exceptions, our biotic co-existents.

#### 7. Morality checks anthropocentrism

Donahue ’10 [Thomas J. Donahue, Postdoctoral Research Fellow in the Institute for Philosophical Research, “Anthropocentrism and the Argument from Gaia Theory,” Ethics and the Environment vol. 15 number 3 Fall 2010, pgs. 59-61, JFang]

If anthropocentrism did imply the Dominion Thesis, that would, in my opinion, decisively refute the doctrine. But the implication does not hold good (even though a good many anthropocentrists have embraced the Thesis). The trouble with the Routleys’ argument is the middle premise, according to which humans are, on anthropocentric principles, entitled to treat as they wish anything which must serve human interests. Let us call this the Entitlement View. This view is false. The anthropocentrist need not hold that humans are so entitled. The reasons are as follows. Recall the claim made by anthropocentrism—that the only things valuable in themselves are human beings; their desires, needs, and purposes; and the satisfaction of those. The Entitlement View does not follow from this claim. For suppose I accept anthropocentrism. I still run into the problem that any plausible anthropocentric morality will forbid me from treating things in such a way that they needlessly harm other human beings. For example, suppose we concede that a mountain must serve human interests. Still, on any plausible anthropocentric morality, I may not strip mine the mountain such that the resulting sludge contaminates a nearby town’s water supply. The same would hold true even if (implausibly) all humanity agreed to use a certain thing in a way that needlessly harmed some human beings. But then it follows that on any plausible anthropocentric morality, it is false that humans are entitled to treat as they wish anything which must serve human interests. So the Entitlement View is false. Defenders of the Dominion implication might reply that a weaker version of the Entitlement View still holds good: namely, that on anthropocentrist principles, humans are entitled to treat as they wish anything which must serve human interests, so long as they do not violate any of the tenets of any plausible anthropocentric morality. But once this concession is made, the route to the Dominion Thesis seems to be blocked. For it is hard to see how one could reach the thesis that “man is entitled to manipulate the earth and all its non-human contents as he wants” by combining anthropocentrism with this weakened Entitlement View. So it seems that anthropocentrism does not imply the Dominion Thesis. Another ugly consequence attributed to anthropocentrism is the view that human beings cannot have general obligations not to harm plants, non-human animals, or ecosystems. The idea here is that, on anthropocentric principles, one cannot have obligations not to harm such beings unless incurs the obligations by promises, contracts, or the fact that the beings are someone else’s property. Let us call this “the No-obligation Thesis.” This Thesis fails, because it does not take into account all the ways that we can incur obligations. If, by harming an ecosystem, I would be needlessly harming other human beings, then clearly on anthropocentric principles I have an obligation not to harm the ecosystem. More interestingly, even if in harming the ecosystem I would not be harming other human beings, I might still have an anthropocentric obligation not to harm the ecosystem. For suppose that a great number of people strongly desire that the ecosystem not be harmed, and have connected some of their hopes and plans with its not being harmed (Yellowstone National Park might be such an ecosystem). On anthropocentric principles, it is quite possible that I would then have an obligation not to harm that ecosystem, even if the harm I might do would not (seriously) harm or endanger any human beings. And since promises, contracts, and property do not figure here, it seems that the No-obligation Thesis is also false.

### - - - 2AC CPs - - -

### 2AC States

#### 1. Federal funding more stable because states can’t deficit spend

The Transportation Politic, 12

The Transportation Politic, February 16, 2012, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/

 - - [Commenter John notes](http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/#comment-546614) that many transit projects are paid for through bonds, which are in essence deficits, and that states have the technical power to have deficits — and these points are both valid. However, all states except Vermont have some form of balanced budget rule. And the selling of bonds by transit agencies are reliant on them having future guaranteed funding sources to pay back the debt — federal funding like capital grants are an important part of making that equation happen. Transit agencies do not have the ability to expand their debt capacity greatly (unlike the federal government) because of investor fears about future funding security.

#### This tanks solvency because it creates unstable mass transit that will make people not use it

#### 2. Perm do both double solvency because every addition to transit helps and shields the link our ethical obligation is linear

#### 3. National action is key to mobilize support necessary to implement an effective transit policy

Dr. Phineas Baxandall et al. 2008, A BETTER WAY TO GO: MEETING AMERICA’S 21ST CENTURY TRANSPORTATION CHALLENGES WITH MODERN PUBILC TRANSIT, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, 3—08, p. 55-56.

