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### Inherency – 1AC

#### Contention one: Inherency

#### The new FAA bill cut funding for the AIP, which will cripple our airport infrastructure – rapid investment is critical

PRINCIPATO ‘12 - president, Airports Council International-North America; M.A. in International Relations from University of Chicago; International Trade and Transportation specialist, Hunton & Williams (Greg, “Why we should invest today in 'Airports Inc.'”. March. <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/labor/218525-faa-why-we-should-invest-today-in-airports-inc>)

With the latest Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) forecast predicting a doubling of passengers and cargo by 2030, the current funding system is not up to the job of ensuring airports will have the infrastructure they need to handle such dramatic increases in traffic.

This will have far-reaching consequences. Commercial airports are powerful economic engines, generating 10.5 million jobs and $1.2 trillion for the U.S. economy, according to a new Airports Council International-North America study. Across the country, workers and businesses count on local airports to attract investment and move people and goods around the world. Since 2001, the total number of jobs associated with airports has increased by more than 50 percent.

Despite unprecedented growth and clear evidence of the economic benefits of infrastructure investments, airports expect to have $80 billion in unmet needs through 2015 because of the flawed system used to pay for infrastructure projects.

That has not always been the case. Airports generated millions of jobs and trillions of dollars for local communities between 2001 and 2010 because President Bill Clinton and Congress made two decisions to improve airport infrastructure planning and investment in 2000.

The first decision allowed local communities to raise more money to finance airport improvements by giving them the authority to increase the passenger facility charge from $3 to $4.50. This helped meet local needs by expanding airport capacity to serve more passengers, handle more cargo, attract more air service and most important: promote business and commerce.

The second decision increased investments in the federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) so that the money users pay into the nation’s Airport and Airway Trust Fund could be reinvested into the system, including the airports where all of this economic activity begins and ends. The money for this comes from the aviation trust fund which is funded by users.

Growth in jobs and business activity took place because we made a national decision to invest in the future – the airports that serve as the economic hubs of our national aviation system.

The result is that in 2010, airports were responsible for about 8 percent of U.S. gross domestic product and 7 percent of all U.S. jobs. By any standard, that is a significant return on investment. Dollar for dollar, commercial airports rate as a remarkably worthwhile infrastructure investment.

This is not news to other countries. Our international competitors recognize the benefits of modern airport infrastructure. That’s why they are building and expanding airports at a rapid pace (China alone is now building 12 to 15 new airports per year) to prepare for predicted growth in global travel and business.

Unfortunately, we are retreating from these policy and investment decisions at just the wrong time. After five years, 23 extensions and a 14-day shutdown, Congress passed an FAA Reauthorization bill early this year that did not provide for any new funding for airports – the passenger facility charge ceiling was not raised and Airport Improvement Program funding was cut.

Yet as the FAA data show, commercial airports need to begin investing now in order to meet the long-term needs of the traveling public over the next two decades. Commercial airports must have new runways and terminals, and aging facilities must be upgraded. This requires long lead times – as much as eight years – to move through the planning and permitting process. And don’t forget that **successful implementation of the future air traffic control system known as NextGen depends on airport infrastructure investment as well**.

#### The status quo fails

ECT ‘12 (Eno Center for Transportation, “Excerpt from Eno Center for Transportation Report “. April. http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting\_packet\_documents/agenda\_1870/8-NextGen\_-\_Excerpt\_from\_Eno\_Report.pdf)

On the policy-side, there are several obstacles to NextGen that hinder progress and the likelihood of a timely and cost-efficient implementation. First of all, there are uncertainties regarding the extent of the benefits NextGen can potentially provide. It is difficult to make forecasts about how much congestion or fuel consumption can be reduced to make the infrastructure investment worthwhile. This makes it challenging to create sustained political, financial, and industry support for the project.

Secondly, there are doubts about costs and the FAA’s ability to deliver technology solutions of this magnitude. In the early 1980s, aviation modernization projects were projected to cost $12 billion and be ready in 10 years. NextGen infrastructure and equipage is now estimated to cost about $40 billion with expected completion by 2025.1 Testimony by the US Department of Transportation Inspector General and a recent report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) have pointed out cost overruns and delays in several NextGen programs. This continued uncertainty regarding the total infrastructure and equipage cost figure of NextGen has planted seeds of doubt amongst stakeholders and potential NextGen beneficiaries.

Third, the airlines and general aviation users have been hesitant to bear equipage costs due to low profitability, economic turmoil, and a lack of clear incentives to justify investing in NextGen. Operators are unlikely to invest until, at a minimum, the FAA is ready to deliver the promised benefits. This leads to a stalemate: operators are uncertain whether investing in NextGen is worthwhile, when the infrastructure is not yet fully in place, and without equipage the infrastructure by itself is ineffective. The FAA has mandated equipage of Automated Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast Out (ADS-B) that allows the equipped aircraft to send transmission to other equipped aircraft ADS-B ground stations for all operators by 2020. However, there is uncertainty over when other NextGen on-board equipment will be required, particularly ADS-B In which allows the equipped aircraft to receive transmission from other ADS-B ground stations and other aircraft.

Fourth, NextGen faces funding issues that pose some very difficult policy decisions. Work on the ground infrastructure aspect of NextGen is currently funded by the Facilities and Equipment account of the AATF and some progress, albeit slow, has been made on this project. However, recent reports by the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office show that current AATF revenues are inadequate to fund NextGen.2 Despite recent resolution over the long overdue FAA reauthorization bill, little progress has been regarding securing a full-fledged modernization funding plan. The current bill authorizes a flat amount of $2.731 billion over four years for NextGen and funding is still subject to annual appropriation. A project that is already endangered by uncertainties regarding its worth would benefit from a stable and adequate funding source.

A fifth problem facing NextGen is lack of Congressional political leadership in prioritizing a project of such potential value. In July 2011 the House of Representatives passed a short-term extension bill that failed to pass the senate, resulting in a shutdown that lasted a fortnight. The AATF received no tax revenues during the shutdown. As Congressional leaders argued over the Essential Air Services program, the trust fund lost over $400 million in foregone tax revenues. Those are funds that could have potentially been used towards an investment like NextGen. Furthermore, according to the FAA some of the NextGen program delays can be attributed to the furlough of some of the FAA employees in July 2011 and a freeze on contractor funding which resulted in work stoppage orders for several projects.3 This impact of the impasse on NextGen was also documented on the GAO report on the FAA’s NextGen cost-management.4

In order for NextGen to succeed, there must be greater certainty about potential benefits and costs. In the highly competitive low profit-margin airline industry, few want to take on the burden of paying for something that spreads speculative benefits so widely. It will also be essential to have a mechanism that raises sufficient capital for NextGen infrastructure in a transparent and equitable manner, while imposing minimal burdens on those who pay for it. Without a sustainable, stable, and reliable strategy for both continued infrastructural improvements and incentives for equipage, there is no guarantee that NextGen can be implemented in a timely and cost-effective manner. Without strong political leadership, a clear and unbiased delineation of costs and benefits, a transparent source of funds, and incentives for operators to equip, it is unlikely that NextGen benefits can be delivered in a timely manner if at all.

#### Even if the transportation bill passes, it crushes the AIP

LAING ‘12 – national political journalist who works for The Hill (“Airports criticize 'recycled' proposals in Obama's transportation budget”, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/aviation/210365-airports-criticize-recycled-proposals-in-obamas-transportation-budget)

The $3.8 trillion budget unveiled by President Obama includes "recycled" transportation proposals such as an increase on airline tickets, but it does not do much for small airports, the Washington, D.C. based Airports Council said Monday.

In the budget proposal Obama sent to Congress Monday, the president called for a transportation bill that spends $476 billion over the next six years. The president's proposal also included a renewal of his call for increasing a per-takeoff fee on flights that could run as high as $100 and an increase to $7.50 in the security taxes airline passengers pay each way on trips.

Airports Council International-North America President Greg Principato said the aviation industry had heard Obama's proposals before.

“The administration simply recycled this approach from last year's budget, while doing nothing to try and help financially empower local airports by working to get the cap on the Passenger Facility Charge lifted so the local community can determine the appropriate level needed to meet the future needs of their airport," Principato said in a statement.

"Given that the FAA Reauthorization bill sitting on the president’s desk awaiting signature, runs through fiscal year 2015 and contains no PFC increase, this budget is four years too late and the only thing it accomplishes is to harm the Airport Improvement Program, which the flying public pays for through the ticket tax.”

### Plan – 1AC

#### The President of the United States should authorize the Federal Aviation Administration to substantially increase funding for the Airport Improvement Program

### Trade Competitiveness – 1AC

#### Contention two: Trade competitiveness

#### Airport infrastructure investment is critical to US trade leadership and the air cargo industry

DRI ‘2 (Global Insight Company, “The National Economic Impact of Civil Aviation”. July. http://www.aia-aerospace.org/stats/resources/DRI-WEFA\_EconomicImpactStudy.pdf)

The disadvantages associated with the baseline future case examined in this study will detrimentally affect economic activity within the United States; they also will constrain the ability of the United States to compete in global markets. This section identifies the degree of global competition among nations, explores the key ways that this competition can be affected, illustrates how the United States currently competes globally, and suggests how the U.S. global competitive stance could be affected by the disadvantages associated with increasing air traffic delays.

Air Transportation and Economic Growth: From Economic Nationalism to a Global Economy

Since World War II, a key direction of global commerce has been the increasing integration of national economic activity. Industrial nations came together to form the Organization for Economic Corporation and Development (OECD). The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was formed and then superseded by the World Trade Organization (WTO) to help facilitate a new era of accelerated global trade.

These trends reflect the global integration of economies as business increasingly sought not only to sell its products into wider markets, but also to coordinate production and distribution across national borders. Every region of the world has participated in these trends except for the Middle East, whose export statistics are distorted by the region’s huge exports of petroleum and related products.

This steady increase in trade activity has been enhanced by the growth of global air transportation. Clearly, air transportation has facilitated business’ ability to move its products around the world. But it has played a far more important role in bringing business managers together, enabling them to build the links, communications, and personal relationships necessary to achieve such a level of international business activity. Despite continuous advances in telecommunications technologies, the growth in global business over the past 50 years could not have been achieved without the personal contact enabled by the world’s air transportation system.

Not only is air transportation important to the global economy; it is also an important enabler of economic growth for individual economies. By developing its air transportation system, a country can better link itself to the global economy and provide an environment for its business that facilitates global activity. Conversely, there are distinct disadvantages for regions or communities that are beyond the reaches of efficient air transportation. In these regions, business remains more isolated and less able to reap the benefits offered by being connected to global economic activity.

Both adequate airport capacity and the efficiency with which the air transportation system works are critical to generating economic benefits. The main body of this report examines the impacts that a constrained system in the United States would have on the U.S. economy later in the decade. But it is also true that these constraints would inhibit the ability of the United States to compete in global markets, **damaging its international competitiveness in general and** the **international competitiveness of U.S. civil aviation specifically**. This chapter examines some of the elements of such potential damage.

Competitiveness by Industry

Air Cargo

During the past three years, several analyses have shown that, in macroeconomic terms, U.S. integrated air express companies have created billions of dollars annually in reduced business inventory carrying costs, over $50 billion per year in logistics cost savings, and tens of billions of dollars of final demand and export sales that would not occur in the absence of their services.

The air express industry itself, including its ground transportation and logistics services divisions, generates approximately $60 billion a year in revenue and employs approximately 600,000 workers. In addition, a significant portion of the world’s freight is still carried either in the bellies of passenger aircraft or by all-cargo aircraft specializing in traditional “heavy freight.” These segments of the marketplace allow those shippers not necessarily demanding “express” service to enjoy the relative speed of movements by aircraft and to permit the transportation by air of oversized cargo to remote regions of the nation and world.

Global economic integration is characteristic of most of the world. Exports of goods and services in 2000 represented almost a quarter of the world’s GDP, up from just 10% in 1970. In turn, U.S. merchandise trade amounts to 22% of the world total. This steady increase in trade activity has been enhanced by the growth of global air transport.

Air Transportation and Tourism

In 1999, almost 48.5 million international visitors came to the United States, spending a total of $74.9 billion on travel-related expenses, such as lodging, gifts/souvenirs, food and beverages, and entertainment. They spent another $19.8 billion on U.S. air carriers in traveling to and from the United States. The total of air travel and travel related spending, $94.7 billion in 1999, has grown 62% since 1990, when international visitors spent about $58.3 billion in travel and travelrelated expenses to visit the United States. 22

This amount of spending is significant (the International Trade Administration—the source of these figures—estimates that foreign travel in the United States in 1999 supported over 1.1 million U.S. jobs), and exceeds the amount spent by Americans visiting other countries by $13.9 billion. In other words, the United States runs a surplus in its travel trade balance.

**Anything adversely affecting this surplus, such as constrained infrastructure** or regulatory barriers to adapting to market forces, would imply a decrease in the United States’ global competitiveness.

Other Industries

The increase in production costs added to American business by air transportation delays affects the U.S. global competitiveness of all industries. In this case, the increased air transportation costs implied by congestion delays raises the costs of production and distribution across the U.S. economy, resulting in a decrease in global competitiveness. An increase in air transportation costs impacts U.S. industries in two ways: higher air passenger transportation costs increase business travel and entertainment expenses, and higher air cargo costs affect those industries that utilize this form of transportation in their logistics.

Improved air transport infrastructure not only increases U.S. competitiveness in general, but also allows U.S. aviation itself to compete more effectively with foreign entities. Constraints in the U.S. air transport system first affect the economic well being of the aviation industry itself.

#### Scenario 1: Trade Leadership

#### US Trade leadership is critical to multilateral trade – which solves all global problems

Panitchpakdi ‘4 (Supachai Panitchpakdi, secretary-general of the UN Conference on Trade and Development, 2/26/2004, American Leadership and the World Trade Organization, p. http://www.wto.org/english/news\_e/spsp\_e/spsp22\_e.htm

The second point is that strengthening the world trading system is essential to America's wider global objectives. Fighting terrorism, reducing poverty, improving health, integrating China and other countries in the global economy — **all of these issues are linked**, in one way or another, **to world trade**. This is not to say that trade is the answer to all America's economic concerns; only that meaningful solutions are inconceivable **without it**. The world trading system is the **linchpin** of today's global order — underpinning its security as well as its prosperity. A successful WTO is an example of how multilateralism can work. Conversely, if it weakens or fails, **much else could fail with it**. This is something which the US — at the epicentre of a more interdependent world — cannot afford to ignore. These priorities must continue to guide US policy — as they have done since the Second World War. America has been the main driving force behind eight rounds of multilateral trade negotiations, including the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round and the creation of the WTO. The US — together with the EU — was instrumental in launching the latest Doha Round two years ago. Likewise, the recent initiative, spearheaded by Ambassador Zoellick, to re-energize the negotiations and move them towards a successful conclusion is yet another example of how essential the US is to the multilateral process — signalling that the US remains committed to further liberalization, that the Round is moving, and that other countries have a tangible reason to get on board. The reality is this: when the US leads the system can move forward; when it withdraws, **the system drifts**. The fact that US leadership is essential, does not mean it is easy. As WTO rules have expanded, so too has as the complexity of the issues the WTO deals with — everything from agriculture and accounting, to tariffs and telecommunication. The WTO is also exerting huge gravitational pull on countries to join — and participate actively — in the system. The WTO now has 146 Members — up from just 23 in 1947 — and this could easily rise to 170 or more within a decade. Emerging powers like China, Brazil, and India rightly demand a greater say in an institution in which they have a growing stake. So too do a rising number of voices outside the system as well. More and more people recognize that the WTO matters. More non-state actors — businesses, unions, environmentalists, development NGOs — want the multilateral system to reflect their causes and concerns. A decade ago, few people had even heard of the GATT. Today the WTO is front page news. A more visible WTO has inevitably become a more politicized WTO. The sound and fury surrounding the WTO's recent Ministerial Meeting in Cancun — let alone Seattle — underline how challenging managing the WTO can be. But these challenges can be exaggerated. They exist precisely because so many countries have embraced a common vision. Countries the world over have turned to open trade — and a rules-based system — as the key to their growth and development. They agreed to the Doha Round because they believed their interests lay in freer trade, stronger rules, a more effective WTO. Even in Cancun the great debate was whether the multilateral trading system was moving fast and far enough — **not whether it should be rolled back**. Indeed, it is critically important that we draw the right conclusions from Cancun — which are only now becoming clearer. The disappointment was that ministers were unable to reach agreement. The achievement was that they exposed the risks of failure, highlighted the need for North-South collaboration, and — after a period of introspection — acknowledged the inescapable logic of negotiation. Cancun showed that, if the challenges have increased, it is because the stakes are higher. The bigger challenge to American leadership comes from inside — not outside — the United States. In America's current debate about trade, jobs and globalization we have heard a lot about the costs of liberalization. We need to hear more about the opportunities. We need to be reminded of the advantages of America's openness and its trade with the world — about the economic growth tied to exports; the inflation-fighting role of imports, the innovative stimulus of global competition. We need to explain that freer trade works precisely because it involves positive change — better products, better job opportunities, better ways of doing things, better standards of living. While it is true that change can be threatening for people and societies, it is equally true that the vulnerable are not helped by resisting change — by putting up barriers and shutting out competition. They are helped by training, education, new and better opportunities that — with the right support policies — can flow from a globalized economy. The fact is that for every job in the US threatened by imports there is a growing number of high-paid, high skill jobs created by exports. Exports supported 7 million workers a decade ago; that number is approaching around 12 million today. And these new jobs — in aerospace, finance, information technology — pay 10 per cent more than the average American wage. We especially need to inject some clarity — and facts — into the current debate over the outsourcing of services jobs. Over the next decade, the US is projected to create an average of more than 2 million new services jobs a year — compared to roughly 200,000 services jobs that will be outsourced. I am well aware that this issue is the source of much anxiety in America today. Many Americans worry about the potential job losses that might arise from foreign competition in services sectors. But it’s worth remembering that concerns about the impact of foreign competition are not new. Many of the reservations people are expressing today are echoes of what we heard in the 1970s and 1980s. But people at that time didn’t fully appreciate the power of American ingenuity. Remarkable advances in technology and productivity laid the foundation for unprecedented job creation in the 1990s and there is no reason to doubt that this country, which has shown time and again such remarkable potential for competing in the global economy, will not soon embark again on such a burst of job-creation. America's openness to service-sector trade — combined with the high skills of its workforce — will lead to more growth, stronger industries, and a shift towards higher value-added, higher-paying employment. Conversely, closing the door to service trade is a strategy for killing jobs, not saving them. Americans have never run from a challenge and have never been defeatist in the face of strong competition. Part of this challenge is to create the conditions for global growth and job creation here and around the world. I believe Americans realize what is at stake. The process of opening to global trade can be disruptive, but they recognize that the US economy cannot **grow and prosper any other way**. They recognize the importance of finding global solutions to shared global problems. Besides, **what is the alternative to the WTO?** Some argue that the world's only superpower need not be tied down by the constraints of the multilateral system. They claim that US sovereignty is compromised by international rules, and that multilateral institutions limit rather than expand US influence. Americans should be deeply sceptical about these claims. Almost none of the trade issues facing the US today are any **easier to solve unilaterally, bilaterally or regionally**. The reality is probably just the opposite. What sense does it make — for example — to negotiate e-commerce rules bilaterally? Who would be interested in disciplining agricultural subsidies in a regional agreement but not globally? How can bilateral deals — even dozens of them — **come close** to matching the economic impact of agreeing to global free trade among 146 countries? Bilateral and regional deals can sometimes be a **complement** to the multilateral system, but they can never be a substitute. There is a bigger danger. By treating some countries preferentially, bilateral and regional deals exclude others — **fragmenting global trade** and distorting the world economy. Instead of liberalizing trade — and widening growth — they carve it up. Worse, **they have a** domino effect: bilateral deals inevitably beget more bilateral deals, as countries left outside are forced to seek their own preferential arrangements, or risk further marginalization. This is precisely what we see happening today. There are already over two hundred bilateral and regional agreements in existence, and each month we hear of a new or expanded deal. There is a basic contradiction in the assumption that bilateral approaches serve to strengthen the multilateral, rules-based system. Even when intended to spur free trade, they can **ultimately risk undermining it**. This is in no one's interest, least of all the United States. America led in the creation of the multilateral system after 1945 precisely to avoid a **return to hostile blocs** — blocs that had done so much to **fuel interwar instability and conflict**. America's vision, in the words of Cordell Hull, was that “enduring peace and the welfare of nations was indissolubly connected with the friendliness, fairness and freedom of world trade”. Trade would bind nations together, **making another war unthinkable**. Non-discriminatory rules would prevent a return to preferential deals and closed alliances. A network of multilateral initiatives and organizations — the Marshal Plan, the IMF, the World Bank, and the GATT, now the WTO — would provide the institutional bedrock for the international rule of law, not power. Underpinning all this was the idea that freedom — free trade, free democracies, the free exchange of ideas — was essential to peace and prosperity, a more just world. It is a vision that has emerged pre-eminent a half century later. Trade has expanded twenty-fold since 1950. Millions in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are being lifted out of poverty, and millions more have new hope for the future. All the great powers — the US, Europe, Japan, India, China and soon Russia — are part of a rules-based multilateral trading system, **greatly increasing the chances for world prosperity and peace**. There is a growing realization that — in our interdependent world — sovereignty is constrained, not by multilateral rules, but by the absence of rules.

