## Disad Links

### Elections Links

#### High-speed rail unpopular- prefer our evidence about likely voters

SSN 11

(Sunshine State News, 2-15-11, http://www.sunshinestatenews.com/blog/new-poll-finds-more-americans-against-obamas-high-speed-rail-plan-it, “New Poll Finds More Americans Against Obama's High-Speed Rail Plan Than For It”, js)

A poll from Rasmussen Reports found that likely voters are not buying President Barack Obama’s plan to dramatically increase high-speed rail in the United States. The poll found 41 percent of those surveyed backed the plan with 46 percent against it. There is a partisan divide on the issue with 59 percent of Democrats behind it, 62 percent of Republicans against it and 55 percent of independents opposing it. ¶ The poll also found Americans think more high-speed rail will not help create jobs -- but slashing government spending would. Most of those surveyed, 57 percent, thought cutting government would lead to more jobs while 28 percent thought that high-speed rail could lead to more employment.

#### 59% of California voters oppose high-speed rail- growing budget deficit, education cuts, and lack of confidence in the government.

USC Dornsife, 6/2

(USC College of Letters, 6-2-12, Arts and Sciences, http://dornsife.usc.edu/usc-dornsife-los-angeles-times-poll-high-speed-rail-june-2012/, “Majority of Californians Would Oppose High-Speed Rail if Given Another Chance to Vote on It”, js)

In 2008, California voters approved a ballot proposition to borrow $9 billion to help fund a high-speed rail line, which is supported by Governor Jerry Brown and President Barack Obama. In the latest poll, conducted May 17-21, 59 percent of voters said they would oppose the plan if given another chance to vote on it, while 33 percent said they would support funding high-speed rail. ¶ "California voters have clearly reconsidered their support for high-speed rail," said Dan Schnur, director of the USC Dornsife/Los Angeles Times Poll and director of the Unruh Institute of Politics at USC. "They want the chance to vote again — and they want to vote no. The growing budget deficit is making Californians hesitant about spending so much money on a project like this one when they're seeing cuts to public education and law enforcement. But they also seem to be wary as to whether state government can run a big speed rail system effectively."

### Politics Links

#### Our link outweighs their link turns—Republicans hate high speed rail and Democrats won’t stand up for the proposal:

Fawn **Johnson, 1/17/2012** (staff writer, “High-Speed Rail in a Coma,” Accessed 7/19/2012 at

<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php>, rwg)

Policymakers' appetite for high-speed rail seems to be **dwindling to almost nothing**. It is old news that congressional Republicans are **not fans** of President Obama's high-speed rail initiative. They view it as a **waste of taxpayer dollars** at a time when belt-tightening is of the highest order. The national conversation has not advanced much beyond that point, perhaps because the biggest fans of high-speed rail are **distracted by other problems**. Democrats in Congress **raised only a faint protest** when the fiscal 2012 appropriations bill cut funding for the Transportation Department's high-speed rail program. Republicans who ostensibly like high-speed rail said the cuts will allow rail enthusiasts to start over from scratch.

#### Their polls on High speed rail are flawed—its a push poll and questions are rigged

Engel 6/11 - Mark, writer for High Speed Train Talk

(June 11, 2012, <http://high-speedtraintalk.blogspot.com>, CS)