Transit has long been seen as primarily a local issue—something of concern to city-dwellers and some suburbanites. In many states—even some with robust transit systems—there is still little or no investment of state government resources in transit systems. And at the federal level, transit advocates have often felt compelled to accept greater spending on highways as a means to achieve greater investment in transit. The consequences of our automobile-centered transportation system, however, are national in scope. Traffic congestion, oil dependence and global warming pollution are issues that affect all Americans and deserve a national response. A wide variety of constituencies have a potential interest in expanding transit infrastructure in the United States. This “grand coalition” potentially includes the following: • Metropolitan area residents, who represent more than 80 percent of the American population and who would benefit most directly from reduced congestion and the ability to use transit.133 • Businesses—both those located in metropolitan areas that would benefit from their employees’ and customers’ access to transit and those that rely on the shipment of goods and would benefit from reduced highway congestion. • Property owners in corridors to be served by transit, who would likely see property values increase. • Construction firms and organized labor, which would benefit from the jobs created in transit system construction, operations and maintenance. • Environmentalists, who would support reductions in global warming emissions and other forms of pollution. • Low-income, elderly and disabled people, who would benefit from an increased range of transportation choices. The elderly could represent an especially important constituency, as the population of Americans ages 65 and older is projected to increase by 20 million between 2000 and 2020.134 • Individuals concerned with national security, who would support reductions in America’s dependence on foreign oil. As long as the transit debate is about one transit line or one city at a time, there will be little hope of mobilizing a wide range of interests behind a major commitment to transit. To generate excitement and widespread support, there must be a compelling vision for what an expansion of transit service would look like and how it would benefit the United States—in short, a national roadmap for transit.

#### 4. States practice discrimination against minorities that prevents solvency – Fed Gov’t key to civil rights to solve

Stanford Journal of Civil Rights & Civil Liberties 6

 [Aug 2006, "Arizona's Proposition 200 and the Supremacy of Federal Law: Elements of Law, Politics, and Faith"]

Though not a major problem given the political legitimacy and responsiveness of state government vis-a-vis the federal government, I do pause here to flag one civic concern: **t**he legacy of oppression and discrimination that particular minority communities associate with their state governments has not yet, unfortunately, been relegated to the annals of ancient history. Not only do segregationist **policies, denial of the franchise, and ruthless state-sponsored violence come to mind for many poor black southerners** when they think about their relationship to the state government; they may also have salient memories of King v. Smith types of intrusive, humiliating home visits related directly to welfare administration. n167 In light of PRWORA's abandonment of federal welfare entitlements, the oppressive and discriminatory policies **and attitudes of the 1950s and 1960s, which had been** reined in by the federal protections **afforded by way of Goldberg and King,** may potentially be revived**.**

 Indeed**,** institutional racism at the state and local level is alarmingly enduring. Professor Cashin, for one, devotes considerable attention to how states profoundly discriminate against their African-American welfare populations. n168 And another, **Professor** Susan **Gooden**, presents a particularly salient case study of Virginia welfare services. In her study, she **documents and contrasts** state administrators' disparaging and ungenerous treatment of black welfare recipients **with their treatment of similarly situated white clients who were always given first notice of new jobs, offered the "newest" work clothes, and given access to automobiles. n169**

 Understanding discrimination is not just an academic exercise, but also a visceral part of the welfare experience. **The civic harms associated with returning power to the** states

#### 5. States create a race to the bottom

Sally F. Goldfarb, Associate Professor of Law, Rutgers University school of law, Camden, 2002 (“The Supreme Court, the Violence Against Women Act, and the Use and Abuse of Fedralsim” 71 Fordham L. Rev. 57)

The existence of dialogue between the state and federal governments does not mean that the two speak in identical voices. State legislatures, free of the limitations imposed on Congress by the federal constitution, have broader scope for their legal and policy experiments. 21 Meanwhile, federal legislation can play a number of roles not open to its state counterparts. Under the doctrine of supremacy, the federal government can impose universal rules that are binding on the states. 219 Moreover, even aside from supremacy, federal law has a degree of visibility and persuasiveness that state law lacks. As a result, when a legislative innovation has been adopted at the federal level, states tend to adopt analogous innovations in their own laws more rapidly than if the innovation had been adopted only by other states. 2 Federal law has a particularly crucial role to play in the establishment of equality rights. By definition, only federal law can provide a national standard. To the extent that certain concepts of equality are essential to our self-definition as a nation, a nationally uniform antidiscrimination law is not merely a shortcut to obtaining coverage in all fifty states, but bespeaks the fundamental nature of the guarantee being offered. Since the end of the Civil War, there has been widespread recognition of a unique federal interest in establishing equality norms precisely to express and enforce the view that such norms are a central feature of national citizenship. 2 VAWA's civil rights remedy was a product of this tradition. 222