#### Nuclear war

**Panzner 8** – faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase (Michael, “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” p. 136-138)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

#### Scenario 2: Air Cargo

#### Air cargo is key to reviving our aerospace industry – solves military readiness

WOODGERD ‘4 - Operations Research Analyst at Leonie Industries; Naval Postgraduate School (“The Mobilus Initiative: Creating A New Component of the US Aerospace Industry Centered Upon Transport Airships”,

The United States requires greater mobility to meet burgeoning military and commercial demands. The US aerospace industry shows signs of faltering and losing its preeminent position in the world and our national economy. Improving the efficiency of the existing air transportation system and its components, including the introduction of new types of airplanes, while critical and achievable, cannot by itself provide enough overall gain in capability to meet future commercial and military needs. The Nation needs a new component of the aerospace industry – a key element of our economic power – to create a new transport capability in the **civilian sector the military can draw upon** when necessary. A different type of airlift platform is necessary. A new initiative is essential to cause the creation of the required capability, and it must use a method copied from success in the private sector rather than traditional government paths that have failed. Only Lighter-Than-Air (LTA) technology--derided, often wildly misunderstood and largely ignored for the last 50 years--actually offers the potential to provide tremendous increases in volume, speed and accessibility for air movement around the world. LTA technology offers new types of aircraft, more complete utilization of airspace, and supports a more fully networked concept to air transportation. The nation needs to move more, faster, point-to-point from various points of origin to relevant locations worldwide. Only the atmosphere provides us a navigable ocean that reaches all points on the planet to which we may maneuver. Thus we must fly, and only exploiting LTA technology will allow us to do so with a payload more akin to a ship than a plane. 1 Only such transport airships 2 will enable us to be Mobilus in Mobile 3 – Mobile Within The Mobile Element. Discussion of the value of transport airships often does not meet disbelief, but rather an acceptance of the value and an awareness of many previous ill-defined or oversold governmental efforts over many years. The Mobilus Initiative exists precisely to rapidly create a broad, diverse commercial sector capability and avoid repeating past errors. The developmental path we must follow emerges from thorough study of the many previous failures, and successes, of past LTA efforts in the public and private sectors. The failures have generated great cynicism and misinformation, but they and the successes also provide many lessons to take forward. The “build it and they will come” mantra has repeatedly failed. Success depends upon a realistic, long-term view that factors in realistic cost and time estimates, realistic technical developmental paths, considers training, utilizes all remaining first hand human experience, and includes key parts of the private sector. Not only is technology alone not enough, nor is a solely military or even governmental effort. This article describes the Vision—a worldwide LTA industry--towards which we must focus efforts and the non-traditional path—a public/private partnership unlike any other-- we must follow to create a broad, sustainable new aerospace capability, and the resultant national advantage, within two decades. This Vision, and the method to realize it, is Mobilus—a new mobility for our Nation, and a challenge for the 21st Century. These airships do not yet exist, but are technically feasible. Historical data and the body of significant conceptual engineering work over the past decades enables realistic prediction of airships within the near term capable of payloads measured in thousands of square feet of deck space and perhaps 200 tons 4 of cargo capacity. These ships would cruise around the clock at speeds between 60-90 MPH origin-to-destination and operate independent of traditional airports and seaports. Think in terms of nearly 3 C-5s or 4-5 C17s of capacity. These rough estimates of a future capability do not require significant technical breakthroughs. The challenge lies far more in closing the business case, in project management, in training crews, in operating airships and in organizing the required value networks to finance, create and operate them. The “right tech” is not necessarily “high tech”. Technological advances are critical to achieve the more demanding sizes that many hope for, but the laws of physics, economics and human nature remain in effect so we must address the entire challenge. This article describes the key military/civilian/aerospace industry needs and opportunities to show how transport airships offer a common solution to multiple problem sets. The bulk of the paper describes the Mobilus Initiative in greater detail. Nexus of Challenges and Opportunities The US Aerospace Industry is essential to the very existence of our national commercial and military mobility. A new LTA centered aerospace sector is attainable and will make an extremely significant quantifiable improvement in our mobility capability and to the US Aerospace Industry. It also supports several of the core strategies for transforming the Next Generation Air Transportation System. 5 While each individual cargo-carrying airship would be capable of significant payload and range, it will take dozens or more ships to achieve truly significant impact. The US Department of Defense cannot develop, operate, crew and maintain a fleet of transport airships no matter how valuable. We are at war, and cannot sacrifice current capabilities (force structure, funding for a full development, etc.) for potential future ones. Development would also be too slow. A cursory inspection of traditional acquisition programs shows delays and cost increases of 40% are common. That means that we will use civilian assets in a manner similar to the current Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) model. The next step in the logic is that a civilian sector of airships/other LTA vehicles must exist on a large scale. The problems and weaknesses across the military needs, commercial needs, and the aerospace industry itself suggest that solutions must apply across all three areas. This is a challenge in itself, but it is also the key opportunity we will exploit. Mobilus will identify the most sensible paths of development and the value networks across government and the private sector to develop airships to meet varied commercial needs. Consortiums are proven effective in harnessing the power of the free market and legal mechanisms exist to help small companies produce technology that they cannot do alone. Mobilus Vision The Mobilus Vision is of a future worldwide LTA industry, a robust and complementary component of the current aerospace industry made up of varied types of airships of various design types performing varied commercial functions throughout the world. Commensurate with the network of airships will be a similar network of facilities, both maintenance and construction, personnel to crew and maintain the ships, lifting gas production, distribution, storage and purification, more precise weather forecasting, the training base for those who operate and maintain ships, and management of operations. The US military will utilize this commercial asset of transport airships and their support structure in a manner similar to how we now use airplanes through the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). Airships will not reside primarily within military force structure. This civilian capability must be broad, deep, and develop as rapidly as reasonably possible. Military considerations will be a key component of development from its inception and the military will be a crucial first customer as well. Why This Path Will Realize The Vision Mobilus is the Vision of the desired endstate and the method to achieve that endstate. The fundamental core of this method is that of a public-private partnership, in this case a type of technology-sharing consortium, though with some unique aspects. This choice of method is recognition of reality and of successful precedent. 6 Major industries have long pooled efforts in innovation in recognition of the overall efficiency of this approach and the fact that such a win/win approach is most efficient and least risky. Innovators have strong incentives to share innovations and technology-sharing consortia are quite stable. 7 Mobilus will identify the best technical developmental path(s), identify the key stakeholders who will share in the development, and identify the most efficient overall path(s) by which various value networks of stakeholders should move toward their desired goals within the endstate. Key stakeholders will join in public-private partnerships (P3s) to develop actual cargo-carrying airships and the required support networks – operators, trainers, maintainers, etc. Arguably, no previous business case closed because developing an airship capability is too big for any company and arguably even for government acting alone. Mobilus, by identifying all relevant participants, working with them to accurately identify the risk and reward for all participants (in a collaborative effort) and showing a comprehensive development path, realistic time line and realistic cost estimate reduces collective risk. One person may not step forward into the unknown, but a team of many will step forward together. “Civil aerospace faces declining federal funding and US worldwide leadership…corporations are risk averse and short-term oriented… the most significant change in our industry is the need for cooperation or …teaming. Pure technology is, of itself, not the answer anymore.” 8 Military Mobility Needs Current military operations are always limited by the availability of “lift”. The desired forces simply cannot be moved through time and space in the volume and tempo operational planners want. Developing Service concepts of operations and logistics demonstrate a tremendous, perhaps even exponential, increase in future movement demands, especially within a theater of operations. To provide an asymmetric advantage for our forces and counter the multiple forms of anti-access, we need the capability to rapidly deliver large volumes/heavy payloads directly to the desired destination, independent of existing infrastructure. 9 Multiple deployment analyses show the value of Ultra-Large Airlifters (ULAs) 10 , the generic term for this capability. They improve overall force closure as well as offering entirely new ways to package and deploy specific capabilities such as hospitals, C2 nodes, bridge building materials, etc. A point-to-point capability and high volume cargo bays translates into significantly faster employment of units such as helicopters (lightweight but large footprints) and also of heavier, denser units that then use the vacated deck space on sealift to move sooner. Remembering that sealift carries 90% of units and sustainment cargo, one can see that an airship provides a useful surge capability early on and also fits a sector between sealift and airlift – combining the better qualities of both. Such a platform blurs the line between inter and intra theater deployment and moves toward the deploy/employ paradigm.

#### Independently, weak readiness increases risk of miscalculation and hampers US primacy

Spencer 00 – Analyst at Heritage (Jack, Analyst at Heritage, “The Facts about Military Readiness,” <http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/BG1394.cfm>)

Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

#### US primacy is key to solve great power wars

ZHANG AND SHI 11 - \*Yuhan, a researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C. \*\*\* AND\*\*\* Lin, Columbia University. She also serves as an independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C. “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry” <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>)

Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts.

However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid.

As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law.

Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations.

However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way.

Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations.

For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy.

Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973).

A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

### Growth Advantage – 1AC

#### Contention three: Growth

#### The economy’s lost resiliency

RAMPELL ’11 – economics reporter for The New York Times; wrote for the Washington Post editorial pages and financial section (Catherine, “Second Recession in U.S. Could Be Worse Than First”. August 7. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/08/business/a-second-recession-could-be-much-worse-than-the-first.html?pagewanted=all)

If the economy falls back into recession, as many economists are now warning, the bloodletting could be a lot more painful than the last time around.

Given the tumult of the Great Recession, this may be hard to believe. But the economy is much weaker than it was at the outset of the last recession in December 2007, with most major measures of economic health — including jobs, incomes, output and industrial production — worse today than they were back then. And growth has been so weak that almost no ground has been recouped, even though a recovery technically started in June 2009.

“It would be disastrous if we entered into a recession at this stage, given that we haven’t yet made up for the last recession,” said Conrad DeQuadros, senior economist at RDQ Economics.

When the last downturn hit, the credit bubble left Americans with lots of fat to cut, but a new one would force families to cut from the bone. Making things worse, policy makers used most of the economic tools at their disposal to combat the last recession, and have few options available.

Anxiety and uncertainty have increased in the last few days after the decision by Standard & Poor’s to downgrade the country’s credit rating and as Europe continues its desperate attempt to stem its debt crisis.

President Obama acknowledged the challenge in his Saturday radio and Internet address, saying the country’s “urgent mission” now was to expand the economy and create jobs. And Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner said in an interview on CNBC on Sunday that the United States had “a lot of work to do” because of its “long-term and unsustainable fiscal position.”

But he added, “I have enormous confidence in the basic regenerative capacity of the American economy and the American people.”

Still, the numbers are daunting. In the four years since the recession began, the civilian working-age population has grown by about 3 percent. If the economy were healthy, the number of jobs would have grown at least the same amount.

Instead, the number of jobs has shrunk. Today the economy has 5 percent fewer jobs — or 6.8 million — than it had before the last recession began. The unemployment rate was 5 percent then, compared with 9.1 percent today.

Even those Americans who are working are generally working less; the typical private sector worker has a shorter workweek today than four years ago.

Employers shed all the extra work shifts and weak or extraneous employees that they could during the last recession. As shown by unusually strong productivity gains, companies are now squeezing as much work as they can from their newly “lean and mean” work forces. Should a recession return, it is not clear how many additional workers businesses could lay off and still manage to function.

With fewer jobs and fewer hours logged, there is less income for households to spend, creating a huge obstacle for a consumer-driven economy.

Adjusted for inflation, personal income is down 4 percent, not counting payments from the government for things like unemployment benefits. Income levels are low, and moving in the wrong direction: private wage and salary income actually fell in June, the last month for which data was available.

Consumer spending, along with housing, usually drives a recovery. But with incomes so weak, spending is only barely where it was when the recession began. If the economy were healthy, total consumer spending would be higher because of population growth.

And with construction nearly nonexistent and home prices down 24 percent since December 2007, the country does not have a buffer in housing to fall back on.

Of all the major economic indicators, industrial production — as tracked by the Federal Reserve — is by far the worst off. The Fed’s index of this activity is nearly 8 percent below its level in December 2007.

Likewise, and perhaps most worrisome, is the track record for the country’s overall output. According to newly revised data from the Commerce Department, the economy is smaller today than it was when the recession began, despite (or rather, because of) the feeble growth in the last couple of years.

If the economy were healthy, it would be much bigger than it was four years ago. Economists refer to the difference between where the economy is and where it could be if it met its full potential as the “output gap.” Menzie Chinn, an economics professor at the University of Wisconsin, has estimated that the economy was about 7 percent smaller than its potential at the beginning of this year.

Unlike during the first downturn, there would be few policy remedies available if the economy were to revert back into recession.

Interest rates cannot be pushed down further — they are already at zero. The Fed has already flooded the financial markets with money by buying billions in mortgage securities and Treasury bonds, and economists do not even agree on whether those purchases substantially helped the economy. So the Fed may not see much upside to going through another politically controversial round of buying.

“There are only so many times the Fed can pull this same rabbit out of its hat,” said Torsten Slok, the chief international economist at Deutsche Bank.

Congress had some room — financially and politically — to engage in fiscal stimulus during the last recession.

But at the end of 2007, the federal debt was 64.4 percent of the economy. Today, it is estimated at around 100 percent of gross domestic product, a share not seen since the aftermath of World War II, and there is little chance of lawmakers reaching consensus on additional stimulus that would increase the debt.

“There is no approachable precedent, at least in the postwar era, for what happens when an economy with 9 percent unemployment falls back into recession,” said Nigel Gault, chief United States economist at IHS Global Insight. “The one precedent you might consider is 1937, when there was also a premature withdrawal of fiscal stimulus, and the economy fell into another recession more painful than the first.”

#### Federal investment into airport infrastructure key to growth

PRINCIPATO ‘12 - president, Airports Council International-North America; M.A. in International Relations from University of Chicago; International Trade and Transportation specialist, Hunton & Williams (Greg, “Airports Have Greater Economic Clout than the Economies of South Korea, Mexico or Switzerland”. February 29. http://acinablog.wordpress.com/2012/02/29/airports-have-greater-economic-clout-than-the-economies-of-south-korea-mexico-or-switzerland/)

As a nation, we (through our Congress and President) decided to increase our investments in airport infrastructure. Our study, the first undertaken since those policy changes went fully into effect, shows the very positive results.

America’s airports support 10.5 million jobs. America’s airports support $1.2 trillion in economic activity, larger than the GDP of South Korea. “Airports, Inc.” directly employs 1.3 million people, making it the second largest employer in the nation, behind Wal-Mart. Total airport payroll equals the total payroll of the State of Michigan. The total economic clout of airports: 8 percent of U.S. GDP and 7 percent of U.S. employment.

Those are big numbers. But if you are still not convinced, consider this: during that time, the jobs number increased by 56 percent. Total payroll has gone up over 90 percent. And the total contribution to the output of the American economy has more than doubled. All this has happened despite the industry being devastated by the largest terrorist attack in history. All this has happened despite the most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression, including spikes in the price of fuel.

This economic growth occurred because we decided to invest in our economic future. In economic times as difficult as most of us will ever experience, those investments paid off.

That is why it is so discouraging that the recent FAA bill leaves in place federal limits on what airports and local communities can do to generate resources. That is why it is so discouraging that the president’s budget reduces investment in airports. That is why it is so discouraging that local communities cannot raise their own resources because of decisions made in Washington. We are putting the future in peril, just as we are set to take off.

Some have called for a new national airline policy, designed to promote the financial strength of airline companies. I am a strong proponent of strong airline companies. But the purpose of the air transportation system is the movement of people and products to destinations and markets. It is not to ensure shareholder value for airlines; that’s what airline executives and boards are supposed to do.

We do need a new national AVIATION policy, looking at all aspects from NextGen to financing airport infrastructure to the regulatory environment in which aviation must operate to the tax structure, all of it. It must be designed to strengthen the air transportation system, not merely any one component of it.

We are now stepping back from investments in aviation at the same time as our competitors around the world are stepping up. **We are in peril of becoming what the steel industry became in the 1970’s and 1980’s, out of date and non-competitive**.

We have a chance to avoid that. Our study shows the benefits in terms of job creation and economic impact when good decisions and good investments are made. I worry that the next study will show when the opposite happens.

#### US crisis tanks the global economy

RAHMAN ‘11 - former Ambassador and Chairman of the Centre for Foreign Affairs Studies. (Ashfaqur . “Another global recession?”. August 21. http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=199461)

Several developments, especially in Europe and the US, fan this fear. First, the US recovery from the last recession has been fragile. Its economy is much more susceptible to geopolitical shocks. Second there is a rise in fuel prices. The political instability in the Middle East is far from over. This is causing risks for the country and the international economy. Third, the global food prices in July this year is markedly higher than a year ago, almost 35% more. Commodities such as maize (up 84%), sugar (up 62%), wheat (up 55%), soybean oil (up 47%) have seen spike in their prices. Crude oil prices have also risen by 45%, affecting production costs. In the US, even though its debt ceiling has been raised and the country can now continue to borrow, credit agencies have downgraded its credit rating and therefore its stock markets have started to flounder. World Bank President Zoellick recently said: "There was a convergence of some events in Europe and the US that has led many market participants to lose confidence in economic leadership of the key countries." He added: "Those events, combined with other fragilities in the nature of recovery, have pushed US into a new danger zone." Employment in the US has, therefore, come near to a grinding halt. Prices of homes there continue to slide. Consumer and business spending is slowing remarkably. So, when the giant consumer economy slows down, there would be less demand for goods she buys from abroad, even from countries like Bangladesh. This would lead to decline in exports from such countries to the US. Then these economies would start to slide too, leading to factory closures and unemployment on a large scale. There would be less money available for economic development activities. Adding to the woes of the US economy are the travails of European economies. There, countries like Greece and Portugal, which are heavily indebted, have already received a first round of bailout. But this is not working. A second bailout has been given to Greece. But these countries remain in deep economic trouble. Bigger economies like Spain and Italy are also on the verge of bankruptcy. More sound economies like France and Germany are unwilling to provide money through the European Central Bank to bail them out. A proposal to issue Euro bonds to be funded by all the countries of the Euro Zone has also not met with approval. A creeping fear of the leaders of such big economies is that their electorate is not likely to agree to fund bankruptcies in other countries through the taxes they pay. Inevitably, they are saying that these weaker economies must restrain expenditures and thereby check indebtedness and live within their means. Thus, with fresh international bailouts not in the horizon and with possibilities of a debt default by countries like Greece, there is a likelihood of a ripple going through the world's financial system. Now what is recession and especially one with a global dimension ? There is no commonly accepted definition of a recession or for that matter of a global recession. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) regards periods when global growth is less than 3% to be a global recession. During this period, global per capita output growth is zero or negative and unemployment and bankruptcies are on the rise. Recession within a country implies that there is a business cycle contraction. It occurs when "there is a widespread drop in spending following an adverse supply shock or the bursting of an economic bubble." The most common indicator is "two down quarters of GDP." That is, when GDP of a country does not increase for six months. When recession occurs there is a slowdown in economic activity. Overall consumption, investment, government spending and net exports fall. Economic drivers such as employment, household savings, corporate investments, interest rates are on the wane. Interestingly, recession can be of several types. Each type may be literally of distinctive shapes. Thus V-shaped, or a short and sharp contraction, is common. It is usually followed by a rapid and sustained recovery. A U-shaped slump is a prolonged recession. The W-shaped slowdown of the economy is a double dip recession. There is also an L-shaped recession when, in 8 out of 9 three-monthly quarters, the economy is spiraling downward. So what type of recession can the world expect in the next quarter? Experts say that it could be a W-shaped one, known as a double dip type. But let us try to understand why the world is likely to face another recession, when it has just emerged from the last one, the Great Recession in 2010. Do not forget that this recession had begun in 2007 with the "mortgage and the derivative" scandal when the real estate and property bubble burst. Today, many say that the last recession had never ended. Despite official data that shows recovery, it was only a modest recovery. So, when the recession hit the US in 2007 it was the Great Recession I. The US government fought it by stimulating their economy with large bailouts. But this time, for the Great Recession II, which we may be entering, there is a completely different response. Politicians are squabbling over how much to cut spending. Therefore, we may be in a new double dip or W-shaped recession.