Let's take a look at the recent Harris Poll on high-speed rail. While they found that "most Americans are unaware of high-speed rail" most of those Americans also favor it. Huh?¶ These 'loaded-dice' polls are favorites of the CHSRA and other pro-HSR organizations. They "prove" that most of us are desperate to have it, regardless of costs. ¶ Yet, with only a little digging, we find that these polls are nothing more than "push-polls." That is, they ask loaded questions that rig the answers to be favorable to what they want as the outcome.¶ This Harris poll is no exception. ¶ ===============================¶ <http://www.hartfordbusiness.com/news17029.html>¶ Most Americans unaware of high-speed rail¶ 02/24/11¶ A new poll shows only a third of Americans are aware of their states' high-speed rail projects, such as the Connecticut proposal for express rail from New Haven to Springfield as part of the bigger northern New England corridor.¶ The Harris Interactive poll conducted Jan. 17-24 shows 66 percent of Americans are likely to consider using high-speed rail when traveling for pleasure and 33 percent would use it to travel for business.¶ The low awareness of proposed projects in their state - 35 percent -- shows rail only generates interest in places with visible projects, such as California and Florida, said Linda Schulz, vice president of public affairs and policy at Harris Interactive.¶ "The relatively low awareness of high-speed rail across the country is not surprising given the disparate, regional nature of today's hottest HSR debates," Schultz said in a statement. "However, as discussions become more prominent in more areas, and as projects get underway, we will be well positioned to monitor changing awareness and attitudes."¶ The poll showed people would choose high-speed rail depending on cost, location of train station, overall trip time and safety.¶ Connecticut's proposed line would link the state's major population centers of New Haven and Hartford while linking to nearby states, such as New York and Massachusetts. The New England corridor plans call for links to New York City, Boston and Montreal.¶ ==================================¶ Below is the Harris International Press Release for this Poll. It also includes some of the actual questions and the data it produced. With all due respect for Linda Schulz, with whom I spoke, I find this poll highly biased in favor of high-speed rail and the results of these questions not unexpected, given the questions. Smart and pleasant, Linda did acknowledge that she had a strong interest in high-speed rail, and I can only presume from the polling questions asked, that her interest is biased to be highly favorable to high-speed rail. In response to my question about sponsorship of this particular poll, she answered that it was supported internally, with no outside funding.¶ Here is the first question: ¶ "High-speed rail is a type of passenger rail transport between major cities that operates at substantially faster speeds than current intercity passenger trains in the U.S. High-speed rail is designed to provide fast, reliable, and convenient service between select major cities. It operates using electric power and often includes onboard amenities such as food and beverage service and Wi-fi access. Do you know if high-speed passenger rail service is being proposed or under development in your state?"¶ That's the base-line question upon which all the other questions depend, since that question defines what the topic is. It's like asking, "Here is a delicious apple. It tastes great and is good for you. Do you know about apples?" And the next question is a follow-up: "If it was paid for by the government, would you want one?" And, finally, if you were asked, "If you were given an apple as described here, would you eat it?" How would you answer that question? ¶ Here's that next question: ¶ "Development of the intercity passenger rail system is paid for by both Federal and state governments, similar to how most other infrastructure projects are funded. Currently the Federal Government is offering funds to the states for high-speed rail projects. Knowing this, how do you feel about state and federal funds being used for High-speed Rail?"¶ What do you make of this question? I read it as intimating that we, the taxpayers, don't have to pay to build it or pay to operate it. The question sounds like this train will be free since it is paid for by the government, state and/or federal. The inference is that since someone else is paying for this train, not us, what's not to like?¶ As you read through these questions and the results, it turns out that the most educated in their sample like the train the most. That's because they correlate positively with the higher income and probably have HSR train travel experience in Europe or Asia. Again, what's not to like? In addition, the higher income cohort has the wherewithal to pay for the train tickets, which are the most expensive for this mode of travel. Those in the lower income or education brackets have less remunerative jobs and are the least likely to be the train riders. ¶ This study, then, makes one compelling point that tends to be over-looked. We've said it often. High-speed rail is for rich people, not poor people. It's a luxury ride for the well to do. It's the premium way to travel by rail. Is this something that our governments -- state and federal -- need to pay for and subsequently subsidize? I don't think so!

### Spending Links

#### Plan costs half a trillion dollars:

Randal **O'Toole, 5/4/2009** (senior fellow with the Cato Institute, “High-Speed Rail Is No Solution,”

<http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/highspeed-rail-is-no-solution>, rwg)

California wants to build a true high-speed rail line between San Francisco and Los Angeles, capable of top speeds of 220 miles per hour and average speeds of 140 miles per hour. The environmental analysis report for the California high-speed rail projects costs of $33 billion for 400 miles, while the Midwest Rail Initiative projects costs of $7.7 billion for 3,150 miles of moderate-speed rail. That's $82 million per mile for true high-speed rail (partly because the California project goes through some mountains) and only $2.4 million for moderate-speed rail. All else being equal, high-speed rail will cost 10 to 12 times more than moderate-speed rail. A true, national high-speed rail network would **cost more than half a trillion dollars**.