#### 6. 50 State Fiat Bad

1. **Not reciprocal – 1 vs 50 actors they can have as many as they want**
2. **There is lit on states counterplan that makes it utopian and kills policy making education**
3. **States counterplan prevents any small cases and makes them all heg affs**
4. **Infinitely regressive – it could be infinite become worse and worse – citys do it or have people do it**
5. **They mooch off the 1ac and just add a fed link – kills debate**
6. **Voter for fairness and education**

### 2AC Election links to States

#### If all 50 states do it together uniformly it will be perceived as if the USFG was doing it

#### Reverse Coattail the plan will make people come out and vote against their local reps and vote against pro-Obama reps that makes Romney win

### 2AC Privates

#### 1. Perm do both

#### 2. The encouragement of public-private partnerships leads to welfare being in the hands of prominent actors in the military-industrial complex, making welfare an issue of private profit rather than public good.

MacLeavy and Peoples 2009

Julie MacLeavy, School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, and Columba Peoples, Department of Politics, University of Bristol, “Workfare–Warfare: Neoliberalism, “Active” Welfare and the New American Way of War” Antipode, 23 OCT 2009 DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00701.x

What the paper hopes to have shown by this point is the pervasive nature of neoliberal or neoliberal-inspired logics in the spheres of welfare and defense provision in the USA. Although these logics may not be entirely identical, there are broad homologies that can be drawn between the two (the assumed efficiency of the free market, flexiblization, privatization, and public–private partnership) with the prevalence of “NewLiberalSpeak” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2001) clearly common to both. Beyond this, however, an increasing (if disparate) body of research suggests that there are areas where these neoliberal-inspired reforms of welfare and warfare are not merely analogous, but overlap and intertwine with significant institutional and societal impacts. Workfare, Warfare and Industry. A prominent instance of this overlap has seen attempts by military industry to become involved in the provision of social welfare. This is perhaps unsurprising given the historical progression of social welfare innovations through war (Clark, Lee and Wilson 2002; Skocpol 1992). The compensation of soldiers for extreme labor not only predates the provisions extended to civilian workers, but has long functioned as a means of managing this highly specialized workforce and its morale (Cowen 2008). What is observable now, however, is the investment of military industry in welfare provision, which is facilitating the withdrawal of the federal state from this policy arena. With the increasing privatization of welfare provision in the USA in the 1990s, which has continued through the early years of this century, responsibility for the employment and related components of the TANF program has been contracted out to for-profit companies. Lockheed Martin Information Managements Systems (Lockheed IMS)—a subsidiary of the defense industry giant Lockheed Martin—is among the organizations to have competed for contracts in a number of states including Texas, Arizona, Florida, California and New York. At one point, Lockheed IMS collected delinquent child support payments in 30 states and boasted more than 200 state and municipal clients. In Florida, child welfare has been privatized under the local “Welfare Transition Program” with the effect that waivers to privatize eligibility determination of food stamps and Medicare across all states were presented at the US Department of Agriculture, and Health and Human Services. Texas was one of the states where IMS made a bid for full-scale welfare provision, which is rendered even more significant by the fact that the Texas privatization plan (the Texas Integrated Enrolment System or TIES) marked the first time that a state sought to allow private companies to bid not only for the task of redesigning public assistance programs but also for the primary role in determining the eligibility of applicants for such programs. As Hartung and Washburn (1998) note, the success of this bid could have left an aerospace and weapons manufacturer in charge of dispensing food stamps and Medicaid. Notably, IMS in part marketed its suitability for the contract on the technological expertise of its parent company, adapting the latter's claim to revolutionize warfare through technology into an aim to revolutionize welfare provision by the same means. Graham Miller, then Lockheed's senior vice president and managing director of its welfare reform services division, declared that Lockheed would provide “an outstanding technology partner” to the IMS team (quoted in Havemann 1997). IMS posters emphasizing the benefits of “public/private partnerships” were accompanied by “colorful pictures depicting fighter planes, missile launchers and clusters of school-aged children smiling for the cameras” (Hartung and Washburn 1998:12), while the underlying narrative behind IMS's campaign was that “private enterprise and the wizardry of technology together can cure the problems of ‘big government’” (1998:15). Hartung and Washburn (1998) argue that Lockheed's track record gave little evidence to support this line of argument, citing a Lockheed IMS contract to create a state-wide computer system to track child-support payments in California that ran from a projected cost of $99 million to an overall cost of $277 million. Failings in the system reportedly caused “hundreds of child-support checks to disappear into an electronic void” (1998:15). Lockheed IMS's success in gaining contracts for welfare provision, however, ensured a 32% growth in profits per annum since 1984, making it the fastest growing subdivision of the Lockheed Martin empire prior to the sale of IMS to the company Affiliated Computer Services in 2002 (Sanger 2003:91). IMS did not gain the Texas contract, due in part at least to a state-wide grassroots campaign that included meetings, public demonstrations, postal campaigns and radio adverts that was organized primarily by the Texas State Employees Union (Hartung and Washburn 1998:14; Handler 2000:134) and a joint venture between a national for-profit company and a regional non-profit organization now supports the private management of food stamps, several employment and training programs and welfare-to-work initiatives (for further details and an overview of contracting for TANF case management in other states, see McConnell et al 2003). The objections of the Texas State Employees Union, it seems, were based less on the connotations of warfare that the name Lockheed inevitably brings, but its prioritization of workfare: a primary bone of contention in the campaign and counter campaign was Lockheed IMS's “relentless emphasis on ‘diversion’—a euphemism for steering mass numbers of people away from public assistance to job-placement programs” (Hartung and Washburn 1998:14).