#### Global war

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

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

### Elections Advantage – 1AC

#### Contention four: Obama v Romney

#### Obama will lose the elections: Romney’s got the edge on the economy

**Williams, ’12** (Juan, Fox News political analyst and author, 4/19/12, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/04/19/romneys-big-advantage-against-obama-in-2012-election/>, JD)

Say what you will about Mitt Romney, he is an extremely intelligent man surrounded by sharp, well-paid political players. And “Team Romney” appears to have one big advantage over President Obama. I’m not talking some financial advantage – though fundraising for GOP-leaning Super PACs is far outpacing those supporting the president. And I am not talking about an organizational edge that comes from having the GOP control the governorships and state legislatures in battleground states like Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida, Michigan and Wisconsin. No, Team Romney’s big advantage in this election is having been forced into a painfully accurate self-awareness. After seeing the candidate stumble repeatedly in the primaries, despite having every advantage, the campaign is extremely aware of their candidates’ weaknesses. They are now in the process of executing a strategy that downplays that weakness. This is the moment predicted by the revealing ‘Etch-A-Sketch’ comment from a top Romney aide. Here are the pivot points to watch for as the old Romney fades from the screen and a new Romney appears for the voters on key issues: Team Romney’s big advantage in this election is having been forced into a painfully accurate self-awareness. The Economy: Romney is a successful businessman. He made billions of dollars as a cold-eyed hedge fund manager. To lots of voters that means he has the ability to turn the economy around. His primary opponents pointed to poor job creation during his time as governor of Massachusetts. They attacked him as a “vulture capitalist,” to try to derail Romney’s strong image as a man who can fix the economy. It did not work. The most recent ABC News/Washington Post poll finds that regardless of whom they plan to vote for, voters trust Romney to do a better job of handling the economy, 47 to 43 percent. The same poll also said that voters trust Romney to do a better job of handling the budget deficit, 51 percent to Obama’s 38 percent. This is why Romney will pivot back to the economy no matter which direction the campaign takes. His team knows that it is still his biggest strength and his best hope to win the election.

#### The economy is the focus – More jobs will swing the win towards Obama

**Weinberg, ’12** (Chris, staff writer for ESSA, 3/25/12, <http://economicstudents.com/2012/03/obamas-moment/>, JD)

Whilst the economic recovery had begun to take hold (as reflected in improved GDP figures), the unemployment rate had not appreciably fallen over the course of Obama’s term, stubbornly stuck (for the Obama White House and the American worker), above 9% for the bulk of 2010 and flat-lining in the mid 8’s as debt and deficit reduction under the new Republican House majority dominated the conversation in 2011. However, when the Labor Department announced that American unemployment had dropped 0.2% over January, a gain of 243,000 jobs, the conventional wisdom of a President burdened by the millstone of pervasive and deep-seated unemployment began to dissipate. Whilst no President since Franklin Roosevelt has won re-election with an unemployment rate stuck above 8%, the general consensus is that an Obama re-election is more than a 50/50 chance, provided the monthly change in added jobs continues to remain in the vicinity of 250,000. As Nate Silver in The New York Times noted, President Ronald Reagan won re-election in 1984 with unemployment at 7.4%, after plummeting from 9.5% the year before. Such is Obama’s challenge; whilst the numbers are not ideal presently, if the economy can give the impression of making significant, steady gains in employment over the next 8 months, the perception for the American voter will be one of an American comeback; and with that would come a likely re-election of the President. Whether this period is looked back on as the moment when Obama’s re-election went from being potentially hazardous to a near certainty depends on the trend of the unemployment rate for the rest of 2012. The biggest factor in determining this trend will be whether the long-term unemployed, currently out of the labour force, decide to re-enter the market and look for a job in an atmosphere of improved hiring conditions; thus placing upward pressure on the unemployment rate. This dynamic coupled with the impending cuts in the federal budget and the unemployment rates in various swing states could be the difference for this President as he seeks to secure a successful legacy, entirely predicated on his re-election.

#### Obama’s made transportation infrastructure investment the core of his economic agenda

USA TODAY 5/1/2012 (“Federal transportation bill enters legislative homestretch”. http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2012-05-01/federal-transportation-highway-bill/54660278/1)

The bill is driven partly by election-year politics. Both Congress and President Obama have made transportation infrastructure investment the centerpiece of their jobs agendas. But the political imperative for passing a bill has been complicated by House Republicans' insistence on including a mandate for federal approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. The White House has threatened to veto the measure if it retains the Keystone provision.

And there are other points of disagreement between the GOP-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate, including how to pay for transportation programs and how much leverage the federal government should have over how states spend their aid money. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has said it's unlikely Congress will pass a final bill until after the November elections.

Despite LaHood's pessimism, lawmakers and transportation lobbyists said they believe prospects are improving for passage of a final bill by June 30, when the government's authority to spend highway trust fund money expires. The fund, which pays for roads and transit, is forecast to go broke sometime next year.

A House-Senate conference committee is scheduled to begin formal negotiations May 8.

**It has taken Congress years to get this far**. Work on a transportation overhaul began before the last long-term transportation bill expired in 2009. The Senate finally passed a $109 billion bill with broad bipartisan support in March. The bill would give states more flexibility in how they spend federal money, step up the pace of road construction by shortening environmental reviews, impose a wide array of new safety regulations and boost funding for a federal loan guarantee program to encourage private investment for major infrastructure projects.

House Republicans, after failing to corral enough votes to pass their own plan, recently passed a placeholder bill that allows them to begin negotiations with the Senate. That bill included the Keystone provision, as well as provisions limiting the public's ability to challenge transportation projects on environmental grounds and taking away the Environmental Protection Agency's power to regulate toxic coal ash.

"I feel like people are worn out on this issue and would like to get something done," said Jeff Shoaf, a lobbyist with the Associated General Contractors of America, a trade association for the construction industry. "I think the prospects are good."

#### Renewed airport infrastructure funding through Obama is the key to his re-election – data proves

BILOTKACH ‘10 – Assistant Professor of Economics University of California, Irvine (Volodymyr, “Political Economy of Infrastructure Investment: Evidence from the Economic Stimulus Airport Grants “. October. http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~vbilotka/Draft\_September10.pdf)

The literature suggests three possible sources of political influence: the White House (President), the US Senate, and the Congressional Committees. We hypothesize that the impact of the White House should be the strongest in this particular case – recall that passing the economic stimulus legislation was one of Barack Obama’s priorities as a candidate. As for hypotheses related to the impact of the White House, we can suppose that ARRA grants might have been used to reward districts which showed support to Obama, as evidenced by the election results. An alternative explanation – grants could be used to sway voters in the districts where support for Obama was not sufficiently strong – is less plausible, as the grants have been appropriated after the election and almost four years before the next Presidential election is scheduled to take place. A priori, we can expect results of the US House of Representatives election to have less of an effect on grant appropriations. At the same time, we can also suppose that the ARRA grants are more likely to be used as an instrument to sway the voters in this case (see also Levitt and Snyder, 1997), as the US House of Representatives is re-elected every two years. Therefore, in addition to the percentage difference in votes, we will use the dummy variable for the districts in which the Democratic candidate lost the House election. To evaluate the extent of the committee power, we have identified congressional districts represented by the members of the US House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and created the corresponding indicator variable. To account for the possible impact of the US Senate, we will include percentage difference in votes received by the Democratic and the Republican Party contenders at the last Senate election held in a given State. Senate composition variables (dummies for States with both Senators represented by either political Party) are also used in some specifications. Regrettably, given the cross-sectional nature of our data, including Statelevel variables will not allow us to use State fixed effects in our regressions. Note however that we have run regressions including State fixed effect (and excluding variables measuring the impact of the Senate). Results, which are qualitatively similar to the ones reported here, are available from the author on request. We will analyze the data in the following ways. First, since many airports in our dataset did not receive the ARRA grants; censored normal regression (also known as Tobit) estimation is appropriate. This regression will make use of the airport-level data. Total amount of ARRA grant(s) received by the airport (in millions of dollars) will be the dependent variable; and Huber-White standard errors will be reported. Using the Tobit model, we will be able to evaluate the impact of political factors on the size of grant(s) received by the airport. To assess effect of politics on the likelihood of an airport receiving an ARRA grant, we will estimate the probit model, with the corresponding indicator as the dependent variable. Finally, we will perform analysis of the project-level data to evaluate whether any political effects we might have captured could be explained by the project-specific heterogeneity. 4.2 Results and discussion The following four tables present results of our data analysis. Table 4 reports the Tobit model results for several specifications. Results for the probit model are in Table 5. Table 6 includes results for the specifications taking into account the election results in the adjacent districts. Finally, Table 7 reports results of the project-level data analysis. Based on those tables, we can make the following general conclusions about the supposed impact of political factors on allocation of ARRA airport infrastructure grants. First, results of the presidential election appear to affect the amounts of grants, but do not have an impact on whether the airport receives the grant. Second, controlling for the State level composition of the Senate, we detect seemingly counterintuitive evidence for impact of the Senate on the grant allocation process. Namely, airports located in the States carried by a Republican at the latest Senate election show higher likelihood of obtaining the grant; the amounts involved are also higher. At the same time, airports located in the States represented by two Democratic Party senators are also more likely to obtain the grants, other things equal – an expected result. Third, we do not find strong evidence of impact of the House of Representatives election results or membership in Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Let us examine these statements in more detail. Conclusion about impact of the White House on the grant allocation process stems primarily from the Tobit regression results. These show positive association between the district level Presidential election results and the amount of funds allocated to the airport. We have suggested that such association is consistent with rewarding districts for their contribution to the election outcome. Recall that elsewhere in the literature impact of the White House on allocation of federal funds has been detected by Garrett and Sobel (2003). Note we have checked for the existence of separate effects for the districts in which Obama won, or districts with small Obama-McCain vote differential, and did not find any. We of course need to note that the association between the airport infrastructure grants and the Presidential election results does break down once we factor in adjacent districts; however, such a result does not necessarily weaken our conclusion, it only shows rewards have been targeted to the specific districts. Impact of the Presidential election results shows more robustly in Tobit than in probit regressions (in probit, the association falls apart once we control for the State level composition of the Senate). This indicates Presidential election had impact on the amount of grants received by the airport rather than the likelihood of an airport receiving the money. As for the variables measuring role of the Senate in the appropriations process, we detect the following. First, impact of Senate election results only shows where we also control for the State level composition of the Senate. Second, we observe association of the Senate election results with both the likelihood of the airport receiving a grant, and the amount of the money involved. Third, unlike with the presidential election results; both likelihood of receiving a grant and the amount involved are larger the higher the share of votes received by the Republican Party candidate relative to his/her Democratic Party opponent in the latest Senate race. This result is somewhat surprising; yet, interaction between the Senators is clearly a repeated game, in which concessions in one area are given away in returns for reciprocal behavior at a later time. Note also that this effect (see Table 4) is about half the size of the impact of presidential election results. A result that is more expected is that, other things equal, an airport located in a State represented by two Democratic Party Senators is more likely to receive an ARRA grant. There is not much we can say about the supposed impact of the House of Representatives. Our data analysis failed to detect any. This might mean that members of the House of Representatives either failed to systematically reward their districts, or they rewarded them via some other programs. An alternative explanation could be that rewards for election performance could have been picked up by the Presidential results variable. While this is not infeasible, it pays to note that correlation between percentage differences measures for Presidential and House elections, while positive, is not exceptionally high – around 0.6. In our opinion, the suggestion that House members could have rewarded “their” districts via other ARRA programs appears the most plausible explanation. Looking at the results for control variables; they mostly confirm what the descriptive statistics presented in Table 2 suggested. Namely, busier airports (in terms of total number of operations) handling larger aircraft (as measured by average runway length) were more likely to be selected for ARRA grants, and received more money. It is somewhat strange that the relationship is reversed for the relatively more congested airports (as measured by the number of movements per runway). It is also counterintuitive that airports which received more AIP grants over the recent years were also the more likely recipients of ARRA grants, especially in light of FAA’s statement of prioritizing renovation and replacement of aging infrastructure. These two results could be simply the evidence of inefficiencies within the program. Project level results for the airport control variables largely mirror those of Tobit and probit models at the airport level; we also see that runway and apron projects are on average costlier. Interestingly, political factors we have introduced do not show as significant determinants of the size of particular grant, with the exception of presidential election results, averaged over the current and the immediately adjacent congressional districts. Overall, our results do indicate that political factors have played a role in ARRA airport grant appropriations. It also appears that the White House and the Senate have been more important players in the process than the House of Representatives. At the same time, our results do not suggest that the House did not have a role in distribution of hundreds of billions of federal grants under ARRA. Recall that our study deals with only $1.1 billion of funds in what is a $787 billion economic stimulus package. 5. Conclusions This study offers the first look at the issue of the impact of political factors on the distribution of federal funds for the transportation related infrastructure investment in the USA. We take advantage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (more broadly known as the Stimulus) to examine whether political factors played any role in allocation of the $1.1 billion worth of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants included into the package. The Stimulus provides an excellent case for studying the political economy of airport investment, at least as far as the Federal involvement is concerned. The law was set up rather hastily – Barack Obama was elected President in November of 2008, and ARRA became law on February 17, 2009; and the criteria for the airport infrastructure projects to be funded under AIP as part of ARRA were rather vague. We can therefore suspect that the airport infrastructure grants could be used by the Administration or the Congress as a mechanism to **reward districts which brought more votes in the latest election**. The data structure allows easy matching of the airport characteristics, ARRA grant details, and election outcomes at the congressional district level. Moreover, study of aviation related infrastructure offers an attractive environment for examining the more general issue of political factors behind the allocation of federal funds. Airports and airfields are ubiquitous, unlike, for instance, tornadoes or corn fields. Also, **airports are generally viewed favorably by the public, unlike some other kinds of federally provided infrastructure** (e.g., prisons).

#### AIP funding fight brings the airport infrastructure to the forefront for the President – Clinton proves

BENNETT ’99 - Journal of Engineering and Public Policy; Denver Urban Renewal Authority Administrator (Grant, D. “Funding Airport Infrastructure: Federal Options for Solvency”. August 5. Journal of Engineering and Public Policy. http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/1999/index.html)

**Presidential Politics in Infrastructure Spending**

The Clinton Administration, along with the FAA, has released a different proposal, S.545, to set AIP spending at $1.6 billion (current funding levels) for each fiscal year for FY2000 through FY2004. 33 This proposal also raises the caps on PFC’ s to $5 so as to increase nonfederal spending.

The House Appropriations Committee is willing to spend more on AIP than the Clinton administration for FY2000. This is clearly a political conflict, as the FAA reports cited earlier state that increased funding is needed for airport infrastructure. The Executive Office of the President overlooks airport needs, like the appropriators, by saying that H.R.1000 would reduce the federal budget surplus so that there would be no long-term solvency to Social Security or Medicare. 34 Politics are controlling the reauthorization of the FAA, and the previous actions by Congress and the President reflect that theme.

#### That fight is key

BENNETT ’99 - Journal of Engineering and Public Policy; Denver Urban Renewal Authority Administrator (Grant, D. “Funding Airport Infrastructure: Federal Options for Solvency”. August 5. Journal of Engineering and Public Policy. http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/1999/index.html)

Politics in the System

Congressional and presidential control of funding has political themes overpowering the effects of poor infrastructure in the current funding debate. As the benefits from increased investment in airports are proven, the federal surplus, created in part by the Aviation Trust Fund, allows lawmakers to address larger social programs. The political benefits of promoting social security, Medicare and tax cuts limit the solvency of the funding mechanism in the current era. Pushing for strong infrastructure funding will move the fight in the right direction, but the political realm is in the way.

Concerns for Federal Oversight and Control Assuming that airport infrastructure funding can be linked to growth in aviation demand, long-term concerns for functionality of the system will arise. Immediately funding the entire demand of aviation is not reasonable and the current funding available through the Aviation Trust Fund is not necessarily the right amount.

There are no exact figures for infrastructure funding levels that will ensure functionality of the airport system. The concern that the Trust Fund might not have enough money for infrastructure opens debate for altering the revenue. Altering PFC’ s or taxation levels could remedy the problem, but the Trust Fund is split among the many needs of the FAA and not on infrastructure alone. The lack of knowledge regarding total needs opens the door for checks and balances in the funding system.

A lack of congressional and presidential oversight could lead to unnecessary and unreasonable spending. The NPIAS looks to aviation demand, but does not consider cost-benefit analysis when evaluating growth for projects under $5 million. 41 Review of benefits versus costs for smaller AIP projects could help resolve this issue. Oversight that does not affect funding levels politically could also help. Firewalls that protect funding levels or controls for the taxes taken into the Trust Fund are ideas for oversight and control, but this debate is a long way off when looking at the current situation

Political themes engulf the current reauthorization of the FAA. If a consensus can be made to link infrastructure funding to the aviation system, then internal battles involving aviation priorities and philosophies can begin. Changing the funding mechanism will start the process in the right direction.

#### Scenario 1: Climate Change

#### Romney win will destroy any progress on warming

**Simpson, ’12** (Walter and Nan, Buffalo News, 4/22/12, <http://www.buffalonews.com/editorial-page/viewpoints/article822432.ece>, JD)

Let’s not reverse progress

While Obama has not yet delivered on some environmental priorities, his environmental record is solid in many areas. He appears to be committed to addressing environmental problems in a meaningful way within the constraints of what he views as politically possible. Obama’s re-election offers the promise of continuing his pro-environment programs and the hope he will do more in his second term. Cleaner air, water and energy mean tens of thousands of green jobs with improved public health outcomes that reduce health care costs. The president understands this win-win. Additionally, Obama is likely to do more on climate change in a second term if re-elected with a Democratic Congress and an increasingly informed public demanding action on this life-and-death issue. None of this will happen if Romney is elected our next president. Worse, given the GOP’s radical turn, a Republican victory would take us in reverse — undermining and eliminating laws and regulations that now protect our environment and public health. The critically important environmental vote goes to Obama.

#### It’s anthropogenic and risks extinction

DEIBEL ‘7 (Terry L. Deibel, professor of IR at National War College, Foreign Affairs Strategy, “Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today Anthropogenic – caused by CO2”)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, **and what was once a mere possibility has passed** through probability **to near certainty.** Indeed **not one of more than 900 articles** **on climate change published in refereed scientific journals** from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually **impossible to find evidence of disagreement** over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to het the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possible end life on this planet. **Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically**. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to **shame**. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

#### Scenario 2: Obama Doctrine

#### Obama’s key to Lead from Behind – which puts shifts our foreign policy towards Asia

WP ‘11 (Washington Post, “A successful post-Bush foreign policy”. September 3. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/a-successful-post-bush-foreign-policy/2011/09/02/gIQAlfzexJ\_story.html)

Tom Donilon, Obama’s national security adviser, argues that this isn’t an accident — and that the president deserves more credit for accomplishing the goals he set in 2009. He would say that, of course; it’s part of the national security adviser’s job to spin perceptions. But it’s true that Obama has had more success with the agenda he set in January 2009 than is usually recognized.

Then why does Obama’s foreign policy often seem “blah,” with people around the world talking about declining American power? Partly it’s the president’s low-key, sometimes deferential style and the unfortunate talk by an adviser about “leading from behind” — which stuck because it conveyed the extraordinary reticence of the man in the Oval Office.

A more important factor is that the administration’s own goal has been to downsize American ambitions and expectations to meet reality. For a generation raised on JFK’s “pay any price, bear any burden” rhetoric, this neorealism hasn’t sounded like leadership. But the lower-key U.S. approach isn’t a gaffe, it’s a deliberate policy.

“The White House talks to us about ‘adjusting the American footprint,’ ” says a leading Arab diplomat. “They want to reassess how the U.S. operates and leads.”

Donilon describes it as a “rebalancing” of foreign policy. The top priority remains winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; whatever the news of the moment, Obama is determined to exit from both. A second sort of rebalancing, enabled by the first, is paying more attention to Asia policy. A third is the reset in relations with Russia, which officials argue pays dividends on issues from Libya to Iran.

#### Romney will replace Lead From Behind

REUTERS 4/12/2012 (“Analysis: Romney defines hawkish yet murky foreign policy”. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/12/us-usa-campaign-romney-policy-idUSBRE83B07Y20120412)

As he locks down the Republican nomination for U.S. president, Mitt Romney is framing what looks to be a decidedly hawkish foreign policy.

But should the former Massachusetts governor defeat Democratic President Barack Obama in November, it remains far from clear how he actually would tackle what his own website describes as a "bewildering array of threats and opportunities."

More clear is the strategy that Romney plans to use to try to diminish Obama's record on foreign policy.

Obama, whose own foreign policy inexperience was widely viewed as a weakness four years ago, now generally gets high marks in polls on the topic - particularly since the killing of Osama bin Laden last year.

The president's campaign cites the dismantling of al-Qaeda's leadership and the historic sanctions against Iran as evidence of his effectiveness.

The Romney campaign, however, believes it can paint an alternate picture of Obama as naive, weak and perhaps secretly convinced that the world's most pre-eminent superpower has entered an era of unstoppable and terminal decline.

Beyond his success at devastating al-Qaeda with drone strikes and special forces raids - a trend begun under Republican George W. Bush but accelerated by the current administration - Romney's team argues that Obama's foreign policy achievements are limited.

By being content to "lead from behind" on issues such as the conflict in Libya, they say Obama has sacrificed America's dominant global position. The attempted "reset" of relations with Russia has largely been a failure, they say, while planned military cuts could leave potential adversaries such as China and Iran with too great an ability to challenge Washington.

"Governor Romney believes in American exceptionalism, that we are great not just because of our military and economic power but also because of our values," says Richard Williamson, a leading Republican foreign policy specialist and adviser to the Romney campaign who served in various roles under Ronald Reagan and both Bush administrations.