### Spending Links—Answers to: “High Speed Rail is Cheap”

#### Costs are more expensive from original approval and there is still no actual funding- California Proves

Moore et. al, vice president of research at Reason Foundation, 12

(Adrian T.,Wendell Cox, *the principal of Wendell Cox Consultancy/Demographia,* and *Joseph Vranich, an Irvine, Calif.-based business consultan,* July 2, 2012, “5 Reasons the California High-Speed Rail Project Shouldn’t Get More Money”, <http://reason.org/news/show/california-high-speed-rail-funding>, lkh)

Despite California’s budget deficit rising to $16 billion recently, Gov. Jerry Brown is asking state legislators for $6 billion in bonds to launch construction on the proposed high-speed rail system. Voters approved a $9.95 billion bond package for the “bullet train” in 2008, but just about everything about the rail system has changed since then.¶ The California High-Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) issued a revised business plan in April that calls for a 130-mile segment running from Bakersfield to Madera in the state’s Central Valley. If the Central Valley leg is built, the plan says the system would eventually share tracks with commuter trains in the Bay Area and Los Angeles, in what it is calling a “blended” approach. Not exactly the bullet train from San Diego to Los Angeles to the Bay Area and Sacramento that voters were sold back in 2008.¶ The last thing California should do right now is add billions more in bond debt. Beyond the most obvious – the state simply cannot afford it – there are at least five major reasons California shouldn’t move forward on this rail project.¶ 1. Broken Proposition 1A Promises: The Costs Look Nothing Like What Voters Approved¶ The text of Proposition 1A asking California voters to approve $9.95 billion in bonds for the project in 2008 said: “The total cost to develop and construct the entire high-speed train system would be about $45 billion.”¶ Now the High-Speed Rail Authority says the price tag for a scaled down system will be $68.4 billion. Last year, the HSRA actually estimated the costs would be over $98 billion but to lower the sticker shock by $30 billion they’ve shifted to a “blended” plan that uses slower, existing rail tracks instead of building the exclusive tracks capable of handling high-speed trains that they originally planned on.¶ The official proponent's argument in the Proposition 1A ballot pamphlet also promised voters that ticket prices would be “about $50 a person.” Now, they are saying tickets would cost an average of $81 each way, with “express” tickets for the fastest trips costing $123 one-way.¶ The costs have changed so much from what voters were promised that funding should be halted until the HSRA fulfills its 2008 promises to voters, or until voters get to approve the changes. Several groups, including popular KFI radio talk show hosts John and Ken in Los Angeles, are starting to get the signatures needed to put a re-vote of the high-speed rail initiative on the ballot.¶ 2. There’s Still No Legitimate Funding Plan¶ The California High-Speed Rail Authority says it will need $53 to $62 billion to build the Phase 1 Blended System, which would run from Los Angeles to San Francisco. Sacramento and San Diego appear to have been dropped from the plan. The state currently has the $9.95 billion in taxpayer-backed bonds originally approved by Proposition 1A plus an additional $3.5 billion in federal grants. But where is the remaining $40-$50 billion going to come from?¶ In April, the nonpartisan Legislative Analyst’s Office wrote, “We find that HSRA has not provided sufficient detail and justification to the Legislature regarding its plan to build a high–speed train system. Specifically, funding for the project remains highly speculative and important details have not been sorted out. We recommend the Legislature not approve the Governor's various budget proposals to provide additional funding for the project.”¶ If the state starts building a high-speed train system somewhere between Bakersfield and Fresno it will run out of money well before the system is finished. That’s okay with many train advocates, who figure once construction begins the government will be forced to find the rest of the money to avoid having a partially built $10 billion train to nowhere sitting in the Central Valley. But the legislature can’t afford to be so fiscally reckless. It needs to demand a detailed plan showing how the full rail system will be funded before approving the bond money to start construction.¶

### **Spending Links**

#### **China proves: High Speed Rail is incredibly expensive:**

Lane 11 (Charles, an American journalist and editor who is an editorial writer for The Washington Post and a regular guest on Fox News Channel, April 22, 2011, The Washington Post “China’s train Wreck”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/chinas-train-wreck/2011/04/21/AFqjRWRE_story.html>, ak)