#### 3. Increasing use of the private sector for public projects leads to prioritizing the needs of affluent suburbanites at the expense of the urban poor.

Brenner and Theodore 2010

Neil Brenner & Nik Theodore “Neoliberalism and the urban condition” 21 Oct 2010 City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13604810500092106>

First, and on the most general level, the preceding articles conceive neoliberalism as a framework that powerfully structures the parameters for the governance of contemporary urban development—for instance, by defining the character of “appropriate” policy choices, by constraining democratic participation in political life, by diffusing dissent and oppositional mobilization, and/or by disseminating new ideological visions of social and moral order in the city. In each case, the contributions track the discourses, strategies and alliances of political elites as they advance policy proposals aimed at (re)igniting market-led growth while glossing over the socially regressive outcomes that are the frequent by-products of such initiatives. From this perspective, neoliberalism is identified primarily with supralocal forces— for instance, new forms of capital accumulation or new regimes of state power—but the latter are understood to have enveloped cities within an increasingly market-dominated governance regime. The contributors elaborate this perspective in a number of ways. For instance, in their wide-ranging case study, Roger Keil and Julie-Anne Boudreau draw attention to the neoliberalization of municipal governance in the Toronto city-region in the aftermath of the 1980s economic downturn and the restructuring of Canadian intergovernmental relations. They document the rescaling of metropolitan governance that has accompanied federal devolution, regional institution building, and the resultant reshuffling of political alliances at the local level. They show that, ironically, despite strident anti-statist rhetoric among many national, regional and local political elites, an activist, market-driven form of statecraft has been consolidated in Toronto. Just as crucially, Keil and Boudreau outline a variety of regulatory failures and political struggles that have emerged in the wake of these political and institutional transformations. According to Keil and Boudreau, rather than resolving basic problems of urban governance in the Toronto metropolitan region, neoliberalization projects have triggered new forms of elite strategizing and popular resistance in key regulatory arenas such as economic development, environmental policy and transportation policy. Neoliberalization thus reconstitutes the terrain of political-economic governance—and social struggle—in the urban region as a whole. Meanwhile, in his study of mass transit infrastructure investment in Vancouver, Matti Siemiatycki examines the character of public planning processes in a political setting that has embraced an enhanced role for private sector actors in (formally) public-sector mega projects. Grounded in claims of private-sector efficiency and enforced through national, provincial, and local fiscal policies, the promotion of private-sector initiative has led to a loss of transparency within the policymaking process. The prioritization of private sector involvement has become entrenched institutionally as public-private partnerships have been elevated in local political discourse to a type of “best practice” in urban governance. Yet, as Siemiatycki demonstrates, the shifting spending priorities associated with these newly consolidated public-private partnerships are likely to result in chronic underinvestment in the services upon which most low-income commuters are dependent. Relatedly, Joe Grengs studies the evolution of mass transit policy in the United States, focusing specifically on policy change and social struggle in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Grengs argues that mass transit policy in Los Angeles is abdicating its traditional role as a redistributive mechanism due to at least two trends—first, a shrinking public sector under conditions of national and state-level neoliberalism; and second, a shift in policy priorities that systematically neglects the needs of low income, transit-dependent residents. Within this neoliberalizing policy landscape, Grengs argues, funding for public services needed by poor, central-city residents is being reduced in favor of transit spending intended to ameliorate the traffic congestion and air pollution generated by affluent suburban commuters. In this sense, as both Siemiatycki and Grengs indicate, neoliberalism is generating new forms of empowerment and disempowerment within a key sphere of urban governance.