"The current president does not. ... He believes in engagement - which has often not worked - while the governor believes we should say what we believe and work from a position of strength."

A 'MORE AGGRESSIVE' APPROACH

That's the kind of rhetoric that Obama's team dismisses as largely meaningless.

But in real terms, Williamson said, a Romney presidency would offer a "more aggressive" approach toward China, Russia and the Middle East. Romney says he would swiftly brand Beijing a currency manipulator, refuse to concede to Moscow on nuclear issues and put more emphasis on defending Israel.

#### Multiple scenarios for Asian nuclear war.

Colby 8-10-11. [Elbridge, Centre for Naval Analysis Research Analysis “Why the US needs its liberal empire”, <http://the-diplomat.com/2011/08/10/why-us-needs-its-liberal-empire/>]

The centre of international gravity is shifting toward East Asia. With China rising, Washington must focus its economic and security policies there, not the Middle East. Political sentiment in the United States seems to be turning against the interventions and nation-building projects that have characterized US foreign policy in recent years. The revulsion at the cost and size of government, including the cost of expensive wars in the Middle East, has been amply demonstrated during the debt ceiling drama of recent weeks. President Barack Obama has spoken of the need to nation-build at home rather than in Afghanistan, while most Republican presidential contenders showed an aversion to the Libyan operation and an unending expansive role in Afghanistan during their first primary debate in New Hampshire. Congressional grumbling is growing against further doubling-down in Afghanistan and the meandering intervention in Libya. This is very much to the good. At times over the past two decades, US foreign policy has lost its moorings in distinguishing the vital from the desirable, with the result that conceptions of US security and humanitarian interests have become so expansive as to be seen to obligate preventive war against rogue states, coercive intervention against recalcitrant dictators, and inordinately ambitious efforts at forcibly modernizing backward societies – with baleful results. If this disorienting fever is subsiding in favour of a return to the more restrictive war-making and intervention criteria typified by the Weinberger/Powell Doctrine, then there’s cause for satisfaction. But the pendulum shouldn’t be allowed to swing too far toward an incautious retrenchment. For our problem hasn’t been overseas commitments and interventions as such, but the kinds of interventions. The US alliance and partnership structure, what the late William Odom called the United States’ ‘liberal empire’ that includes a substantial military presence and a willingness to use it in the defence of US and allied interests, remains a vital component of US security and global stability and prosperity. This system of voluntary and consensual cooperation under US leadership, particularly in the security realm, constitutes a formidable bloc defending the liberal international order. But, in part due to poor decision-making in Washington, this system is under strain, particularly in East Asia, where the security situation has become tenser even as the region continues to become the centre of the global economy. A nuclear North Korea’s violent behaviour threatens South Korea and Japan, as well as US forces on the peninsula; Pyongyang’s development of a road mobile Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, moreover, brings into sight the day when North Korea could threaten the United States itself with nuclear attack, a prospect that will further imperil stability in the region. More broadly, the rise of China – and especially its rapid and opaque military build-up – combined with its increasing assertiveness in regional disputes is troubling to the United States and its allies and partners across the region. Particularly relevant to the US military presence in the western Pacific is the development of Beijing’s anti-access and area denial capabilities, including the DF-21D anti-ship ballistic missile, more capable anti-ship cruise missiles, attack submarines, attack aircraft, smart mines, torpedoes, and other assets. While Beijing remains a constructive contributor on a range of matters, these capabilities will give China the growing power to deny the United States the ability to operate effectively in the western Pacific, and thus the potential to undermine the US-guaranteed security substructure that has defined littoral East Asia since World War II. Even if China says today it won’t exploit this growing capability, who can tell what tomorrow or the next day will bring? Naturally, US efforts to build up forces in the western Pacific in response to future Chinese force improvements must be coupled with efforts to engage Beijing as a responsible stakeholder; indeed, a strengthened but appropriately restrained military posture will enable rather than detract from such engagement. In short, the United States must increase its involvement in East Asia rather than decrease it. Simply maintaining the military balance in the western Pacific will, however, involve substantial investments to improve US capabilities. It will also require augmented contributions to the common defence by US allies that have long enjoyed low defence budgets under the US security umbrella. This won’t be cheap, for these requirements can’t be met simply by incremental additions to the existing posture, but will have to include advances in air, naval, space, cyber, and other expensive high-tech capabilities. Yet such efforts are vital, for East Asia represents the economic future, and its strategic developments will determine which country or countries set the international rules that shape that economic future. Conversely, US interventions in the Middle East and, to a lesser degree, in south-eastern Europe have been driven by far more ambitious and aspirational conceptions of the national interest, encompassing the proposition that failing or illiberally governed peripheral states can contribute to an instability that nurtures terrorism and impedes economic growth. Regardless of whether this proposition is true, the effort is rightly seen by the new political tide not to be worth the benefits gained. Moreover, the United States can scale (and has scaled) back nation-building plans in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Balkans without undermining its vital interests in ensuring the free flow of oil and in preventing terrorism. The lesson to be drawn from recent years is not, then, that the United States should scale back or shun overseas commitments as such, but rather that we must be more discriminating in making and acting upon them. A total US unwillingness to intervene would pull the rug out from under the US-led structure, leaving the international system prey to disorder at the least, and at worst to chaos or dominance by others who could not be counted on to look out for US interests. We need to focus on making the right interventions, not forswearing them completely. In practice, this means a more substantial focus on East Asia and the serious security challenges there, and less emphasis on the Middle East. This isn’t to say that the United States should be unwilling to intervene in the Middle East. Rather, it is to say that our interventions there should be more tightly connected to concrete objectives such as protecting the free flow of oil from the region, preventing terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies, and forestalling or, if necessary, containing nuclear proliferation as opposed to the more idealistic aspirations to transform the region’s societies. These more concrete objectives can be better met by the more judicious and economical use of our military power. More broadly, however, **it means a shift in US emphasis away from the** greater Middle East toward the Asia-Pacific region, which dwarfs the former in economic and military potential and in the dynamism of its societies. The Asia-Pacific region, with its hard-charging economies and growing presence on the global stage, is where the future of the international security and economic system will be set, and it is there that Washington needs to focus its attention, especially in light of rising regional security challenges.

### Solvency – 1AC

#### Contention five: Solvency

#### Federal investment into the AIP is key to solve – yum yum yum

BENNETT ’99 - Journal of Engineering and Public Policy; Denver Urban Renewal Authority Administrator (Grant, D. “Funding Airport Infrastructure: Federal Options for Solvency”. August 5. Journal of Engineering and Public Policy. http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/1999/index.html)

Funding problems are the main priorities to address when looking at the future of airport infrastructure. Current political themes driving funding decisions obscure and ignore needed investments. Solutions involve funding options that link investment to airport demand for infrastructure. Only after long-term and dedicated investment is established can the internal FAA priorities on exact funding levels be addressed.

Literature Review

Airport Problems and Infrastructure Solutions

The foreseeable future for airport infrastructure is grim. As growth in airline traffic continues, many experts predict that significantly higher spending will be needed for airport infrastructure. The National Civil Aviation Review Commission (NCARC) was established by Congress to review, in part, whether the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has the resources it needs to meet critical safety, security and operational activities, and to continue investing in airport capital development. The NCARC reports that the aviation field will soon feel dramatic effects from added flight delays. 9 The effects of flight delays were quantified when the Air Transport Association reported that the delays in aviation cost carriers $2.4 billion in 1997. 10

The FAA’ s National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) came to the same conclusions regarding added flight delays in the future. It describes the most problematic areas of aviation to be large numbers of people exposed to high noise levels and delays due to congestion. 11 NPIAS helps the FAA to coordinate airport development, and includes some 3,344 airports that are “ significant to national air transportation.” It estimates $35.1 billion is needed over the next 5 years to meet the need of all segments of commercial and general aviation. The NPIAS suggests major airfield improvements, together with enhanced technology, will be needed to solve the problem. 12

Growth in passenger traffic requires increased infrastructure spending at airports. The NPIAS says that due to a 62% increase in passengers, more investment in terminals is necessary to accommodate this growth. 13 The national plan goes on to say that developing new runways at large and medium hub airports will help to relieve the load. While mentioning alternative solutions like scheduling more flights for off-peak hours, it concludes that congestion pricing to force alternative scheduling will not substitute for capacity enhancement. 14 An Aviation Week article states that trading frequency for capacity will not solve the problem. The article emphasizes that improvements like added runways, terminals and gates are the only solutions to the upcoming capacity problems. 15

If investment does not occur now, costs will escalate in the future. The GAO reports that airfield pavement rehabilitation will cost 2 to 3 times more if airports wait to fix the problem. 16 The NPIAS confirms this fact with recommendations that regular maintenance is needed for airfield pavement. 17 Although current pavement conditions are not terrible, the NPIAS credits funding from thousands of local and state agencies for these conditions. 18

In addition to cost savings and flight delays, safety is also addressed by infrastructure funding because federal money requires specific standards be used in airport development. The NPIAS says uniformity, with regards to infrastructure, helps promote safety and that federal funds ensure uniformity. 19 Experts throughout aviation argue that new infrastructure funding is necessary to increase capacity and safety, and reduce flight delays.

Federal Funding Role

Funding for the FAA primarily comes from the Aviation Trust Fund. In 1970 the Congress passed the Airport and Airway Revenue Act to establish the Aviation Trust Fund, which allowed the FAA to implement a series of user fees and gas taxes related to aviation as a source of revenue. 20 The Aviation Trust Fund then finances the FAA along with help from the general fund of the U.S. government. The appropriations to the FAA for fiscal year 1999 include $1.6 billion for the Airport Improvement Program, $1.9 billion for facilities and equipment, $150 million for research, engineering and development and $4.1 billion for FAA operations. The federal government general fund contributes approximately 26% of the FAA operations budget. 21

Airport Improvement Program

The FAA, through the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), addresses infrastructure needs. The AIP was established to promote and enhance safety, security, capacity, noise mitigation and environmental concerns, and to promote the use of existing infrastructure (i.e., using former military airports for civilian use). 22 In general, the AIP receives money from the Aviation Trust Fund to address infrastructure and development needs and concerns at airports.

Although the AIP is tasked to support airport infrastructure, the demand for further funding is not met by these federal dollars and the burden is falling on state and regional authorities. The overall capital development by airports in 1998 is shown in the chart below. 23

The tax-exempt bonds are issued at the regional level, leaving AIP grants as the sole source for federal funding. Even for AIP projects, the nonfederal share of funding is 10% for smaller airports and 25% for large and medium hub airports. 24

Passenger Facility Charges

Although the federal government does not fund a majority of infrastructure, the AIP grants and Passenger Facility Charges (PFC’ s) combined cover over one-third of the development money, and could be increased to cover a larger share. PFC’ s began in 1992 by allowing airports to collect up to $3 per boarding passenger for preserving or enhancing airports’ safety, security, or capacity; reducing noise; or enhancing airline competition. 25 This allows for use of PFC’ s in development areas similar to AIP use, except with respect to airline competition. PFC’ s play a crucial role in addressing competition between airlines since regulations require development projects using these funds to enhance competition among airline carriers. Congress sets limits on the amounts of these charges, so current legislation to reauthorize the FAA looks to alter PFC levels.

Current Legislation on Capitol Hill

Realizing that airports need more funding for infrastructure, some members of Congress are asking why there is a surplus of money in the Aviation Trust Fund that could go to AIP grants. For 1999, the unexpended balance of the Aviation Trust Fund will be $3.41 billion. This money, along with unexpended balances from years past, will create a beginning balance in the Aviation Trust Fund of $12.3 billion for fiscal year 2000. 26

Addressing this concern, Rep. Bud Shuster (R-PA), Chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, pushed H.R.1000 through the House on June 15th , 1999, by a vote of 316-110. 27 H.R.1000, the Aviation and Investment Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR21), proposes AIP spending of $2.475 billion for FY2000, $4 billion for FY2001, $4.1 billion for FY2002, $4.25 billion for FY2003, and $4.35 billion for FY2004. Also included in H.R.1000 are proposals to change PFC caps to $4, $5, or $6. The proposed AIP funding levels in H.R.1000 are dramatically increased over current levels because of an AIR21 measure moving the Aviation Trust Fund off budget. Off budget treatment removes the Trust Fund from the Budget Enforcement Act, guaranteeing that all the dollars collected by the Aviation Trust Fund go to FAA programs. 28

The Senate bill reauthorizing the FAA does not move the Trust Fund off budget. The Air Transportation Improvement Act, S.82, sponsored by Chairman John McCain (R-AZ) of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, proposes AIP spending of $2.41 billion for FY1999 and $2.475 billion for FY2000. 29 A conference committee will create the final bill to be passed by both houses of Congress and then to be signed or vetoed by the President. The bills from both the House of Representatives and the Senate increase funding for the AIP, but opposition within Congress and by the President is a problem.

Congressional Opposition to Increased Funding Levels

A key distinction to recognize is that the previously mentioned bills are authorizations. This legislation allows the money to be spent, but a second obstacle facing airport infrastructure and the FAA is the appropriations process in Congress. Appropriators actually give the money to specific programs, and the funding levels authorized are not necessarily the same as the money appropriated.

Many members in Congress from Budget and Appropriations committees want to have oversight of the AIP funding, but they never mention the needs of airport infrastructure in their analysis. The Senate Budget Committee, chaired by Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM), says strong oversight is needed **from both authorization and appropriation committees to prevent inappropriate spending**. 30 Further analysis by the committee states that firewalls around aviation funding will not be sufficient alternatives for moving the Aviation Trust Fund off budget. Firewalls in legislation would allow for earmarking by Congress to specific AIP projects, but force the authorized funding levels to be spent on aviation. The main theme appearing is one of control and oversight of spending by the congressional committees.

Reasons for wanting these controls do not focus on infrastructure needs, but instead focus on political concerns. Rep. C. W. Bill Young (R-FL), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, worries that the increased spending from AIR21 will break the current budget caps and postpone income tax cuts for the general public. His main concerns revolve around maintaining fiscal discipline, tax cuts, and protecting social security. 31 Although Chairman Young warns of effects from moving the Aviation Trust Fund off budget, the Appropriations Committee recommended that $2.25 billion be spent on the AIP for FY2000, which is $65 million higher than FY1999 levels. 32

Presidential Politics in Infrastructure Spending

The Clinton Administration, along with the FAA, has released a different proposal, S.545, to set AIP spending at $1.6 billion (current funding levels) for each fiscal year for FY2000 through FY2004. 33 This proposal also raises the caps on PFC’ s to $5 so as to increase nonfederal spending.

The House Appropriations Committee is willing to spend more on AIP than the Clinton administration for FY2000. This is clearly a political conflict, as the FAA reports cited earlier state that increased funding is needed for airport infrastructure. The Executive Office of the President overlooks airport needs, like the appropriators, by saying that H.R.1000 would reduce the federal budget surplus so that there would be no long-term solvency to Social Security or Medicare. 34 Politics are controlling the reauthorization of the FAA, and the previous actions by Congress and the President reflect that theme.

Status Quo Funding Levels

Currently, and in the past, Congress and the President have extended the same funding levels to the FAA for a few months at a time so differences in funding priorities could be worked out. In May, the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act included an extension of the AIP authorization that expires August 6th , 1999. 35 As mentioned earlier, this funds the AIP at $1.6 billion annually. In all likelihood, the August deadline will cause a similar extension of previous funding levels if differences between the Senate and the House are not worked out soon. The effects from this kind of **stop-and-go funding could lead to negative effects on airport infrastructure development and upkeep**, but these effects fall outside of the scope of this paper.

The Truth in Budgeting Alliance Whether the status quo is extended for a few more months or new legislation is enacted, changes in the methods of airport infrastructure funding need to be supported. Addressing this concern, the American Society of Civil Engineers supports having the trust fund moved off budget. 36 ASCE has joined the Alliance for Truth in Transportation Budgeting, which supports legislation to move all transportation trust funds off budget. Members of the alliance include: Airports Council International, Airports Consultants Council, Air Transport Association, National Air Carrier Association, National Association of State Aviation Officials, American Road and Transportation Builders Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. 37 The alliance is advocating that all aviation dollars go to aviation projects, and stands as a strong force in the push for an off budget measure. The alliance supports the permanent extension of user fees to fund the specific areas they tax.

Overview The growth of aviation and the needs of airports bring infrastructure spending to the forefront of the aviation debate. Political concerns block the path for dedicated funding of airport infrastructure. As the deadline approaches for the FAA reauthorization, analysis of the problems within infrastructure funding must be addressed to remedy the current situation.

Pressing Conflicts and Long Term Concerns

Airport infrastructure funding problems start with an increased need for money due to growth in aviation. The next obstacle to be faced involves supplying proactive funding to airports. **These two concerns can only be addressed if problems within current funding mechanism at the federal level are solved**. Once necessary funding is linked to airport infrastructure needs, the long term concerns for federal oversight and control can be addressed.

Link Funding to Infrastructure As infrastructure needs more money for upkeep and growth, experts in aviation point to additional funding to solve current airport problems and to stay even with the growth in aviation. Federal funding needs to be linked to changes in the aviation system. Ideas like moving the Aviation Trust Fund off budget support the concept that dedicated user fees should be going back into the system they came from. As aviation gets larger the taxes collected and funding spent on infrastructure should reflect the growth in system size. Even if forecasts for growth and need are wrong, a link between system changes and spending are still not in place. To implement a strong funding mechanism, loopholes in the system must be overcome.

Internal Conflicts within the FAA

The FAA is essentially reporting limited needs with the presidential budget request in mind. The airport funding proposal the FAA submits to the President has an overall need value based on desired funding levels, giving a false picture of real needs. 38 To determine which AIP projects are at the top of the funding list, the FAA uses the National Priority System (NPS). The NPS ranks projects according to criteria vital to the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). 39 This false sense of need looks at what legislation will address and not at what aviation demand actually requires. This internal conflict of actual demand versus presidential requests clearly presents problems for determining how much funding is really needed.

Nonfederal Funding Role Increasing PFC’ s for a large infrastructure burden could have significant negative effects on the NPIAS and small airports. A Congressional Budget Office report states that large airports could succeed without federal aid if caps on PFC’ s were raised or eliminated. This method would leave smaller airports in a difficult spot to finance capital investment since PFC’ s help large airports the most. 40 The report states that small airports’ finances are not all the same, but the federal role of funding is still important. The AIP, with a mission complementary and contrasting to PFC’ s purpose, stands to help the national aviation system instead of PFC’ s helping individual airports. The federal role in funding airport infrastructure needs to be resolved before system philosophies can be debated.

Politics in the System Congressional and presidential control of funding has political themes overpowering the effects of poor infrastructure in the current funding debate. As the benefits from increased investment in airports are proven, the federal surplus, created in part by the Aviation Trust Fund, allows lawmakers to address larger social programs. The political benefits of promoting social security, Medicare and tax cuts limit the solvency of the funding mechanism in the current era. Pushing for strong infrastructure funding will move the fight in the right direction, but the political realm is in the way.

Concerns for Federal Oversight and Control Assuming that airport infrastructure funding can be linked to growth in aviation demand, long-term concerns for functionality of the system will arise. Immediately funding the entire demand of aviation is not reasonable and the current funding available through the Aviation Trust Fund is not necessarily the right amount.

There are no exact figures for infrastructure funding levels that will ensure functionality of the airport system. The concern that the Trust Fund might not have enough money for infrastructure opens debate for altering the revenue. Altering PFC’ s or taxation levels could remedy the problem, but the Trust Fund is split among the many needs of the FAA and not on infrastructure alone. The lack of knowledge regarding total needs opens the door for checks and balances in the funding system.

A lack of congressional and presidential oversight could lead to unnecessary and unreasonable spending. The NPIAS looks to aviation demand, but does not consider cost-benefit analysis when evaluating growth for projects under $5 million. 41 Review of benefits versus costs for smaller AIP projects could help resolve this issue. Oversight that does not affect funding levels politically could also help. Firewalls that protect funding levels or controls for the taxes taken into the Trust Fund are ideas for oversight and control, but this debate is a long way off when looking at the current situation

## \*\*\*Case\*\*\*

### Environment Addon – 2AC

#### Fixing the airport crisis fixes pollution

DRI ‘2 (Global Insight Company, “The National Economic Impact of Civil Aviation”. July. http://www.aia-aerospace.org/stats/resources/DRI-WEFA\_EconomicImpactStudy.pdf)

There are direct costs to passengers as a result of airline congestion delays. This category of costs includes such things as additional meals away from home or, in the case of severe delays, hotel accommodations not reimbursed by the airlines or by an individual's employer.

Indirect costs to the individual are incurred as a result of the opportunity cost of time. Given a choice, most passengers would prefer to spend their time engaged in some other activity than waiting either in an airport or onboard a plane. The value of their time in some other activity is the opportunity cost of time. For example, there is value associated with the time an individual spends with family or in some personal activity. For personal travelers, airline delays may disrupt vacation plans and lower the quality of the vacation experience. If personal travelers are visiting friends or family, a delay in arrival imposes costs on those being visited. If personal travelers curtail their travels, then friends and family will also not be able to enjoy their visits.