For the past eight years, [Liu Zhijun](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/25/AR2011022500616.html) was one of the most influential people in China. As minister of railways, Liu ran China’s $300 billion high-speed rail project. U.S., European and Japanese contractors jostled for a piece of the business while foreign journalists gushed over China’s latest high-tech marvel.¶ Today, Liu Zhijun is ruined, and his high-speed rail project is in trouble. On Feb. 25, he was fired for “severe violations of discipline” — code for embezzling tens of millions of dollars. Seems his ministry has run up $271 billion in debt — roughly five times the level that bankrupted General Motors. But ticket sales can’t cover debt service that will total $27.7 billion in 2011 alone. Safety concerns also are cropping up.¶ Faced with a financial and public relations disaster, China put the brakes on Liu’s program. On April 13, the government cut bullet-train speeds [30 mph](http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/china-slows-down-showcase-bullet-trains-after-warnings-about-safety-cost-complaints/2011/04/14/AFVA8IaD_story.html) to improve safety, energy efficiency and affordability. The Railway Ministry’s tangled finances are being audited. Construction plans, too, are being reviewed. ¶ Liu’s legacy, in short, is a system that could drain China’s economic resources for years. So much for the grand project that Thomas Friedman of the New York Times likened to a “[moon shot](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/26/opinion/26friedman.html)” and that President Obama held up as a model for the United States. ¶ Rather than demonstrating the advantages of centrally planned long-term investment, as its foreign admirers sometimes suggested, China’s bullet-train experience shows what can go wrong when an unelected elite, influenced by corrupt opportunists, gives orders that all must follow — without the robust public discussion we would have in the states. ¶ The fact is that China’s train wreck was eminently foreseeable. High-speed rail is a capital-intensive undertaking that requires huge borrowing upfront to finance tracks, locomotives and cars, followed by years in which ticket revenue covers debt service — if all goes well. “Any . . . shortfall in ridership or yield, can quickly create financial stress,” warns a [2010 World Bank](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2010/07/26/000334955_20100726032714/Rendered/PDF/558560WP0Box341SR1v08121jul101final.pdf) staff report. ¶ Such “shortfalls” are all too common. Japan’s bullet trains needed a bailout in 1987. Taiwan’s line opened in 2007 and needed a government rescue in 2009. In France, only the Paris-Lyon high-speed line is in the black.

### Air Trade-off DA: DA Turns Environment Advantage

#### Future airplanes are green

Stephenson, writer for Boeing, 10

(Daryl, 8-16-10, <http://www.boeing.com/Features/2010/06/corp_envision_06_14_10.html>, “Envisioning tomorrow’s aircraft”, ks)