#### 4. Private-Public Partnerships in transportation infrastructure get downgraded

Glazier 12 (Kyle Glazier , over economic indicators and national transportation news for @TheBondBuyer in Washington, D.C. , The bond Buyer: INFRASTRUCTURE Vol. 121 No. 134, July 13, 2012 “Moody's: P3s a Credit Risk If a Participant's Rating Is Downgraded,”)hhs-ps

WASHINGTON - An analysis of rating actions on bonds issued for projects involving public-private partnerships reveals that P3s are vulnerable to credit risk following downgrades of participants even if the projects are going well, according to a [Moody's Investors Service](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15160866208&returnToId=20_T15160866277&csi=303185&A=0.4367739669498675&sourceCSI=3652&indexTerm=%23CC0009P6T%23&searchTerm=Moody's%20Investors%20Service%20&indexType=C) report released Thursday. P3s are gaining popularity in the United States, where more states are enacting, or seeking to enact, laws authorizing such arrangements. Government and industry leaders like Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation officials are actively promoting the potential of the P3 finance method. However, these arrangements leave projects exposed to risk from downgrades of governments, banks and construction companies, said Moody's senior credit officer Catherine Deluz. The debt of P3 projects can be downgraded if proper safeguards aren't in place. Deluz said that since Moody's began rating P3s about 10 years ago, more than half of downgrades, reassignments to negative outlooks, or reviews for downgrade have been at least partially connected to a downgrade of one or more of the project's participating parties. Project participants represent key risk factors during different phases of a project, the report demonstrates. A downgrade of the firm constructing the project is potentially most damaging early on, but becomes less so as the project nears completion and begins operating, Deluz said. The report points out some common characteristics of P3s that make them sensitive to participant risk. "They usually do not keep a large amount of cash apart from the minimum required to be kept in various reserves," the report states. "That limits their ability to meet unexpected material cash requirements." Additionally, Deluz wrote, many types of P3s don't have a means of increasing revenue or liquidating assets to meet sudden cash needs. Some types of P3s, such as toll roads, do have that flexibility. To protect against the possibility of one party's weakened credit damaging the entire project, most P3 arrangements include a mechanism that "de-links" the participants' credit with that of the project. The mechanism can take the form of an obligation to replace one company with another if the risk reaches a certain level, according to the report. "However, even when de-linkage of the framework is strong, it is not bullet-proof," the report said. "Unexpected events often shine a light on management's approach to risk mitigation, and where an issuer fails to take prudent measures to mitigate an emerging risk, e.g. by contracting with weaker counterparties while stronger alternatives remain available, this in itself will likely weigh on its ratings."

### 2AC Conditionality bad

#### 1. Strat Skew – they can read any number of cp or ks and pick what we do worse on

#### 2. Time Skew – they split up the 2ac into multiple pieces and then go for 13 minutes of it

#### 3. Education – We only learn about bits and pieces instead of the full ideas and implications and resolution

#### 4. Voter for fairness and education

### - - - Conditionality Ext. - - -

### AT Critical Thinking

#### Condo kills critical thinking – indepth debate where we develop on specific places develop the most critical thinking on both sides as opposed to hit and misses that just makes it impossible for the aff with the time constraint

### AT Harder 2ACs

#### 2AC becomes too hard when they test multiple worlds they split our 2ac into as many pieces they want depending on their number of worlds and then kick out of anything they want, even if it is just 1 conditional advocacy, 2 worlds they split our 2ac into 4 minutes each max and then they can pick and choose and go 13 minutes on it.