Airline delays impose costs on society. If travelers avoid delays by departing from a less convenient airport, it may increase congestion on roadways and add to air pollution. If airline delays cause travelers to choose less efficient modes of transportation, it may contribute to congestion and increased pollution on intercity/interstate highways. Congestion delays also cause departing flights to burn more fuel than required, which contributes to air pollution. Further, arriving aircraft that are required to remain in a holding pattern due to congestion burn additional fuel and contribute to local air pollution. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), an arm of the United Nations, considers air traffic system modernization an important policy to reduce aircraft emissions, and the resulting reduction in fuel burn also would positively affect the U.S. trade balance. 23 Finally, airline delays increase the cost of doing business, and these costs are passed on to customers in the form of higher prices, which leads to a decrease in general economic activity and real GDP.

#### Air pollution spreads globally

John Merefield, lecturer in environmental studies at the University of Exeter and an air quality consultant, September 21, 2002, New Scientist, “Dust to dust”

By hitching a ride on a series of weather systems, particles can embark on a veritable odyssey. Shifting local and global weather patterns serve up a continuously changing selection of particles. On one day, the air might be loaded with far-travelled desert dust, while on the next it could be filled with a fog of salt-laden aerosol particles from the ocean. Overnight, winter weather conditions might trap soot from vehicle exhaust emissions due to a temperature inversion (when a layer of hot air created by sun-warmed hilltops or high-rise buildings during the day seals in colder air beneath), or far-travelled nitrates and sulphates from industrial pollution. Or several of these scenarios could coincide. When hospital admissions for asthma and heart conditions start to go up, this complexity gives environmental scientists quite a headache.

#### Extinction – pollution risks come first

Driesen 03 (David, Associate Professor, Syracuse University College of Law. J.D. Yale Law School, 1989, Fall/Spring, 10 Buff. Envt'l. L.J. 25, p. 26-30

**Air pollution can make life unsustainable by harming the ecosystem upon which all life depends and harming the health of both future and present generations**. The Rio Declaration articulates six key principles that are relevant to air pollution. These principles can also be understood as goals, because they describe a state of affairs that is worth achieving. Agenda 21, in turn, states a program of action for realizing those goals. Between them, they aid understanding of sustainable development’s meaning for air quality. The first principle is that "human beings. . . are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature", because they are "at the center of concerns for sustainable development." While the Rio Declaration refers to human health, its reference to life "in harmony with nature" also reflects a concern about the natural environment. 4 Since air pollution damages both human health and the environment, air quality implicates both of these concerns. Lead, carbon monoxide, particulate, tropospheric ozone, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides have historically threatened urban air quality in the United States. This review will focus upon tropospheric ozone, particulate, and carbon monoxide, because these pollutants present the most widespread of the remaining urban air problems, and did so at the time of the earth summit. 6 Tropospheric ozone refers to ozone fairly near to the ground, as opposed to stratospheric ozone high in the atmosphere. The stratospheric ozone layer protects human health and the environment from ultraviolet radiation, and its depletion causes problems. By contrast, tropospheric ozone damages human health and the environment. 8 In the United States, the pollutants causing "urban" air quality problems also affect human health and the environment well beyond urban boundaries. Yet, the health problems these pollutants present remain most acute in urban and suburban areas. Ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate cause very serious public health problems that have been well recognized for a long time. Ozone forms in the atmosphere from a reaction between volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, and sunlight. 10 Volatile organic compounds include a large number of hazardous air pollutants. Nitrogen oxides, as discussed below, also play a role in acidifying ecosystems. Ozone damages lung tissue. It plays a role in triggering asthma attacks, sending thousands to the hospital every summer. It effects young children and people engaged in heavy exercise especially severely. Particulate pollution, or soot, consists of combinations of a wide variety of pollutants. Nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide contribute to formation of fine particulate, which is associated with the most serious health problems. 13 Studies link particulate to tens of thousands of annual premature deaths in the United States. Like ozone it contributes to respiratory illness, but it also seems to play a [\*29] role in triggering heart attacks among the elderly. The data suggest that fine particulate, which EPA did not regulate explicitly until recently, plays a major role in these problems. 16 Health researchers have associated carbon monoxide with various types of neurological symptoms, such as visual impairment, reduced work capacity, reduced manual dexterity, poor learning ability, and difficulty in performing complex tasks. The same pollution problems causing current urban health problems also contribute to long lasting ecological problems. Ozone harms crops and trees. These harms affect ecosystems and future generations. Similarly, particulate precursors, including nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide, contribute to acid rain, which is not easily reversible. To address these problems, Agenda 21 recommends the adoption of national programs to reduce health risks from air pollution, including urban air pollution. 19 These programs are to include development of "appropriate pollution control technology . . . for the introduction of environmentally sound production processes." 20 It calls for this development "on the basis of risk assessment and epidemiological research." It also recommends development of "air pollution control capacities in large cities emphasizing enforcement programs using monitoring networks as appropriate." A second principle, the precautionary principle, provides support for the first. As stated in the Rio Declaration, the precautionary principle means that "lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation" when "there are threats of serious or irreversible damage." Thus, lack of complete certainty about the adverse environmental and human health effects of air pollutants does not, by itself, provide a reason for tolerating them. Put differently, governments need to address air pollution on a precautionary basis to ensure that humans can life a healthy and productive life.

### Readiness Addon – 2AC

#### Airport infrastructure solves power projection

DRI ‘2 (Global Insight Company, “The National Economic Impact of Civil Aviation”. July. http://www.aia-aerospace.org/stats/resources/DRI-WEFA\_EconomicImpactStudy.pdf)

On November 27, 2001, just 11 weeks after the terrorist attacks, John Marburger, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, reiterated the continued need for investment in the nation’s airports and airways in remarks to the Commission on the Future of the U.S. Aerospace Industry: “We need to develop a 21st Century global air transportation system that provides safe, secure, efficient and affordable transportation of people, goods, and information in peacetime and wartime—enabling people and goods to move freely anywhere, anytime, on time. We need a system that: - Enhances national security by strengthening homeland defense while enabling the military to project power anywhere in the world at any time; - Increases U.S. economic competitiveness by building a more efficient, higher capacity air transportation system; and - Improves the quality of life of all Americans by enabling them to do what they want to do when and where they want to do it.? 3 This study addresses the economic competitiveness and quality of life benefits that Dr. Marburger describes.

### A2: LFB Kills Heg

#### Lead from behind sustains heg

Cohen 11. [Roger, op-ed columnist, “Leading from Behind” New York Times -- October 31]

Leading from behind — a phrase first used by a White House adviser in a New Yorker article by Ryan Lizza — was smart policy in Libya. The United States, short on cash, bruised by Iraq and Afghanistan, did not want to head the charge into a third Muslim country, **even if** the Arab League had backed intervention. Discreet U.S. military assistance with France and Britain doing the trumpeting was sensible. Discreet does not mean desultory. The United States took out Libya’s air defense system. It provided more than 70 percent of the surveillance, intelligence and reconnaissance capabilities. It flew 70 percent of refueling missions. What it did not do was wade into Libya with the army it had in the vanguard of a motley coalition of the willing. But of course “leading from behind” was too good a phrase for Republican hopefuls to pass up, whatever the damage done to America under a Republican presidency that lined up behind recklessness. Mitt Romney has latched onto the phrase as if it was his passport to the White House, attacking Obama for “leading from behind” on the Arab Spring and declaring: “God did not create this country to be a nation of followers. America must lead the world, or someone else will.” Michelle Bachmann and Rick Perry have joined the chorus; even yesterday’s candidate, John McCain, could not resist. All of which has gotten the White House worried enough for there to be questioning of the original New Yorker quote, statements from Obama like “We lead from the front” — and rapid-response tweets from his NATO ambassador insisting on U.S. leadership. I say they shouldn’t have blinked before the Republican onslaught. If leading from behind brings the success of the Libyan intervention, and refusal to be “a nation of followers” brings you Iraq and Afghanistan, the choice seems clear enough. Lead me from behind, Mr. President. The Tea Party says, “We want our country back.” In some guise that’s what the Republican National Committee seems to think all Americans want — a mythical nation at the pinnacle of its power back in the midst of the American century, so overwhelmingly “No. 1” that it can speak and others will follow, so inspiring in wealth and might that it has all humanity in its thrall. “This century must be an American century,” Romney insists. The little hitchwith **these G.O.P. clarion calls** is that they **ignore the facts**. Iraq and Afghanistan have exacted a toll on America — in lives, treasure and standing — that it will take a generation to work through. Globalization and the information technology revolution are sucking away jobs; the jobs that remain demand levels of education that the country is doing a poor job providing. Debt, national and personal, hangs like a giant cloud over the United States. Other nations are growing so fast that the U.S. share of global output fell to 19.1 percent in 2011 from 23.5 percent in 2000. The country is beset by paralyzing political division. Growing inequality has trampled on fairness to the point that Americans are taking to the streets. **Right now America is neither morally compelling nor materially convincing.** In these circumstances it’s sensible to husband resources, use the burden-sharing of military alliances to the full, take out terrorists one by one rather than go to war against them, and act in concert with like-minded nations where possible — which is what I take “leading from behind” to mean. **It’s a doctrine for a changed world**. The Libyan intervention was a conspicuous example of its capacity for good. None of this means that I accept the inevitability of American decline. On the contrary, I am a strong believer in America’s unique gift for reinvention and regeneration. The American century is over and not coming back — this could be nobody’s century, as befits a globalized world — but that does not make American power any less critical. It just has to be exercised in ways consistent with the facts, as it was in Libya.

.

## \*\*\*A2: CP\*\*\*

### A2: States CP – 2AC – Fed Funding Key

#### Federal funding key to reciprocal state funding

COHEN ‘2 - Associate Professor of Economics; Ph.D., University of Maryland, College Park, December 1998 (Jeffrey, P. “Reciprocal State and Local Airport Spending Spillovers and Symmetric Responses to Cuts and Increases in Federal Airport Grants”. January. SAGE)

Recently, the U.S. Congress has debated whether to reauthorize funding for the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA’s) intergovernmental grants program, the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). This debate has been revived on more than one occasion over the past several years, bringing to the forefront the importance of examining the state and local airport spending responses to changes in AIP grants. Furthermore, the value of AIP cash outlays awarded in individual states has varied over the course of the AIP. Although in some years total AIP cash outlays to some states have risen, total AIP cash outlays to other states have fallen at the same time. Similarly, for many states, there is individual variability over time in total AIP cash outlays awarded in the sense that in some years, total AIP cash outlays to a given state rise, whereas in other years, total AIP cash outlays fall. This variability is demonstrated for a selection of states in Table 1. The variability in the AIP grants also leads to the question of whether states and localities exhibit symmetric spending responses to both increases and decreases in these grants.

There is an extensive literature on the effects of changes in intergovernmental grants on spending responses of state and local governments receiving federal aid. The public finance literature has shown that in general, an increase in lump-sum intergovernmental grants to a state or locality should lead to an expenditure response by the recipient government equivalent to that from a lump-sum increase in income of the median voter (Bradford and Oates 1971).The theory similarly predicts a symmetric response in state and local spending for a decrease in intergovernmental grants.

For the most part, the empirical evidence has not supported this theory. Many studies (discussed by Gramlich 1977) have found that increases in various types of intergovernmental grants to states and localities have led to spending increases somewhat greater than the marginal propensity to spend out of an increase in private income. This phenomenon has been described as the flypaper effect because these empirical results have implied that the grant money “sticks where it hits.” There have been many attempts to explain such empirical findings, including criticisms of econometric specifications and allegations of the presence of price effects arising due to the matching rates present in some grants programs.

How states and localities respond to general forms of diminished federal aid has become a question of increasing interest (see Quigley and Rubinfeld 1996 for a discussion of this issue). A more recent empirical literature has examined the spending responses of states and localities to cuts in intergovernmental grants. Overall, the empirical evidence is mixed as to whether states and localities exhibit symmetric expenditure responses to both cuts and increases in grants. Furthermore, when asymmetric spending responses are found, there is the ad- ditional question of whether states and localities pick up the slack and spend more in response to cuts in intergovernmental grants (fiscal replacement) or spend less in response to cuts in intergovernmental grant receipts (fiscal restraint). Stine (1994) studied 66 Pennsylvania county governments and found that own-source revenue fell in response to a cut in aid from the federal government. But county spending rose in response to decreases in grants from state governments. Gamkhar and Oates (1996) used aggregate time series data for state and local expenditures and found symmetric state expenditure response to cuts and increases in grants.

Volden (1999) studied the asymmetry question by analyzing specific data on state welfare expenditures. He found that when the state matching level rose (implying a cut in welfare grants to the states), states did not change their welfare payments. But when the matching level fell, states increased their welfare payments.

Gamkhar (2000) examined asymmetries related to federal highway grants. She found that cuts in grants resulted in an asymmetric highway spending response by state and local governments in the period the cut occurred. States and localities spent less on highways at the time of the cut, whereas the contemporaneous effect on highway spending of an increase in grants was insignificant. But she did find a symmetric highway spending response to changes in lagged highway obligations.

It is postulated here that AIP grants from the federal government are an important determinant of state and local airport spending. It is also reasonable to postulate that airport spending in a particular state depends not only on its own economic variables (such as grants from the federal government and disposable income) but on the level of airport spending in other states. The theory elaborating on the possibility of individuals’ receiving benefits from public spending in other states can be traced back to Oates (1972). In the present case, this seems plausible due to the “hub and spoke” (Morrison and Winston 1985) structure of the U.S. air transportation system. Namely, cross-country passengers may fly from a spoke in a state in one end of the country to a central hub in another state, change planes, and fly on to a state in the other end of the country. Often, passengers wait in an airport in a particular state for a plane that has been delayed on its previous leg due to congestion at an airport in another state. A delay resulting from congestion at one node in the air transportation system often results in further delays for connecting passengers throughout the entire system. Thus, spending increases at airports that are proverbially riddled with time delays confer spillover benefits on individuals in other states who travel through the airport in question. These benefits are in the form of travel time savings. This could make it socially optimal for an individual state to increase its airport spending when other states spend more on airports. Moreover, these benefits are reciprocal in nature as described by Oates (1972). It will be important to incorporate this potential interdependency into an empirical framework that examines asymmetric state and local airport expenditure responses to changes in AIP grants.

### A2: States CP – 1AR – Fed Funding Key

#### Federal funding key for the CP

VOGT ’99 - Frederick H. Vogt director, aeronautics division, tennessee department of transportation and chairman of NASAO legislative affairs committee (Frederick H. Vogt, “Prepared Statement by Frederick H. Vogt director, aeronautics division, tennessee department of transportation and chairman of NASAO legislative affairs committee on behalf of the national association of state aviation officials before the house committee on transportation and infrastructure subcommittee on aviation subject - the airport improvement program”. February 11. Lexis)

I would like to note that NASAO, based upon its research of airport needs nationwide published in its State Aviation Database Report, has recommended an annual $2 billion AIP funding level for several years. The National Civil Aviation Review Commission and the Air Transport Association agree with us. And as stated before, the Southern Governors Association, the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials concur in recommending a $2 billion annual AIP. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I would suggest that when all 50 States, the airlines, a congressionally mandated, non-partisan commission, and those previously mentioned associations all confirm that a $2 billion annual AIP is necessary for the health of this nation...then $2 billion ought to be the minimum that Congress is willing to fund. As you know, the Aviation Trust Fund, designed to provide AIP with a stable source of funding, is predicted to enjoy an uncommitted significant balance at the end of this fiscal year. The aviation taxpayers have put the money in the system, we hope Congress will now spend it where it is most needed. Congress, in its great wisdom, has provided our nation with the first five-year term for the FAA Administrator. We at NASAO applaud this action and ask that you now grant us a five-year AIP bill. This five- year AIP authorization would also be in line with the Administration's budget proposal.

As one of the newest State Block Grant states, Tennessee has developed a comprehensive airport Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with nearly $150 million in requirements to meet FAA airport standards. I can personally assure you that a five-year, $2 billion annual AIP will allow us to plan and spend federal dollars more efficiently. "Efficiently" means saving dollars and applying them to the most beneficial projects - to increase safety and meet the needs of our state's business interest. We would be able to avoid the disorderly, start-and-stop nature of the development and construction of our nation's airports due

### A2: States CP – 2AC – Links to Politics

#### Links to Politics – the CP needs to go through a formal federal determination process

FAA ’00 – Federal Aviation Administration (“AIRPORTS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN”. April 22. http://www.faa.gov/airports/resources/publications/orders/media/aip\_5100\_39a.pdf)

The FAA Reauthorization Act of 1996 amended Title 49 of the USC to require the FAA to permit block grant States to use their priority systems if such systems are not inconsistent with the national priority system. If a block grant State is interested in using its priority system, the State must submit the proposed priority system to APP-510 for a determination. APP-510, in coordination with APP-520, will review the State’s priority system and determine whether it is inconsistent with the national priority system. A block grant State cannot use its priority system if different from the NPS until a formal determination has been made.

### A2: States CP – 2AC – Econ DA

#### Weak state budgets mean the CP will blow up our economy

POLLACK ‘11 - Economic Policy Institute; Office of Management and Budget and the George Washington Institute of Public Policy; staff member for President Obama’s National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform; M.P.P. The George Washington University (Ethan, “Two years into austerity and counting…”, October 19, http://www.epi.org/blog/years-austerity-counting/)

It’s popular to criticize Keynesian economics by alleging that the Recovery Act was an experiment in fiscal expansion, and because two-and-a-half years later the economy still hasn’t roared back to life, it must have failed.

What this criticism forgets is that the federal government isn’t the only government setting fiscal policy. While the federal government did conduct Keynesian expansionary fiscal policy over the last few years, the states have been doing the reverse, acting, as Paul Krugman put it, like “50 Herbert Hoovers” as they cut budgets and raise taxes. They’re forced to do this because the cratering of private-sector spending which threw the economy into recession blew huge holes in their budgets (in particular with a huge fall in income, sales, and property taxes, and increases in demands on safety-net programs), **and just about all of them are required to balance their budgets** each year. Overall, states have had to close over $400 billion in shortfalls over the last few years – this is spending power siphoned off from the economy and acts as a significant “anti-stimulus.”

This means that just looking at the amount of federal stimulus that’s been enacted significantly overestimates how much fiscal support has actually been pumped into the economy. In fact, as the Goldman Sachs graph below shows, the net fiscal expansion across all levels of government only lasted through the third quarter of 2009. For the last two years, state and local cuts have been overwhelming the federal fiscal expansion, making overall fiscal policy across all levels of government actually contractionary and creating a net drag on economic growth.

What’s needed to reverse this drag of public-sector austerity on growth? The $35 billion for state and local aid that’s part of the American Jobs Act is a good start, as it would help keep states and local governments from being forced to cut further. As the last two years of **austerity** have shown, this **would only serve to further weaken the economy**. And if we’re going to get out of this economic hole, we first need to stop digging down further.

## \*\*\*A2: Disads\*\*\*

### A2: Politics – 2AC – Link Turn

#### Congress compromises for FAA funding

LENGELL ’12 – Staff Writer (“Congress approves long-term FAA funding bill”. February 6. http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/feb/6/congress-approves-long-term-faa-funding-bill/?page=all)

After more than four years of delays and almost two-dozen stopgap extensions, Congress on Monday approved a long-term Federal Aviation Administration funding bill that will lead to major upgrades of the nation’s decades-old air traffic control system and other safety measures.

Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee Chairman John D. Rockefeller IV called the bipartisan compromise “the best news that the airline industry ever had.”

### A2: Spending DA – 2AC

#### Plan can be funded through internal trade-offs

BENNETT ’99 - Journal of Engineering and Public Policy; Denver Urban Renewal Authority Administrator (Grant, D. “Funding Airport Infrastructure: Federal Options for Solvency”. August 5. Journal of Engineering and Public Policy. http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/1999/index.html)

The federal funding of airport infrastructure is made through the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). The AIP is appropriated money from the Aviation Trust Fund, which collects a combination of ticket and fuel taxes from the aviation community. Although there is $11.17 billion in the Trust Fund for fiscal year 1999, not all of that money is going to aviation. 6 Approximately $3.41 billion from the Trust Fund will revert back to the federal government’ s general fund and be spent outside of aviation. 7 This raises concern for future infrastructure investment, especially when the aviation community is growing. The American Society of Civil Engineers, along with many key players in the aviation field, support removing the Aviation Trust Fund from the federal government’ s general fund. 8 This would establish a direct link between taxes and investments in the aviation system and insure that dedicated user fees go toward their intended use. Infrastructure funding could then become proactive and grow as the aviation field grows.

# \*\*\*NEG\*\*\*

## \*\*\*Politics\*\*\*

### Politics Link – 1NC

#### FAA Spending triggers Congressional backlash

HIAR ’11 - D.C. bureau news editor at The Huffington Post and as a reporting editor at PBS MediaShift (“Controversial FAA program serves just 153 communities at a cost of $200 million”. September 11. http://www.iwatchnews.org/2011/09/15/6542/controversial-faa-program-serves-just-153-communities-cost-200-million)

The latest short-term funding extension for the Federal Aviation Administration leaves intact a small but costly program that has been criticized for decades by government auditors.