What might future commercial airplane designs look like 25 to 30 years from now?¶ Two teams led by Boeing Research & Technology have completed 18-month studies on that question and have submitted their findings to NASA under a program called N+3, which denotes three generations beyond the current transport fleet.¶ After examining various subsonic and supersonic concepts, the teams have come up with potential configurations that may offer dramatic improvements in operational and environmental performance over the aircraft of today to meet aggressive goals set by NASA.¶ The Boeing subsonic team, which includes BR&T, Boeing Commercial Airplanes, General Electric and Georgia Tech, has looked at five concepts as part of the SUGAR (Subsonic Ultra Green Aircraft Research) project. The concepts include two conventional reference configurations, similar in appearance to a 737 (nicknamed SUGAR Free and Refined SUGAR), two versions of a new design high span, strut-braced wing aircraft (referred to as SUGAR High and SUGAR Volt), and a hybrid wing body configuration (called SUGAR Ray).¶ The team’s report provides detailed benefits and drawbacks as well as recommendations for further study, but doesn’t show favorites. “No single concept met all of the study goals, so we did not pick a preferred concept,” said team leader Marty Bradley of BR&T.¶ For the subsonic concept, hybrid electric engine technology "is a clear winner because it can potentially improve performance relative to all of the NASA goals."¶ However, the team has found that the SUGAR Volt concept (which adds an electric battery gas turbine hybrid propulsion system) can reduce fuel burn by greater than 70 percent and total energy use by 55 percent when battery energy is included. Moreover, the fuel burn reduction and the ‘greening’ of the electrical power grid can produce large reductions in emissions of life cycle CO2 and nitrous oxide. Hybrid electric propulsion also has the potential to shorten takeoff distance and reduce noise.¶ The SUGAR team’s report concludes that hybrid electric engine technology “is a clear winner, because it can potentially improve performance relative to all of the NASA goals.”¶ However, Bradley said, in order for the hybrid electric concept to be competitive, battery technology “needs to improve many, many times over what we have today. Battery technology is being worked around the world, especially in the auto and electronics industries. We need to leverage that work to see if we can get the improvement we need in an aviation compatible package.”¶ The SUGAR team identified hybrid electric engine technology as a “high-risk high-payoff technology,” Bradley said. “At this point, the SUGAR Volt is only a concept configuration that we are using to assess the potential of hybrid electric engine technology.”¶ For conventional propulsion, a combination of improvements to air traffic management, airframe and propulsion could reduce fuel burn by 44 to 58 percent, the SUGAR team’s report says. Other improvements include use of sustainable biofuels, which could reduce CO2 emissions even more and use of advanced combustor technology, which could reduce nitrous oxide emissions by 75 percent.¶ For noise reduction, “the best performing concept is the SUGAR Ray (the hybrid wing body), which achieved a 37 decibel reduction relative to today’s aircraft,” said Bradley. “That’s well short of the NASA goal, so more work needs to be done in this area.”¶ The Boeing SUGAR team was one of four that received contracts from NASA in 2008 to study subsonic concepts for the 2030 to 2035 timeframe. The other teams were led by GE Aviation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Northrop Grumman.¶ All four teams have submitted proposals for a second phase of studies to begin developing new technologies that will be necessary to meet the national goals related to an improved air transportation system with increased energy efficiency. Contract award for Phase II, which will start later this year, is expected in the next few months.¶ The Boeing supersonic team, which includes BR&T, BCA, Pratt & Whitney, Rolls Royce, General Electric, Georgia Tech, Wyle and M4 Engineering, has focused on four concepts that include a low fuel burn / low boom swing-wing “arrow” configuration, a low sonic boom concept with a V-tail to shield noise and control the sonic boom, a joined wing alternate concept and an oblique “scissor” wing alternative concept.¶ Based on conceptual design studies, the team has recommended to NASA a fixed wing configuration (nicknamed Icon II) with V-tails and upper surface engines as the technology reference concept plane for N+3, said team leader Bob Welge of BR&T. The Icon II concept can carry 120 passengers in a two-class, single-aisle interior, and can cruise at Mach 1.6 to Mach 1.8 with a range of about 5,000 nautical miles.¶ The study acknowledges that supersonic aircraft inherently have less fuel efficiency than subsonic aircraft, but points out they offer offsetting productivity benefits because of speed. The study concludes that advanced technologies can reduce fuel burn enough that a supersonic aircraft could be viable, economically and environmentally, in multiple markets.¶ The study also indicates that these efficiencies can be achieved while meeting the same community noise certification limits as subsonic aircraft – with a reduction of the sonic boom noise en route to 65 to 75 decibels. “That may make it possible for a supersonic transport to operate at maximum cruise speed -- even over land,” Welge said.¶ The Boeing-led team was one of two that received contracts from NASA to study supersonic concepts. The other was led by Lockheed Martin.¶ The NASA N+3 supersonic program does not provide the option for a Phase II system study, but Welge explained that technology development research announcements are anticipated in the near term

### Air Trade-off DA: DA Turns Environment Advantage

#### Solar-power planes fully ready by 2014

The Gulf Today, July 13, 2012 (<http://gulftoday.ae/portal/55393147-8001-442f-8468-17375401c64d.aspx>, “Solar-powered plane to visit Abu Dhabi in 2014,” ks)

Swiss adventurer Bertrand Piccard, who pilots the world’s first solar-powered plane, said he is bracing for a round-the-world trip from Switzerland to the far east via Abu Dhabi by the end of next year.¶ The pilot of experimental plane Solar Impulse said he discussed the arrangements for the trip in Abu Dhabi during the past two days.¶ The Solar Impulse, which is made of carbon fibre and flies without fuel, flew back to Switzerland after flying from Spain to Morocco as part of a rehearsal for an attempted round-the-world trip by an updated version of the plane to showcase renewable energy and encourage the use of clean, new technologies.¶ Piccard expressed gladness at completing the 2,000km Switzerland-to-Morocco leg, exclusively using the sun’s energy.¶ While in Abu Dhabi, Piccard gave a presentation on the plane, which is powered by 12,000 photovoltaic cells that cover its wings to absorb solar energy and transfer it to the aircraft’s four batteries, which allow it to fly for up to five hours.¶ He said the Solar Impulse manufacturer would co-operate with Masdar on clean energy research and training as well as on designing carbon components.¶ The gigantic, but ultra-lightweight revolutionary airplane was invented by Piccard and Solar Impulse co-founder Andre Borschberg.¶ WAM