### AT Flexibility Good

#### Neg already has flexibility they can run any DA,CP, K to test the affirmative they want they just have to defend one world

### AT Most Real World – sq always an option

#### We are not policy makers, this is debate a time constraint activity so there must be 1 world to make it fair

### AT Time Skew Inevitable

#### Time Skew bad enough the 1ar has 5 minutes to answer 13 minutes, by allowing the neg multiple worlds it just makes it too hard to be aff

### AT Still have the 1AC against the status quo

#### Even if we have the 1ac against the status quo – there will be a big strategy skew where they can still read a cp in a few seconds and absorb our entire case

### AT Perm Checks

#### Perm doesn’t check multiple counterplans all it does is check the competitiveness of the counterplans.

### AT All arguments are conditional

#### Arguments are conditional if the other team wins them, they simply can’t just present something for us to answer and take it back to work on others

### AT Err Neg – infinite prep first and last

#### Time constraints of the 1ar and the amount the neg can run is infinite making it balanced without it

### Breadth over Depth ext

#### Breath is done before the round where we learn the types not for inround

#### Debate and inround is key to depth where we directly compare 2 plans in depth for the most education

### AT Logical Judge

#### Debate is a time constraint activity that involves the testing of 2 direct things. Time skew and strat skew makes it impossible to be telling if it actually is logical

### Theory Overview

#### By having a conditional advocacy they are advocating that it is ok to have conditional advocacy.

#### Even with 1 conditional advocacy they split it the 2ac in half to a 4minute speech for each world creating a 4:13:5 minute ratio. It makes the aff too hard, everything about the 1st and last speech and infinite prep for the aff balances out with the neg block and the time constraint. Conditionality just disrupts the balance and makes it too hard to be aff.

### Potential Abuse

#### 1. Conditionality is what is going to win this round. The negative advocates conditionality is ok and by the judge voting negative they are allowing conditionality.

#### 2. Conditionality splits up the 2ac to as many pieces as they want and then picking and choosing what we did worse on. They have 13minutes of whatever they please against even with 1 conditional advocacy would be a 4:13:5 making it too hard for the affirmative. Debate is perfectly balanced right now, the aff gets infinite prep and the first and last speech. The neg gets the neg block and flexibility to running anything against the plan

#### 3. They kill the strategy they can throw out as much as they can in the 1nc and there is no way anyone is able to predict what the neg is going to go for making the affirmative lose every round

#### 4. Fairness is superior to education if debate wasn’t fair in other words by allowing conditionality in debate, aff is going to lose every round. This will destroy debate itself as an activity. As the reasons stated by making it too hard to be affirmative. Debate itself would dissolve which will kill education the most. Education from debate will be loss itself. Fairness comes before education once we make debate fair and keep debate alive to actually learn about the things from debate.

#### 5. Depth over breadth – before a round when we research for debate we learn about the things like all the counterplans that they talk about in the round. In the round is about picking and choose the best way to defeat a plan, and then bringing it into the round to test out to the full extent which plan is better. In a debate we would directly analyze 2 different plans or 2 directly different things to the full extent debate is supposed to be about to learn which is better

#### 6. In their world where we split their strategy to multiple worlds we won’t know what is better there is no way the affirmative would win since they can just cheat their way since we don’t have enough time to answer each individual world so we don’t actually learn anything this is one reason why fairness is above. We don’t actually learn if the plan is a good idea since we only learn about bits and pieces of each plan rather than fully fleshing out plans if they are good or not – which is more real world since policy makers do this

#### 7. They say time skew is inevitable, this is a new argument but ill answer it

#### 8. Time skew is pretty bad in debate right now there is a 13minute block against a 5minute 1ar that already makes it extremely difficult to be affirmative. If they bring up at least 1 different multiple world. Cross apply the ratio of the 4 to 13 to 5 minute ratio that destroys all the balance that is manageable in debate

#### 9. Debate is nowhere near a real world, in the real world there is no time constraint that you can talk for about 2 and a half as much as I do like that is just messed up.

#### 10. Debate is a time constraint activity we have to learn to be efficient than persuasive. Real world education is best without conditionality so we mimic one single focused debate as policy makers between 2 policies or doing a policy or not.