Created in 1978 as a part of the Airline Deregulation Act , the Essential Air Service subsidy was designed as a 10-year initiative to help rural airports likely to be left without routes as commercial aviation converted to a market-driven system. In most cases, the program limits assistance to isolated communities more than a 70-mile drive from the nearest major hub airport, which could be subsidized at a rate of less than $200 per passenger.

But EAS has persisted almost 25 years past its original congressionally mandated expiration date. It now serves 153 communities and costs some $200 million a year.

With growing political and economic pressure to reduce spending, some in Washington are focusing renewed attention on a subsidy program that, for example, has allowed constituents of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., to fly from Ely, Nev., to Denver for as little as $70 — even though the cost of each ticket to taxpayers is reportedly $4,107 . A standoff over the program was at the root of a two-week FAA shutdown this summer and threatened earlier this week to shutter the agency again. A clean extension of the FAA passed the Senate Thursday night, averting the potential for a second shutdown.

“The effectiveness of [EAS] as anything other than enabling commercial airports to remain afloat is questionable, since the goal of the program was to help airports transition away from federal subsidies for air carrier service,” said Sen. Tom Coburn, R-Okla., in his “Back in Black” deficit reduction plan , published in July. “Taxpayers should not be expected to subsidize air service indefinitely.”

While EAS is a vital support program for Alaska communities with no other transportation options, there are also 109 airports in the lower 48 states that still benefit from the long-lived subsidy. These include Hagerstown, Md., an hour and a half drive from both Washington and Baltimore with a reported per ticket subsidy of $191, and Jonesboro, Ark., where the Transportation Department estimates taxpayers are on the hook $840 for every ticket even though it's only 79 miles from Nashville.

The persistence of the subsidy “is a classic example of a small but vocal constituency trumping a large and unfocused majority – most folks don’t know about the Essential Air Service,” said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the conservative American Action Forum and a former chief of the Congressional Budget Office. “Every administration knows this is a bad policy, but it’s not worth all the political pain you have to go through to [cut it]. It’s exactly the right size to live on like this.”

But others contend that current political realities may have altered the dynamic. “By any standard, you can’t justify the cost to benefit ratio here,” said Norman J. **Ornstein, an expert on congressional politics** at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. Although this is not “a program in the billions,” he said, “the pressure and the squeeze on almost every area of discretionary spending is such that even the smaller items are going to come under more scrutiny.”

## \*\*\*States CP\*\*\*

### States – 1NC

#### States are more effective

VOGT ’99 - Frederick H. Vogt director, aeronautics division, tennessee department of transportation and chairman of NASAO legislative affairs committee (Frederick H. Vogt, “Prepared Statement by Frederick H. Vogt director, aeronautics division, tennessee department of transportation and chairman of NASAO legislative affairs committee on behalf of the national association of state aviation officials before the house committee on transportation and infrastructure subcommittee on aviation subject - the airport improvement program”. February 11. Lexis)

Tennessee, along with Pennsylvania, are your two newest State Block Grant States. We have a channeling act in Tennessee for federal funds, thus from an airport owners' perspective, not much changed. However, from the state's perspective, the block grant program decreased our paperwork considerably. Rather than submitting 10-12 detailed applications for individual projects, we submit one streamlined application for a block grant. Neither the state nor the FAA has to deal with numerous individual grants. Our workload at the state level has increased in the grant compliance and environmental areas, but because we are closer to the airports, we can be more effective in dealing with these issues. The State Block Grant Program has reduced the workload of the FAA airport engineers so that they can concentrate on the large air carrier airports and provide better service. As cited by GAO in its report, "The states have streamlined AIP project approval processes, reduced paperwork requirements, and eliminated the duplication that took place when state and federal activities overlapped. Airports have benefited from the states' streamlined approach, allowing them to obtain project approvals and approvals to change projects more quickly. FAA has been able to shift its resources to other high-priority tasks, thereby partially offsetting reductions' in field staff that have occurred in recent years." That's clearly a ringing endorsement of a highly successful program.

NASAO's fifth recommendation is that program flexibility should be a major concern in this reauthorization. We recommend four specific areas of flexibility, which will improve the system and save federal money.

The federal funding share should be flexible. In order to optimize available resources, states should be given the flexibility to adjust the federal funding shares within the respective State Apportionment project cost. Simply put, the federal government today pays 90 percent of costs of most airport projects. But, what if a state wants to speed up the process by paying 15, 20 or even 25 percent of the costs? This flexibility will enhance efficiency and help federal dollars go further. In 1996, you gave FAA the authority to test a flexible local share in the interests of innovative financing. That program is working and should be expanded and made permanent.

We also believe that airport design and construction standards need to be more flexible. Today these FAA standards adhere to "one-size-fits- all" criteria. But state standards are less expensive to implement while maintaining the highest degree of safety and durability.

### States – 2NC

#### Uniformity is predictable and solves

VOGT ’99 - Frederick H. Vogt director, aeronautics division, tennessee department of transportation and chairman of NASAO legislative affairs committee (Frederick H. Vogt, “Prepared Statement by Frederick H. Vogt director, aeronautics division, tennessee department of transportation and chairman of NASAO legislative affairs committee on behalf of the national association of state aviation officials before the house committee on transportation and infrastructure subcommittee on aviation subject - the airport improvement program”. February 11. Lexis)

 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee. On behalf of the state government aviation departments serving the public interest in all 50 states, Guam and Puerto Rico, it is my privilege to present our proposal for the reauthorization of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). I will summarize our views but ask that our full statement be entered into the record.

As you know, NASAO is one of the most senior aviation organizations in the United States, predating even the Federal Aviation Administration's predecessor, the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The states first established NASAO 68 years ago to ensure uniformity of safety measures, to standardize airport regulations and develop a truly national air transportation system responsive to local, state, and regional needs. Since 1931, NASAO has been unique among aviation advocates. Unlike special interest groups, which speak for a single type of aeronautical activity, NASAO represents the men and women in state government aviation agencies who serve the public interest in all 50 states, Guam and Puerto Rico. These highly skilled professionals are full partners with the federal government in the development and maintenance of the safest and most efficient aviation system in the world.

NASAO members organize, promote, and fund a wide variety of aviation programs across the nation. All states develop statewide aviation system plans and airport capital improvement plans. The states invest about $450 million annually in planning, infrastructure development, maintenance, navigational aids and airport operations at 5,000 airports across the country. Many states also build, own, and operate their own airports. Each year, state aviation officials conduct safety inspections at thousands of public-use airports. Countless aviation activities including statewide meetings, airport symposiums, pilot safety seminars and aviation education forums are also organized annually by the states.

The role of state programs and the responsibilities of the state aviation agencies are expanding. In 1996, Congress made the State Block Grant Program permanent. As a result, nine states, including Tennessee, are already fully responsible for directly administering federal Airport Improvement Program funds. **In an era of declining federal budgets and downsized government programs, the states' involvement in aviation is growing**.

#### States can fund by themselves – AIP not necessary

COHEN ‘2 - Associate Professor of Economics; Ph.D., University of Maryland, College Park, December 1998 (Jeffrey, P. “Reciprocal State and Local Airport Spending Spillovers and Symmetric Responses to Cuts and Increases in Federal Airport Grants”. January. SAGE)

The FAA has been administering grants under the AIP since 1982, which was authorized under the Airport and Airways Improvement Act of 1982. This act authorized certain apportionments for projects at specific airports based on a number of factors. There are different federal matching shares for different types of projects, but most of these projects imply federal shares of between 75%and 90% (U.S. Department of Transportation 1994). There are upward adjustments in the federal shares in certain states with high percentages of public lands. The incentives generated by the high federal shares encourage states and localities to use most of the funds obligated to them. In fact, an inspection of state and local airport spending data reveals that in most cases, total airport spending in a particular state in a particular year exceeds the new AIP grants to the state in that time period. This implies that at the margin, the matching constraint is not binding. In other words, most states appear to be undertaking projects that are not receiving federal funds. If the FAA decides to approve an additional project for funding, the effect of the grant on airport spending in the state or locality should be the same as if it had been a lump-sum grant. The grant does not necessarily induce additional state and local spending to meet the matching rate because the state already is spending more than required to meet the state matching shares. So at the margin, changes in these types of project grant awards should have the same effects as if they were lump-sum grants. Thus, the theory would lead one to expect that the state-level airport expenditure responses to fluctuations in such grants would be analogous to the airport expenditure responses arising from changes in the disposable income of the median voter in that state. Because the available data from FAA report total dollar values of all grants for projects in a particular state in a particular year, this study includes a variable for total outlays to a given state in a particular year.

#### States model each other

COHEN ‘2 - Associate Professor of Economics; Ph.D., University of Maryland, College Park, December 1998 (Jeffrey, P. “Reciprocal State and Local Airport Spending Spillovers and Symmetric Responses to Cuts and Increases in Federal Airport Grants”. January. SAGE)

This study also found significant evidence of interstate airport spending interdependencies. The inclusion of a term for other states’ airport spending in the estimation was motivated by the observation that individual states confer benefits on each other in the form of travel time savings when they spend more on airports. Because this interdependency term was significant and equal to approximately 50 cents, it is justified to include such a term in this study of asymmetric airport spending response to cuts in grants. The magnitude of this coefficient implies that when all states raise airport spending by 1 dollar, an individual state raises its airport spending by approximately 50 cents.

## \*\*\*Case\*\*\*

### SQ Solves – 1NC

#### Next Gen working now

AT ’12 (Aviation Today, “ FAA Releases Updated NextGen Implementation Plan”. March 22. http://www.aviationtoday.com/av/air-traffic-control/FAA-Releases-Updated-NextGen-Implementation-Plan\_76004.html)

In its annual NextGen Implementation Plan, FAA said it is "enthusiastic and confident" about the direction of its multibillion dollar Next Generation Air Transportation (NextGen) initiative, adding the agency has demonstrated steady and tangible progress in 2011 and expects more progress in 2012 and beyond. The report also responded to the NextGen Advisory Committee's (NAC) working group recommendations, issued in September.

"Even in the face of new challenges, the FAA remains confident about NextGen success. Given our history of overcoming difficulties, we are prepared to respond to any new obstacles," according to the report.

Going forward, FAA said it will focus on expanded surface data-sharing capabilities and the development of closely spaced parallel runways. During the 2013-2015 timeframe, FAA said it plans on developing and implementing mechanisms to provide National Airspace users with information about the current and future status of Special Activity Airspace, which is airspace set aside for military training and other specialized use, and leverage Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) infrastructure for surface monitoring. Initial tower datacomm capability for revised departure clearance is expected in 2015; FAA is set to award the datacomm contract this summer.

Also, in 2012, FAA will initiate Surface Wide Information Management for surface data; publish FAA responses to Aviation Rulemaking Committee recommendations on ADS-B In; issue a final investment decision on ADS-B In; and work toward satellite navigation alternatives to ILS for dependent staggered approaches.

"Uncertainties and constraints increase the importance of managing NextGen with the skill and determination that such a complex system engineering project requires. We are making considerable progress on challenges that are malleable to management solutions," according to the report.

Among the 2011 highlights:

-- More than 300 Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) ground stations were operational by the end of 2011. FAA said it expects the total complement of about 700 radio stations to be in place and operating by 2014.

-- FAA said it published 354 Wide Area Augmentation (WAAS) LPV procedures in 2011. As of February 2012, there were nearly 2,800 LPVs at more than 1,400 airports nationwide.

-- Also, the agency advanced the design phase of its metroplex initiative in two locations.

#### NextGen solves the aff

FAA ’11 (Federal Aviation Administration, “NextGen Implementation Plan”. March. http://www.faa.gov/nextgen/media/ng2011\_implementation\_plan.pdf)

NextGen is a comprehensive overhaul of our National Airspace System to make air travel more convenient and dependable, while ensuring your flight is as safe, secure and hasslefree as possible. In a continuous roll-out of improvements and upgrades, the FAA is building the capability to guide and track air traffic more precisely and efficiently to save fuel and reduce noise and pollution. NextGen is better for our environment, and better for our economy. • NextGen will be a better way of doing business. Travel will be more predictable because there will be fewer delays, less time sitting on the ground and holding in the air, with more flexibility to get around weather problems. • NextGen will reduce aviation’s impact on the environment. Flying will be quieter, cleaner and more fuel-efficient. We’ll use alternative fuels, new equipment and operational procedures, lessening our impact on the climate. More precise flight paths help us limit the amount of noise that communities experience. • NextGen will help us be even more proactive about preventing accidents with advanced safety management to enable us, with other government agencies and aviation partners, to better predict risks and then identify and resolve hazards. • NextGen boils down to getting the right information to the right person at the right time. It will help controllers and operators make better decisions. This data will assist operators in keeping employees and passengers better informed. • Our nation’s economy depends on aviation. NextGen lays a foundation that will continually improve and accommodate future needs of air travel while strengthening the economy with one seamless global sky. • NextGen will help communities make better use of their airports. More robust airports can help communities attract new jobs, and help current employers expand their businesses. By doing this the U.S. will strengthen its economy and help communities realize all the benefits that aviation can bring. • NextGen will allow us to meet our increasing national security needs and ensure that travelers benefit from the highest levels of safety.

### SQ Solves – 2NC

#### Next Gen solves airport operation

KARP ‘11 - Air Transport World senior editorreviously serving as editor of World Airport Week, reporter for Flight International/Air Transport Intelligence and managing editor of Air Cargo World (Aaron, “FAA reorganization aims to streamline NextGen implementation”. October 6. http://atwonline.com/international-aviation-regulation/news/faa-reorganization-aims-streamline-nextgen-implementation-100)

US FAA Administrator Randy Babbitt said Congress has approved the agency's request to make changes to its organizational structure, including establishing a Program Management Office (PMO) to manage major acquisition programs, particularly those associated with implementing the satellite-based NextGen ATC system.

"While much of NextGen involves the air traffic control function, it also involves much more than that, and needs the involvement and focus of every FAA office going forward," Babbitt told the Air Traffic Control Assn. (ATCA) Conference and Exposition in Washington this week. He said the PMO "will play a critical role in the success of NextGen by acting as the bridge between strategic requirements and tactical program implementation. Currently, air traffic acquisitions managers are embedded in different offices. Soon they will all be in one place. Having a portfolio of programs under one umbrella provides the potential for streamlining, better cost control and economies of scale."

Greg Burke, formerly FAA's VP-en route and oceanic services, has been charged with standing up the PMO, which will reside within FAA's Air Traffic Organization (ATO). Also speaking at the ATCA conference, he said the PMO will be "bringing the acquisition community together … It's all about doing a lot of collaborating. It's all about doing a lot of dialogue." The PMO, he added, will create "a real line of sight between our acquisition people" and the provision of air traffic services.

ATO COO David Grizzle (ATW Daily News, July 8) said coordination within FAA and between the agency and industry will be critical to implementing NextGen. "One of the things that is being accomplished by the reorganization … is that structurally we are forcing people to collaborate," he told ATCA attendees. "They won't be able to live and work in silos."

Burke noted, "As you think about NextGen, it's really about tying everything together … We still need to do more in the area of communicating clearly to everyone what NextGen is, what people are going to gain with these capabilities."

He said the PMO will be particularly focused on ensuring FAA maintains ATC service levels even as it rolls out NextGen over the next decade. "So we'll be spending a lot of time talking in house about how we balance operational improvements with operational sustainability," he said. "What keeps me up at night are all of the interdependencies."

### Trade Competitiveness – 1NC

#### US not key to global free trade

Matthews and Eakin ’11 (Merril and Dough Holtz, Institute for Policy Innovation, Merrill Matthews is a resident scholar with the Institute for Policy Innovation. Douglas Holtz-Eakin is president of the American Action Forum and served as a member of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, “Recapturing US Leadership on Trade”, <http://www.ipi.org/IPI/IPIPressReleases.nsf/97704cbd573c70d88625763a007cd241/a97aaa8817da1e578625783700786289?OpenDocument>, February 9, 2011, LEQ)

More important, NAFTA was passed by a Democratic-controlled Congress, when the country was in the middle of an acrimonious debate over health care reform. Does that sound familiar? Despite this, the vote was about as bipartisan as you can get. Things are different today, unfortunately. The U.S. has lost its role as a free trade leader. Free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama have been languishing for years — as had negotiations with South Korea until recently. Meanwhile, the European Union is aggressively promoting free trade agreements, opening up the world to more European products.

#### SKFTA solves trade leadership

Levy 11 – work in AEI's Program in International Economics ranges from free trade agreements and trade with China to antidumping policy (1/25/11, Philip I., “Phil Levy: Four reasons why the new GOP majority needs to support a bold trade agenda,” http://conhomeusa.typepad.com/platform/2011/01/part-1-of-dr-phil-levys-series-why-the-gop-should-embrace-a-bold-trade-agenda.html)

4. The distinction between global economic leadership and foreign policy leadership is small and shrinking rapidly. The quest for economic prosperity is so central to the mission of governments around the world that it has become increasingly difficult to have warm diplomatic ties but frosty economic ones. This is a major reason the Obama administration ultimately backed the Trans-Pacific Partnership talks begun by President Bush in late 2009 and then moved to pass the KORUS FTA in late 2010. The same arguments apply with Colombia and Panama and at a global level as well. It was no accident that G-20 gatherings to address the recent financial crisis repeatedly featured vows to bolster the global trading system. Unfortunately, those vows have not been fulfilled. That, in no small part, is because of a void in global trade leadership left as the United States has tried to adopt a diminished role. This is a prime area in which the world looks to the United States for leadership and judges the country on the basis of its ability to fill that role. In 2008, a popular theme in the U.S. presidential campaign was the restoration of America’s popular standing in the world. The United States will not enjoy that esteem until it once again takes up a leadership role in trade.

#### Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace

MARTIN et al ‘8 (Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Alt causes to aerospace decline—military cuts, oil prics, and economic downturn

Investment Weekly News 6/25(6/25/2011, Investment Weekly News, “Aerospace and Defense; Aerospace Industry to Be 'Squeezed' by Steep Ramp-up in Commercial and Continued Cuts in Defense, According to AlixPartners Study”, p.15, ProQuest)

There is significant risk, says the study, that commercial-sector suppliers will not be able to keep up with aggressive new manufacturing demands and will be challenged by: capacity constraints of their own (Tier-2 and Tier-3) suppliers that have under-invested in capability development; specialty raw-materials shortages (e.g., carbon fiber and titanium fasteners); and ongoing supply-chain delays and shortages resulting from the disaster in Japan.

"The aerospace supply chain was basically decimated by the economic downturn, as even sold orders were put on hold or otherwise put in a lumpy, stop-and-go mode," said David Wireman, director in AlixPartners' Aerospace and Defense Practice. "From all indications, that supply chain is not at all prepared for steep commercial ramp-up curve that lies ahead, and production constraints are a very real possibility." Defense Sector But while demand on the commercial-aircraft side looks strong, defense, globally, looks to be weakening. According to the study, U.S. defense spending is expected to decrease by at least 12.2% by 2013 and by 6.5% by 2016, while defense spending in Europe, already down 2.8% in 2010, is expected to continue to drop sharply in the coming years, led by the U.K.'s recent announcement of an 8% cut by 2015 and promised drops of up to 25% in smaller European nations.

As a result of these expected widespread cuts, says the study, defense priorities will shift toward extending the life of existing equipment, improving communication networks and investing more in weapons systems targeted at supporting today's more asymmetric warfare. However, says the study, the scale of these new investments will not be enough to make up for cutbacks in major-platform investments such as the F-35 fighter aircraft series built jointly by Lockheed Martin Corp., BAE Systems PLC and Northrop Grumman Corp., which has already experienced significant cuts in planned production numbers. In response to these kinds of cutbacks, the larger defense companies will need to pursue a more diverse business mix that will lead to partnerships, M&A and consolidation among smaller players as larger companies pursue new markets, the study says.

In sum, the study shows that both the commercial-aviation and defense industries face critical challenges that they will need to address. Key economic challenges will come from federal budget uncertainties, volatile fuel prices and new entrants into the few growing sectors of the industry. In particular, the recent volatility of oil prices, coupled with continued sluggish economies in the West, has made it hard to predict future industry trends. These factors are leading many aerospace and defense manufacturers, especially lower-tier suppliers, to delay investments, says the study.

"The aerospace and defense industry faces a very challenging next few years," said Fitzpatrick. "The simultaneous need for near flawless execution on the commercial side and belt-tightening on the defense side, plus the need to deal with supply-chain challenges across the board while also seizing M&A opportunities will push management capabilities to the extreme." M&A Outlook Driven by supply-chain pressures in commercial and budget cuts in defense, the pace of mergers and acquisitions in the aerospace industry is expected to rebound in the next few years. In addition, it finds, low valuations today across the industry, with multiples generally below 10 times earnings before depreciation and taxes, have made deals look far more palatable.