#### Breakthroughs in the Airline Industry, solar-powered planes

**AFP, 7/7/12**

(7/7/12,http://dawn.com/2012/07/07/solar-powered-plane-makes-breakthrough-intercontinental-flight/ (“Solar-powered plane makes breakthrough intercontinental flight”, kaw)

Swiss adventurer Bertrand Piccard, 54, piloted the experimental plane Solar Impulse on the 17-hour flight from Rabat in Morocco and landed at Madrid’s main airport overnight early on Saturday, his team said in a statement.¶ The Solar Impulse, which is made of carbon fibre and flies without fuel, is on its way back to Switzerland after last month flying from Spain to Morocco, the first time a solar-powered aircraft has crossed continents.¶ The flights are a rehearsal for an attempted round-the-world trip in 2014 by an updated version of the plane.¶ The 900-kilometre Morocco to Spain leg was “a particularly tactically challenging flight” at an average of 60 kilometres an hour, with the plane hitting strong crosswinds, the team said in a statement.¶ “The aircraft’s technology has once again proven its reliability and its energy-saving efficiency,” Solar Impulse co-founder Andre Borschberg said in the statement.¶ “This flight has taught us even more about the aircraft, allowing us to fly through winds superior to the speed of the airplane.”¶ The statement said the plane would stay in Spain for “a few days” of official and sponsorship events before heading for Switzerland.

## Advantage Counterplans

### Carbon Tax Counterplan

CP Text: The USFG should substitute a carbon tax on our current taxes on payroll, investment, businesses, and workers.

#### **A carbon tax would solve warming:**

Bauman and Hsu 12 (Yoram and Shi-Ling, law professor at Florida State University and environmental economist, “The Most Sensible Tax of All,” July 4, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/05/opinion/a-carbon-tax-sensible-for-all.html>)

ON Sunday, the best climate policy in the world got even better: British Columbia’s carbon tax — a tax on the carbon content of all fossil fuels burned in the province — increased from $25 to $30 per metric ton of carbon dioxide, making it more expensive to pollute.¶ This was good news not only for the environment but for nearly everyone who pays taxes in British Columbia, because the carbon tax is used to reduce taxes for individuals and businesses. Thanks to this tax swap, British Columbia has lowered its corporate income tax rate to 10 percent from 12 percent, a rate that is among the lowest in the Group of 8 wealthy nations. Personal income taxes for people earning less than $119,000 per year are now the lowest in Canada, and there are targeted rebates for low-income and rural households.¶ The only bad news is that this is the last increase scheduled in British Columbia. In our view, the reason is simple: the province is waiting for the rest of North America to catch up so that its tax system will not become unbalanced or put energy-intensive industries at a competitive disadvantage.¶ The United States should jump at the chance to adopt a similar revenue-neutral tax swap. It’s an opportunity to reduce existing taxes, clean up the environment and increase personal freedom and energy security.¶ Let’s start with the economics. Substituting a carbon tax for some of our current taxes — on payroll, on investment, on businesses and on workers — is a no-brainer. Why tax good things when you can tax bad things, like emissions? The idea has support from economists across the political spectrum, from Arthur B. Laffer and N. Gregory Mankiw on the right to Peter Orszag and Joseph E. Stiglitz on the left. That’s because economists know that a carbon tax swap can reduce the economic drag created by our current tax system and increase long-run growth by nudging the economy away from consumption and borrowing and toward saving and investment.¶ Of course, carbon taxes also lower carbon emissions. Economic theory suggests that putting a price on pollution reduces emissions more affordably and more effectively than any other measure. This conclusion is supported by empirical evidence from previous market-based policies, like those in the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act that targeted sulfur dioxide emissions. British Columbia’s carbon tax is only four years old, but preliminary data show that greenhouse gas emissions are down 4.5 percent even as population and gross domestic product have been growing. Sales of motor gasoline have fallen by 2 percent since 2007, compared with a 5 percent increase for Canada as a whole.¶ What would a British Columbia-style carbon tax look like in the United States? According to our calculations, a British Columbia-style $30 carbon tax would generate about $145 billion a year in the United States. That could be used to reduce individual and corporate income taxes by 10 percent, and afterward there would still be $35 billion left over. If recent budget deals are any guide, Congress might choose to set aside half of that remainder to reduce estate taxes (to please Republicans) and the other half to offset the impacts of higher fuel and electricity prices resulting from the carbon tax on low-income households through refundable tax credits or a targeted reduction in payroll taxes (to please Democrats).¶ Revenue from a carbon tax would most likely decline over time as Americans reduce their carbon emissions, but for many years to come it could pay for big reductions in existing taxes. It would also promote energy conservation and steer investment into clean technology and other productive economic activities.¶ Lastly, the carbon tax would actually give Americans more control over how much they pay in taxes. Households and businesses could reduce their carbon tax payments simply by reducing their use of fossil fuels. Americans would trim their carbon footprints — and their tax burdens — by investing in energy efficiency at home and at work, switching to less-polluting vehicles and pursuing countless other innovations. All of this would be driven not by government mandates but by Adam Smith’s invisible hand.¶ A carbon tax makes sense whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, a climate change skeptic or a believer, a conservative or a conservationist (or both). We can move past the partisan fireworks over global warming by turning British Columbia’s carbon tax into a made-in-America solution.