#### Readiness impact empirically denied: Iraq

Perry and Flournoy 6 (William and Michael, “The US Military: Under Strain and at Risk”, National Defense Magazine, May, http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/issues/2006/may/TheU.S.MilitaryUnder.htm)

The Army and the Army National Guard also have experienced equipment shortfalls that increased the level of risk to forces deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan and reduced the readiness of units in the United States. From the beginning of the Iraq war until as late as last year, the active Army experienced shortages of key equipment — such as radios, up-armored Humvees, trucks, machine guns, rifles, grenade launchers, and night vision equipment — for troops deploying overseas.  While many of these shortfalls havenow been addressed for deployed units, the readiness ratings of many non-deployed units have dropped. This is particularly worrisome because some of these units are slated to deploy later this year. This situation is even worse for Army National Guard units, many of which have had to leave their equipment sets in Iraq for arriving units. These readiness shortfalls are only likely to grow as the war in Iraq continues to accelerate the wear-out rate of all categories of equipment for ground forces.

#### Heg is inevitable: structural foundations buffer heg decline

NORRLOF ’10 - an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto (Carla, “ America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 1-2)

The United States has been the most powerful country in the world for more than sixty years. Throughout this period, it has had the world’s largest economy and the world’s most important currency. For most of this time, it had the world’s most powerful military as well – and its military supremacy today is beyond question. We are truly in an era of US hegemony, a unipolar moment, a Pax Americana, which has enabled Americans to enjoy the highest standard of living in human history. Is this privileged position being undercut by serial trade deficits? The pessimists are growing more numerous by the day. They see the country’s spendthrift ways as a disaster waiting to happen. They warn that the cavernous gap in merchandise trade, well above 6 percent in 2006, is an ominous sign of competitive slippage. In 2008, the liabilities acquired to finance the shortfall in exports reached an amazing 29 percent of GDP. A falling dollar, military overstretch, the rise of the euro, the rise of China, and progressively deeper integration in East Asia are among the factors that many believe herald the imminent decline of American hegemony. In my view, the doomsayers are mistaken. I argue that American hegemony is stable and sustainable. While the United States **certainly** does face a number of challenges, an analysis of the linkages between trade, money, and security shows that American power is robust. This book is a story about why and how American hegemony works, and what other states would have to do to emulate or, on other grounds, thwart, America’s power base. As I will show, the United States benefits from running persistent trade deficits as a result of its special position in the international system. I will argue that any comparably situated country would choose to pursue the same cyclical deficit policy as the one encouraged by the US government. A series of size advantages cut across trade, money, and security: the size of the American market, the role of the dollar, and American military power interact to make a trade deficit policy rewarding and buffer the United States from the extreme consequences that a sustained deficit policy would otherwise have.

#### No impact to the transition

IKENBERRY ‘8 professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University (John, The Rise of China and the Future of the West Can the Liberal System Survive?, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb)

Some observers believe that the American era is coming to an end, as the Western-oriented world order is replaced by one increasingly dominated by the East. The historian Niall Ferguson has written that the bloody twentieth century witnessed "the descent of the West" and "a reorientation of the world" toward the East. Realists go on to note that as China gets more powerful and the United States' position erodes, two things are likely to happen: China will try to use its growing influence to reshape the rules and institutions of the international system to better serve its interests, and other states in the system -- especially the declining hegemon -- will start to see China as a growing security threat. The result of these developments, they predict, will be tension, distrust, and conflict, the typical features of a power transition. In this view, the drama of China's rise will feature an increasingly powerful China and a declining United States locked in an epic battle over the rules and leadership of the international system. And as the world's largest country emerges not from within but outside the established post-World War II international order, it is a drama that will end with the grand ascendance of China and the onset of an Asian-centered world order. That course, however, is not inevitable. The rise of China does not have to trigger a wrenching hegemonic transition. The U.S.-Chinese power transition can be very different from those of the past because China faces an international order that is fundamentally different from those that past rising states confronted. China does not just face the United States; it faces a Western-centered system that is open, integrated, and rule-based, with wide and deep political foundations. The nuclear revolution, meanwhile, has made war among great powers unlikely -- eliminating the major tool that rising powers have used to overturn international systems defended by declining hegemonic states. Today's Western order, in short, is hard to overturn and easy to join. This unusually durable and expansive order is itself the product of farsighted U.S. leadership. After World War II, the United States did not simply establish itself as the leading world power. It led in the creation of universal institutions that not only invited global membership but also brought democracies and market societies closer together. It built an order that facilitated the participation and integration of both established great powers and newly independent states. (It is often forgotten that this postwar order was designed in large part to reintegrate the defeated Axis states and the beleaguered Allied states into a unified international system.) Today, China can gain full access to and thrive within this system. And if it does, China will rise, but the Western order -- if managed properly -- will live on.

### -----Trade Defense – 2NC

#### Trade conflicts won’t escalate

NYE ‘96 (Joseph, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government – Harvard University, Washington Quarterly, Winter)

The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, increased trade and economic interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point, however, is that such disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.

#### Doha proves even sudden collapse of free trade will not cause war

THE SEATTLE TIMES 7-31-2008, lexis

Economists disagree on the Doha round's potential benefits; estimates of economic gain that could have been reaped through additional trade range from $4 billion to $100 billion. Set against the rapid expansion of global trade to $13.6 trillion last year from $7.6 trillion five years ago, however, the bottom-line loss from Doha's failure is "not a market issue," said Julian Callow, an economist at Barclays Capital in London. Nor is the world on the edge of the kind of protectionist wave that ended the last period of globalization in the early 20th century and contributed to two world wars, analysts say. Countries are likely to go on negotiating bilateral trade deals with each other, such as the U.S.-South Korea free-trade deal earlier this year.

#### Trade is resilient – no collapse

Perroni and Whally 96 (Carlo, University of Warwick and John, University of Western Ontario, American Economic Review, 86(2), May, p. 60)

Furthermore, trade performance in the period since the late 1940’s also clearly stands in sharp contrast to the events of the 1930’s. The largest players, the United States and the EU have consistently displayed a determination to mediate their trade disputes in the 1980’s, triggered by EU enlargement. And today’s global economy is much more interdependent than it was in the 1930’s. Firms and industries have become more reliant on export markets, and there is more interindustry trade. There is also the major difference of the presence of the GATT/WTO, accompanied by bindings on tariffs achieved in eight rounds of negotiations; and, despite its weaknesses, a GATT/WTO dispute-settlement procedure has continued to function.

### -----Heg Defense – 2NC

#### Predictions underestimate locking mechanisms to heg

NORRLOF ’10 - an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto (Carla, “ America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 1-2)

We have seen erroneous predictions of American decline before. In the 1970s, the combination of high inflation, high interest rates, high unemployment, the Vietnam War, political and military challenges from China and the Soviet Union, and the economic rise of Japan led to eerily similar forecasts. Pessimists then, as today, underestimated the longevity of American power. The main reason the United States has continued to occupy a unique place in the international system is because a sufficient number of major and lesser powers have a strong interest in maintaining America at the top of the hierarchy. To bring America down would take a deliberate, coordinated strategy on the part of others and this is simply not plausible. As much as the United States benefits from the space it has carved out for itself in the current world order, its ability to reap unequal gains will remain unless and until allies start to incur heavy losses under American dominance. Even that, by itself, will not be sufficient to sink American hegemony. A strong alternative to American rule will have to come into view for things to fundamentally change. At present, no credible alternative is in sight. The United States is not invincible but its dominance is currently steady. Those who are inclined to think that American hegemony will persist – at least for a while – tend to dwell on the claim that the United States is providing a range of public goods to the benefit of all at its own expense. This is a chimera. The United States is self-interested, not altruistic. The illusion of benevolence has meant that very little attention has been given to uncovering the mechanism through which the United States gains disproportionately from supplying a large open market, the world’s reserve currency, and a military machine capable of stoking or foiling deadly disputes. This book exposes the mechanism through which the United States reaps unequal gains and shows that the current world system, and the distribution of power that supports it, has built-in stabilizers that strengthen American power following bouts of decline. Although all dominant powers must eventually decline, I will show that the downward progression need not be linear when mutually reinforcing tendencies across various power dimensions are at play. Specifically, I will demonstrate how the United States’ reserve currency status produces disproportionate commercial gains; how commercial power gives added flexibility in monetary affairs; and, finally, how military preponderance creates advantages in both monetary and trade affairs.

#### Even if the US declines, liberal international norms will survive - solves the impact

IKENBERRY 11 – (May/June issue of Foreign Affairs, G. John, PhD, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, “The Future of the Liberal World Order,” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/

articles/67730/g-john-ikenberry/the-future-of-the-liberal-world-order?page=show)

For all these reasons, many observers have concluded that world politics is experiencing not just a changing of the guard but also a transition in the ideas and principles that underlie the global order. The journalist Gideon Rachman, for example, says that a cluster of liberal internationalist ideas -- such as faith in democratization, confidence in free markets, and the acceptability of U.S. military power -- are all being called into question. According to this worldview, the future of international order will be shaped above all by China, which will use its growing power and wealth to push world politics in an illiberal direction. Pointing out that China and other non-Western states have weathered the recent financial crisis better than their Western counterparts, pessimists argue that an authoritarian capitalist alternative to Western neoliberal ideas has already emerged. According to the scholar Stefan Halper, emerging-market states "are learning to combine market economics with traditional autocratic or semiautocratic politics in a process that signals an intellectual rejection of the Western economic model." Today's international order is not really American or Western--even if it initially appeared that way. But this panicked narrative misses a deeper reality: although the United States' position in the global system is changing, the liberal international order is alive and well. The struggle over international order today is not about fundamental principles. China and other emerging great powers do not want to contest the basic rules and principles of the liberal international order; they wish to gain more authority and leadership within it. Indeed, today's power transition represents not the defeat of the liberal order but its ultimate ascendance. Brazil, China, and India have all become more prosperous and capable by operating inside the existing international order -- benefiting from its rules, practices, and institutions, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the newly organized G-20. Their economic success and growing influence are tied to the liberal internationalist organization of world politics, and they have deep interests in preserving that system. In the meantime, alternatives to an open and rule-based order have yet to crystallize. Even though the last decade has brought remarkable upheavals in the global system -- the emergence of new powers, bitter disputes among Western allies over the United States' unipolar ambitions, and a global financial crisis and recession -- the liberal international order has no competitors. On the contrary, the rise of non-Western powers and the growth of economic and security interdependence are creating new constituencies for it. To be sure, as wealth and power become less concentrated in the United States' hands, the country will be less able to shape world politics. But the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive. Indeed, now may be the best time for the United States and its democratic partners to update the liberal order for a new era, ensuring that it continues to provide the benefits of security and prosperity that it has provided since the middle of the twentieth century.

### Growth – 1NC

#### Stimulus fails to boost growth

FOSTER ’12 - Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of Fiscal Policy at The Heritage Foundation (J.D., “WaPo Admitting Keynesian Stimulus Failed?”. March 6. http://blog.heritage.org/2012/03/06/wapo-admitting-keynesian-stimulus-failed/

So what went wrong? Why is this not short-term stimulus? The widely respected Rivlin explained it clearly and succinctly: “Investments in infrastructure, if well designed, should be viewed as investments in future productivity growth.”

Exactly right—future productivity growth.

She went on to say that if investments in infrastructure “speed the delivery of goods and people, they will certainly do that. They will also create jobs, but not necessarily more jobs than the same money spent in other ways.”

Exactly right—a dollar spent is a dollar spent. A job gained here, a job lost there.

This speaks to a longstanding flaw of highway spending arguments. Proponents argue that this spending creates tens of thousands of jobs, and they are half right. The other half is the tens of thousands of jobs not created (or saved) by shifting spending to highways from other areas in the economy. The valid argument about infrastructure spending is: If done right, it will lift future productivity growth, not current job growth.

The central failing—the essential fiscal alchemy of Keynesian stimulus—is the belief that government can increase total spending in the economy by borrowing and spending. What Keynesians ignore is that we have financial markets whose job in good times and bad is first and foremost to shift funds from savers to investors, from those who have money they do not wish to spend today to those who have a need to borrow to spend as much as they’d like, whether on new business equipment, a home, or a car.

There are no vast sums of “excess funds” just sitting around in bank tellers’ drawers waiting for government to borrow and spend them. Government borrowing means less money available to the private sector to spend. So government deficit spending goes up, and dollar-for-dollar private spending goes down. America’s resources are generally speaking spent less wisely, and the federal debt is unequivocally higher.

#### No impact- econ decline doesn’t cause war

Barnett ‘9(Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” 8/25/2009)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first **truly worldwide** recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on **the** international security **landscape**. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \* No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \* The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \* Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \* No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \* A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \* No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

### -----Stimulus Defense – 2NC

#### Stimulus doesn’t solve fast enough

HUFFMAN ’11 - taught for 38 years at Lewis & Clark Law School and served as Dean from 1993 to 2006; serves on the Hoover Institution; Distinguished Bradley Scholar at the Heritage Foundation; University of Chicago Law School (Jim, “Why More Infrastructure Spending Is Unlikely to Create Jobs and Stimulate the Economy”. September 10. http://nwfreepress.com/why-more-infrastructure-spending-is-unlikely-to-create-jobs-and-stimulate-the-economy/jim-huffman/)

In making his case for infrastructure spending, the President described the state of the nation’s infrastructure as “inexcusable.” “Building a world-class transportation system,” said the President, “is part of what made us an economic superpower. And now we’re going to sit back and watch China build newer airports and faster railroads?” The President went on to say that there are “millions of unemployed construction workers [who] could build them right here in America.”

After months of Congressional focus on reducing the fiscal year deficit and the national debt, and in light lukewarm Republican reaction to the President’s speech, it is appears certain that Congress will not enact the President’s proposal in its entirety. Although the President asserted that the entire $450 billion program would require no new borrowing, he explicitly kicked the financing can down the road. The reality is that the spending cuts and tax increases necessary to finance the plan cannot be ensured by the current Congress. Thus, financing the President’s proposal is effectively delegated, like debt, to future Congresses and future generations of taxpayers.

But assuming the Republicans and fiscally conservative Democrats in Congress can be persuaded to incur more debt on the promise of lowering the unemployment rate, will the plan work? Keynesian theory says yes, though Krugman is certain to argue that the President’s proposal is still not big enough. But experience, both long term and from the 2009 stimulus effort, suggest otherwise.

As best one can tell from the vague description offered by the President, the two principal job creation initiatives in the Administration’s proposal are an extension of the payroll tax holiday and new infrastructure spending. Because it is popular with most taxpayers, the former could gain Republican support, although the experience of the past year, with the reduced payroll tax in effect, suggests that continued payroll tax relief is unlikely to contribute to significant job creation. As for infrastructure spending, the President argued that there are two objectives: 1) to create jobs in the near term and 2) to provide the infrastructure necessary for long term growth and economic prosperity.

As I pointed out in a chapter on infrastructure investment in Hoover’s Reacting to the Spending Spree: Policy Changes We Can Afford(2009), in promoting the 2009 stimulus bill the Obama Administration relied on wildly optimistic projections of job creation and economic growth. The Administration projected the creation of 47,000 jobs from each one billion dollars spent on infrastructure, while the Alliance of American Manufacturers (AAM) put the number at 18,000 jobs from the same spending. But as an unemployment rate still above 9% evidences, even the AAM projection was overly optimistic. The Obama Administration projected 3.7 percent GDP growth and nearly 3.7 million new jobs as a result of the 2009 stimulus. The record, sadly, speaks for itself.

There are several reasons why a new burst of infrastructure spending by the federal government is unlikely to stimulate a significant economic recovery.

 To create jobs in the near term, spending must be in the near term. Although spending planned for infrastructure was actually a small fraction of the 2009 stimulus package, there was enough to make clear that there are few, if any, “shovel ready” projects in our heavily regulated world. Even deferred maintenance often requires extensive regulatory approvals before work (and hiring) can begin.

 Pressures to create jobs in the short term, combined with the absence of shovel ready projects, leads to “make work” projects selected because they can be implemented immediately, and not because they are part of a comprehensive and long term infrastructure plan. The result, at best, is temporary employment and a completed project that is unlikely to contribute to long term economic growth.

 Another lesson relearned with the enactment of ARRA and the 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act is that rent seeking, on behalf of the district or state members of Congress represent, is difficult to overcome even when the President has declared an end to earmarks. In his Thursday speech the President insisted, again, that there would be no earmarks. It is possible that public opposition to earmarks (at least for others) is sufficiently strong to prevent a rerun of the 2009 scramble for shares of the federal largess. But absent earmarked spending, it is unlikely an infrastructure spending bill can be passed. And if a bill is passed with earmarked spending, the resulting infrastructure is, again, unlikely to be part of a considered plan that will promote long term economic growth.

 Although more muted than in the past, the President clearly remains committed to promoting “green jobs” and a “green economy.” While such spending might create some short term jobs, and there might be a long term future for alternative energy solutions, the recent failure of solar innovator Solyndra (and the earlier collapse of Spain’s alternative energy ambitions) should remind us that the much ballyhooed green economy will not be achieved in a timeframe relevant to solving current economic challenges.

 The idea of an infrastructure bank has been around for several years and was part of ARRA (as the National Infrastructure Reinvestment Bank). The idea is to attract private capital to infrastructure projects, a good idea that will only work if markets are allowed to play a significant role in the defining of infrastructure priorities. That seems unlikely in an Administration wedded to central planning and government control of the economy.

 Without significant reliance on market indicators of demand, government supplied infrastructure will be, as often as not, a net drag on economic development. The President promised no more “bridges to nowhere,” but without market signals it is difficult to know where nowhere, or somewhere, is. We are left to rely on experts (in the Progressive tradition) guided by visions of the good society, rather than user demand.

### -----Econ Defense – 2NC

#### US not key

The Economist 7 (November 23, “America’s Vulnerable Economy”, pg. 13)

The best hope that global growth can stay strong lies instead with emerging economies. A decade ago, the thought that so much depended on these crisis-prone places would have been terrifying. Yet thanks largely to economic reforms, their annual growth rate has surged to around 7%. This year they will contribute half of the globe's GDP growth, measured at market exchange rates, over three times as much as America. In the past, emerging economies have often needed bailing out by the rich world. This time they could be the rescuers. Of course, a recession in America would reduce emerging economies' exports, but they are less vulnerable than they used to be. America's importance as an engine of global growth has been exaggerated. Since 2000 its share of world imports has dropped from 19% to 14%. Its vast current-account deficit has started to shrink, meaning that America is no longer pulling along the rest of the world. Yet growth in emerging economies has quickened, partly thanks to demand at home. In the first half of this year the increase in consumer spending (in actual dollar terms) in China and India added more to global GDP growth than that in America. Most emerging economies are in healthier shape than ever (see article). They are no longer financially dependent on the rest of the world, but have large foreign-exchange reserves—no less than three-quarters of the global total. Though there are some notable exceptions, most of them have small budget deficits (another change from the past), so they can boost spending to offset weaker exports if need be.

#### 93 crises prove no war

Miller ‘00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

The question may be reformulated. **Do wars spring from** a popular reaction to a sudden **economic crisis** that
exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisi**s** in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War **they concluded that**:19 Much of **the conventional wisdom** about the political impact of economic crises **may be wrong** ... **The severity of economic crisis** – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - **bore** **no relationship** to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) **to an outbreak of violence** ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

### Election – 1NC

#### Obama’s not running on warming

MIHALCIK ’12 – Staff writer (Carrie, “Why is Obama tiptoeing around climate change?”. April 24. http://current.com/groups/news-blog/93752682\_why-is-obama-tiptoeing-around-climate-change.htm)

There was one noticeable omission from President Barack Obama's 2012 Earth Day proclamation -- any mention of climate change. In the 2011 Earth Day proclamation, Obama declared that no person could "escape the impact of climate change," but did his best to avoid the topic this year. The only line that hints at the existence of global warming is about cutting "greenhouse gas emissions."

Certainly the president is trying to avoid touching on controversial topics during an election year, but is climate change controversial anymore. Polls show a majority of Americans now believe in climate change, and ABC news reports that extreme weather, not campaigns by global warming denialists, is the only thing likely to change voters minds on the issue.

#### Flawed studies - warming’s not a threat and not anthropogenic

Leake 10 (Jonathan, Times Online, Citing John Christy of the UA Huntsville, a former author for the IPCC, “World may not be warming, say scientists,” 2-14, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7026317.ece?print=yes&randnum=1269060067737>)

The United Nations climate panel faces a new challenge with scientists casting doubt on its claim that global temperatures are rising inexorably because of human pollution. In its last assessment the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) said the evidence that the world was warming was “unequivocal”. It warned that greenhouse gases had already heated the world by 0.7C and that there could be 5C-6C more warming by 2100, with devastating impacts on humanity and wildlife. However, new research, including work by British scientists, is casting doubt on such claims. Some even suggest the world may not be warming much at all. “The temperature records cannot be relied on as indicators of global change,” said John Christy, professor of atmospheric science at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, a former lead author on the IPCC. The doubts of Christy and a number of other researchers focus on the thousands of weather stations around the world, which have been used to collect temperature data over the past 150 years. These stations, they believe, have been seriously compromised by factors such as urbanisation, changes in land use and, in many cases, being moved from site to site. Christy has published research papers looking at these effects in three different regions: east Africa, and the American states of California and Alabama. “The story is the same for each one,” he said. “The popular data sets show a lot of warming but the apparent temperature rise was actually caused by local factors affecting the weather stations, such as land development.” The IPCC faces similar criticisms from Ross McKitrick, professor of economics at the University of Guelph, Canada, who was invited by the panel to review its last report. The experience turned him into a strong critic and he has since published a research paper questioning its methods. “We concluded, with overwhelming statistical significance, that the IPCC’s climate data are contaminated with surface effects from industrialisation and data quality problems. These add up to a large warming bias,” he said. Such warnings are supported by a study of US weather stations co-written by Anthony Watts, an American meteorologist and climate change sceptic. His study, which has not been peer reviewed, is illustrated with photographs of weather stations in locations where their readings are distorted by heat-generating equipment. Some are next to air- conditioning units or are on waste treatment plants. One of the most infamous shows a weather station next to a waste incinerator. Watts has also found examples overseas, such as the weather station at Rome airport, which catches the hot exhaust fumes emitted by taxiing jets. In Britain, a weather station at Manchester airport was built when the surrounding land was mainly fields but is now surrounded by heat-generating buildings. Terry Mills, professor of applied statistics and econometrics at Loughborough University, looked at the same data as the IPCC. He found that the warming trend it reported over the past 30 years or so was just as likely to be due to random fluctuations as to the impacts of greenhouse gases. Mills’s findings are to be published in Climatic Change, an environmental journal. “The earth has gone through warming spells like these at least twice before in the last 1,000 years,” he said.

#### Romney’s the same as Obama on foreign policy

WALTER 4/3/2012 – a Ph.D. student of the Department of International Relations and European Studies at the Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University (Aaron, T. “Romney’s Foreign Policy in the Middle East”. April 3. http://www.e-ir.info/2012/04/03/romneys-foreign-policy-in-the-middle-east/)

Under a Romney Administration, only minor changes would occur within the foreign policy of the United States; in reality, the difference would be largely semantic. His statements and campaign policy positions indicate that Romney would be a conservative and hawkish president. But a Romney Administration would not only continue the current policy initiatives of the Obama Administration, but those of the George W. Bush presidency, too. On topics ranging from Iran’s nuclear program to American involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, there would not be any significant change. Romney’s view of the Middle East During the 2008 Republican presidential primaries, the Middle East was discussed in both debates between candidates. These primaries took place while the surge strategy in Iraq was being implemented, which Romney supported. This put him squarely behind the policy of then-President George W. Bush. He also spoke against setting a timetable for U.S. troop withdrawal, in the belief that such statements gave Iraqi insurgents the knowledge of when to increase attacks in efforts to sow sectarian conflict. Romney also voiced concerns that Iraq’s neighbors would take advantage of this weak country to try to influence its domestic and foreign affairs. Romney argued that “dividing Iraq up into parts and later walking away would present grave risks to the United States and the world. Iran could seize the Shiite south, al Qaeda could dominate the Sunni west, and Kurdish nationalism could destabilize the border with Turkey. A regional conflict could ensue, perhaps even requiring the return of U.S. troops under far worse circumstances.” [1] In addition to supporting the surge strategy, Romney was in favor of continued efforts to build democracy within Iraq and was critical of the conciliatory talk by then-presidential candidate Barack Obama towards Syria and Iran in his first year as president. Romney responded bluntly: “Having the president meet with the authoritarian tyrants of the world is remarkably poor judgment.” [2] Romney reiterated his opposition to authoritarian regimes, focusing mostly on Iran, during the 2012 campaign. While Romney does not believe that the US is unable to deal with Iran militarily, he “would not use ground forces for a possible eventual attack on Iran but instead would use ‘blockade, bombardment and surgical military strikes’ for the purpose.” [3] Romney was asked in the New Hampshire Republican debate if he agreed “that the use of tactical nuclear weapons potentially, would be possible if that were the only way to stop Iran from developing a nuclear bomb?” He responded: “You don’t take options off the table, but what you do is stand back and say, ‘What’s going on here?’ You see what’s happening in Sudan and Afghanistan, in Iraq and Iran. All over the world, we’re seeing the same thing happening, and that is people are testing the United States of America. And we have to make sure they understand that we’re not arrogant; we have resolve. And we have the strength to protect our interests and to protect people who love liberty.” [4] Romney also tried to influence world opinion against Iran as early as his 2008 presidential run, by requesting that the United Nations not allow Iran’s president to speak at the opening of the 62nd session of the United Nations General Assembly. Iranian President Ahmadinejad was scheduled to speak; Romney issued a thinly-veiled threat to cut U.S. funding of the U.N. [5] On Iran’s nuclear program, Romney stated that it was “unacceptable”, and vowed that he would send aircraft-carriers to the region to make clear “that a military option…remains on the table”. However, these statements and actions largely echo those of President Obama. [6] According to a view from his official campaign website, Romney in fact supports a continuity of official U.S. policy towards Iran. He is in favor of economic sanctions, including denying Iran access to international banking, discouraging it from obtaining credit and divesting from companies that support the Iranian regime. Finally, he supports diplomatic isolation, which coincidentally already exists between the U.S. and Iran. Furthermore, in an overt recognition of U.S. support of the so-called 2009 Green Revolution, Romney would support the Iranian opposition by improving the flow of information to the Iranian population about its own government’s repressive activities and refusing to stand silent while the Iranian regime ruthlessly terrorizes its own people. However, the aforementioned positions are all policy actions begun by President George W. Bush in 2008 or intensified by the Obama administration in 2010 and 2011. One could argue, as Molly Worthen suggests, that Mormonism, and its unique brand of evangelizing, will influence Romney’s approach if elected.[7] However, while partisan rhetoric may be required for the campaign trail, Worthen argues that, “international experience and instinctive prudence would rein in [Romney’s] commitment to any ideological grand strategy.” Another impediment to any radical departure from U.S. foreign policy is the fact that Romney faces lingering suspicions by core Republican constituency of how ‘tough’ he would be as president, including questions on his commitment to Israel. Israel: A vital U.S. interest On the special relationship with Israel, Romney reaffirms that Israel is America’s closest ally in the Middle East, and calls Israel’s existence as a Jewish state “a vital U.S. national interest” [8], in a calculated effort to gather the financial and electoral support of American Jews. [9] Moreover, while Romney promises in his campaign website to “work intensively with Turkey and Egypt to shore up the now fraying relationships with Israel that have underpinned peace in the Middle East for decades” [10], such language, translated as policy, would mean only the continuation of present U.S. policy. While Romney’s rhetoric towards Israel has been in the context of Iran, in 2007 he presented a speech at the Herlzliya conference in Israel, calling upon Arab states to stop funding and arming to Hezbollah and Hamas. [11] With specific regard to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, Romney has argued that the Obama administration, “threw Israel under the bus by laying out [Obama’s] view of the policies he thought Israel should adopt in the peace process,” particularly the president’s May 2011 suggestion of a return to the 1967 borders as the basis for negotiations. [12] This is fantastic political rhetoric, but George W. Bush endorsed this idea, too. Hence, as Michael Cohen wrote: “In principle, at least, it’s very difficult to see how these priorities are in any way different from those underpinning Obama’s foreign policy. Notwithstanding Romney’s exceptionalist rhetoric and constant complaints that Obama regularly apologizes for America, in broad strokes the two men view the world and American power basically along the same lines. If there are any identifiable differences between the two candidates it is in their political bluster — and this has the potential to be far more consequential than actual policy alternatives.” [13] More of the Same Romney’s stated foreign policy positions offer broad continuity with those of the Obama administration. For example, his campaign has produced a voluminous white paper on foreign policy. Romney’s instinct appears to be to avoid controversy and play safe. [14] But there are some contradictory statements from his 2012 foreign policy paper, entitled An American Century. While Romney claims that the Obama administration is “undermining allies, only to affirm several pages later that a Romney administration would “reassure allies”, he provides very little clarification of who those allies are. [15] Overall, Mitt Romney’s foreign policy acumen has improved significantly since his 2008 run, when it was apparent in debates with Senator John McCain that this was not his area of expertise.[1] But all the positions which Romney has advocated are standard Republican Party talking points, such as robust defense spending and strong ties to Israel. Some argue that a Romney presidency would represent a more hawkish approach to U.S. foreign policy.[2] But as Heather Hurlburt put it, Romney’s tough rhetoric is “the kind of posturing that may be effective with the primary electorate but will be quite embarrassing if he winds up in office.” Furthermore, the experienced staff of foreign policy advisors Romney has assembled indicates the triumph of realism and pragmatism over ideology. The simple truth is that a Romney foreign policy would not significantly alter current U.S. foreign policy. [19] The greatest distinction between Obama and Romney is of a stylistic nature; one is more measured, the other bolder. There is very little substantial difference of opinion between them. Conclusion American presidential elections are fascinating to observe; each election cycle follows a particular pattern. During the primary season, the candidate’s statements are abstract, generalized, and usually employ ideologically-specific language. Once nomination is guaranteed, the language used for particular issues becomes precise, the ideological language remains, but is not employed as often, as the candidate attempts to secure support from undecided voters and independents. Romney’s use of language portrays a candidate with firm ideas and unchangeable policy positions. However, it is more realistic to expect that these ideas and policy positions would probably be altered to fit the realities of foreign policy challenges imposed upon the incumbent of the White House. Romney would be a conservative American president who would use strong, bellicose language, but keep the status quo once in office.

#### Asian war is unlikely --- all potential conflicts are solved by regional stability initiatives throughout the region

Bitzinger and Desker ‘8 (senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328\_731200556\_906256449.pdf)

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints**. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common eopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

### -----Warming Defense – 2NC

#### No extinction

**NIPCC 11**. Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. Surviving the unprecedented climate change of the IPCC. 8 March 2011. <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>

In a paper published in *Systematics and Biodiversity*, Willis *et al*. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas *et al*., 2004; Solomon *et al*., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford *et al*., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### If it’s real then it’s irreversible - it’s too late to stop the greenhouse effect

Harris 9 (Richard, Science Reporter for National Public Radio, Peabody Award Winner, American Association for the Advancement of Science Journalism Award, “Global Warming Irreversible, Study Says,” January 26th, NPR, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=99888903)

Climate change is essentially irreversible, according to a sobering new scientific study. As carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise, the world will experience more and more long-term environmental disruption. The damage will persist even when, and if, emissions are brought under control, says study author Susan Solomon, who is among the world's top climate scientists. "We're used to thinking about pollution problems as things that we can fix," Solomon says. "Smog, we just cut back and everything will be better later. Or haze, you know, it'll go away pretty quickly." That's the case for some of the gases that contribute to climate change, such as methane and nitrous oxide. But as Solomon and colleagues suggest in a new study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, it is not true for the most abundant greenhouse gas: carbon dioxide. Turning off the carbon dioxide emissions won't stop global warming. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide that the climate would go back to normal in 100 years or 200 years. What we're showing here is that's not right. It'**s** essentially an irreversible change that will last for more than a thousand years," Solomon says. This is because the oceans are currently soaking up a lot of the planet's excess heat — and a lot of the carbon dioxide put into the air. The carbon dioxide and heat will eventually start coming out of the ocean. And that will take place for many hundreds of years.

### -----Romney LFB Defense – 2NC

#### Can’t accurately predict what Romney will do

REUTERS 4/12/2012 (“Analysis: Romney defines hawkish yet murky foreign policy”. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/12/us-usa-campaign-romney-policy-idUSBRE83B07Y20120412)

Analysts wonder whether Romney - who has moved to the right on issues such as healthcare, abortion and immigration during his run for the Republican nomination - is talking tough on foreign policy merely as a political strategy. "Romney seems to believe that the way to beat Obama is to paint himself as the tough guy when it comes to national security," says Charles Kupchan, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and a senior member of the National Security Council under President Bill Clinton. "We simply don't know whether he will stick to that." George W. Bush, after all, pledged a "humble" foreign policy and an end to nation-building before the attacks of September 11, 2001, changed everything. Even those currently closest to Romney, analysts said, may still be largely in the dark about how Romney would handle foreign policy. "On economic issues, it is clear that Romney has his vision and everyone else follows. But I don't think that's the case with foreign affairs," says Douglas A. Ollivant, a former National Security Council director for Iraq and now senior national security fellow at the New America Foundation. "I know some of the people who advise Romney, and right now I don't think even they know," Ollivant said. "They are just all pitching and hoping for a seat at the top table." PORTRAYING ROMNEY AS 'ALL OVER THE MAP' Democratic officials believe that Romney's vulnerabilities on foreign policy range from awkward statements that they believe show his naiveté - such as when he said Russia is Washington's "number one geopolitical foe" - to a failure to truly come up with different or coherent policies on Iran or Afghanistan. "The president's record stands in stark contrast to Mitt Romney, who has been all over the map on the key foreign policy challenges that face our nation," an Obama campaign official said. Despite his international business background, critics said, Romney's foreign experience is weak, largely limited to fundraising for the Mormon church and working with the International Olympic Committee to salvage the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Games. Even Romney's supporters seem to acknowledge as much. "You certainly wouldn't get a President Romney doing what Obama did and phoning Vladimir Putin from Air Force One to congratulate him on a stolen election," says Danielle Pletka, vice president for foreign and defense policy studies at the conservative American Enterprise Institute. "But can we say whether (Romney) would be more or less likely to launch the kind of intervention we saw in Libya? I think at the moment we simply do not know." Romney has hired a list of advisers that reads like a who's who of right-leaning foreign and national security affairs specialists - many of them veterans of George W. Bush's administration. "On foreign policy ... Romney still has to show us who he really is," says Nikolas Gvosdev, professor of national security studies at the U.S. Naval War College. But "he has a reputation for being very analytical and thorough, and that could work for him when it comes to foreign affairs." Prominent Romney advisers include former CIA Director Michael Hayden and a conservative clique that includes writer Robert Kagan and John Bolton, a former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. Williamson said Romney is intent on considering as many views as possible.

### -----Asia War Defense – 2NC

#### ASEAN solves stability.

Noi ‘7 (Goh Sui Noi, @ Straits Times, 8-23-07 [Asean 'holds key to building stable East Asian region'; S'pore official says grouping plays vital role by providing neutral platform, lexis]

GOVERNMENTS in the East Asian region have realised that it is in their nations' interests to build a community to preserve **stability** for growth, a senior Singapore official has said. And building such a community depends on Asean's ability to integrate deeper and faster, said Mr Bilahari Kausikan, Second Permanent Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Ministry. In addition, a grouping of the region's think-tanks, which held a conference in Singapore, yesterday called for greater cultural exchanges to promote community-building. 'An East Asian community will...depend on Asean's ability to integrate deeper and faster and create a community of its own,' Mr Kausikan said on Tuesday. He explained that the complexity and sensitivity of relationships among major powers meant that Asean played an essential role in providing a relatively neutral platform for an East Asian architecture. 'This is the real meaning of the oft-repeated refrain 'Asean in the driver's seat',' he said. He added that this was the broader significance of the Asean Charter, which will be discussed at the next summit of the 10-nation grouping to be held in Singapore in November. The charter, which will give a legal basis to the grouping, is expected to deepen integration within Asean.

#### War is unlikely, and lack of alliances mean it wouldn’t escalate

Berry 1 (Dr. Nicholas, Senior Analyst – CDI, “The Security Environment in Asia”, Defense Monitor – Center for Defense Information, 4, May, http://www.cdi.org/dm/2001/issue4/asiansecurity.html)

The Asian security environment is not organized for major war. An aggressive China could transform the security environment into one more conducive to major war. Only an aggressive China could end Japanese pacifism. The challenge for the United States is to keep China from becoming aggressive, a foreign policy posture that China itself wants desperately to avoid. The United States must constrain Taiwan's policy towards the mainland and not allow Taiwan to manage Washington's policy towards Beijing. The challenge for China is to keep the United States from forcing China to be aggressive over Taiwan. Multilateral cooperation is required to contain and eventually resolve the myriad bilateral disputes in Asia that could explode out of control. Taking each in turn: 1. The Asian security environment is not organized for war. So far, widespread latent hostilities, absent a serious regional aggressor, have prevented the region's multipolar structure from becoming bipolar and thus organized for war. Security relations in Asia are fragmented. In particular, China lacks allies. If Japan is the most resented, China is the most feared as the power on the rise and infused with enthusiastic nationalism. Erstwhile imperialist powers, Japan and Russia, are constrained by history. All states are economically interdependent, harbor anti-war sentiments, and have major domestic problems, including maintaining government legitimacy. War is not a rational foreign policy option for anyone. The strongest power in Asia, the United States, is determined to prevent war in the region, but if one occurs, the United States has the capability to determine the outcome to its advantage (albeit at great cost). Under the Powell Doctrine, there will be no more Koreas or Vietnams. Any Asian aggressor will suffer huge losses and defeat. No state will willingly confront the United States militarily. The United States has the capacity to be the inhibitor of war.

### A2: Air Pollution Addon – 2NC

#### Air quality is improving - their evidence flawed

Hayward 4 (Steven F., Senior Fellow – Pacific Research Institute, Index of Leading Indicators, http://www.pacificresearch.org/pub/sab/enviro/04\_enviroindex/Enviro\_2004.pdf)

Average **vehicle emissions are dropping** about **10 percent per year as the fleet turns over to inherently cleaner vehicles,** including modern SUVs. · Since 1985, nitrogen oxides (**NOX) emissions** from cars **have dropped 56 percent** and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are down 67 percent, according to the most recent EPA data. · Stories touting an uptick in ozone pollution are based largely **on the weekend effect**, a paradoxical situation **in which the** weekend **drop in NOX emissions**, from 10 to 40 percent, **causes an increase in ozone** levels. · Asthma rates in children under the age of five rose more than 160 percent between 1980 and 1994, while **air pollution rates fell from 25 to 80 percent**. Was 2003 the year we started losing the battle against ozone smog? That is what you would think if you read the media headlines. .Smog Woes Back on Horizon,. trumpeted an abovethe- fold Los Angeles Times headline in mid-July.1 .It.s One Smoggy Summer,. declared the Associated Press. And USA Today joined the chorus in October with .Smoggy Skies Persist Despite Decade of Work..2 Unfortunately, a reader of these articles will learn very little about what is behind the recent uptick in ozone levels. To the contrary, **most media stories convey** loads of misinformation**.** The USA Today story, for example, offers this explanation of stubborn ozone levels: .One likely reason why the smog isn.t lifting: Americans are driving more miles than they did in the 1980s. And they.re driving vehicles that give off more pollution than the cars they drove in the .80s. (emphasis added). USA Today needs a better fact-checking department.

#### Global air pollution inevitable

Watson 5 (Traci, Staff Writer – USA Today, “Air Pollution From Other Countries Drifts into USA”, USA Today, 3-13, http://www.usatoday.com/weather/resources/climate/2005-03-13-pollution-\_x.htm)

Americans drive imported cars, wear imported clothes and chug imported beers. Now scientists are discovering another, less welcome import into the USA: air pollution. Mercury from China, dust from Africa, smog from Mexico — all of it drifts freely across U.S. borders and contaminates the air millions of Americans breathe, according to recent research from Harvard University, the University of Washington and many other institutions where scientists are studying air pollution. There are no boundaries in the sky to stop such pollution, no Border Patrol agents to capture it. Pollution wafting into the USA accounts for 30% of the nation's ozone, an important component of smog, says researcher David Parrish of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. By the year 2020, Harvard University's Daniel Jacob says, imported pollution will be the primary factor degrading visibility in our national parks. While the United States is cutting its own emissions, some nations, especially China, are belching out more and more dirty air. As a result, overseas pollution could partly cancel out improvements in U.S. air quality that have cost billions of dollars.

#### The impact’s empirically denied

Lomborg 5 (Bjorn, Adjunct Prof at the Copenhagen Business School, Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Centre, and Former Director of the Environmental Assessment Institute in Copenhagen, 8-15, “Take a Deep Breath…Air Quality is Getting Better,” THE GUARDIAN, Lexis)

We often assume that air pollution is a modern phenomenon, and that it has got worse in recent times. However, air pollution has been a major nuisance for most of civilisation, and the air of the western world has not been as clean as it is now for a long time. In ancient Rome, the statesman Seneca complained about "the stink, soot and heavy air" in the city. In 1257, when Henry III's wife visited Nottingham, she found the stench of smoke from coal burning so intolerable that she left for fear of her life, and in 1285 London's air was so polluted that Edward I established the world's first air pollution commission. Shelley wrote: "Hell must be much like London, a smoky and populous city." For London, the consequences were dire. In the 18th century it had 20 foggy days a year, but this had increased to almost 60 by the end of the 19th century: this meant that London got 40% less sunshine than the surrounding towns, and the number of thunderstorms doubled in London from the early-18th to the late-19th century. We have data for air pollution in London since 1585, estimated from coal imports till 1935 and adjusted to measured pollution from the 1920s till today. This shows how levels of smoke and sulphur pollution increased dramatically over the 300 years from 1585, reaching a maximum in the late 19th century, only to have dropped even faster ever since, such that the levels of the 1980s and1990s were below the levels of the late 16th century. And despite increasing traffic, particulate emissions in the UK are expected to decrease over the next 10 years by 30%. Smoke and particles are probably by far the most dangerous pollutant, and London's air has not been so free of them since the middle ages.