### Carbon Tax Counterplan—Solves Warming

#### CP is the only way to solve global warming – alternative energy alone increases carbon emissions

Hsu ‘11

Shi-Ling, law professor at the University of British Columbia Faculty of Law, Ph.D in Agricultural and Resource Economics and an M.S. in Ecology, both from the University of California at Davis, and a J.D. from Columbia Law School, “Technological innovation that will increase greenhouse gases?”, The Dismal Environmentalist, 5/24/11, <http://dismalenvironmentalist.blogspot.com/2011/05/technological-innovation-that-will.html>

Ralph Winter has a new draft paper out, Innovation and the Dynamics of Global Warming, which warns us that well-intentioned technological innovation reducing greenhouse gas emissions may perversely increase the probability of climate change. This counter-intuitive result derives from two factors: (1) the "rebound effect" of emissions-reducing technological changes, in which emissions reductions are partially offset by resultant cheaper fossil fuel prices and concomitantly greater utilization, and (2) the possibility that in the short term, a rebound could be so severe as to create a "backfire" in which the rebound more than offsets the first-order emissions reductions, it increases emissions. Winter's dynamic model is very interesting. What he has done is model the long-term expectations about fossil fuel prices in the wake of a technological innovation; in his model, if the innovation is significant enough, and the long-term expectations are fully capitalized in fossil fuel prices, the result really could be a temporary uptick in fossil fuel usage. There has been much work on the rebound effect, but Winter's model is unique in incorporating this long-term capitalization effect. And if there is an uptick, even a temporary increase in greenhouse gases could trigger a positive feedback effect that causes global warming to increase. What is an example of a positive feedback effect? There are many, but one is that warmer temperatures will cause northern Arctic systems to release more methane, which is much more powerful greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, and which would further warm the planet. This incorporation of positive feedback effects is the other new idea in Winter's paper. What he is essentially saying is that technological innovation, even if it produces a temporary increase in fossil fuel utilization and a temporary increase in greenhouse gas concentrations (carbon dioxide is effectively resident in the Earth's atmosphere for almost a century) could produce a runaway feedback effect that would not have occurred without the technological innovation. How realistic is the model? It is hard to say. Most rebound effect research seems to find that the effect less than completely offsets the first-order emissions reductions, and that backfire is rare. But much of this research has focused on fairly marginal improvements in vehicle fuel efficiency. What if we are talking about one of these "game-changers" that are supposed to magically rescue us from climate change, like biofuels, that could displace petroleum-based gasoline? A big change in that technology could shake up the energy markets of the world enough to increase emissions. Also, it is worth noting that rebound or backfire should not occur if the technological innovation only came about as a result of a price signal, and **not a government subsidy**. If a carbon tax were instituted, and technological innovation discovered thereby, emissions would not increase, because the innovation would never have taken place if emitters were going to have to pay more in carbon taxes thereby (I hedge with the words "should not" because I can imagine an exception for those with very low discount rates, but I can't imagine anybody with a very low discount rate).

### Carbon Tax Counterplan—Solves Warming

#### The carbon tax is key to prevent clean energy from fueling global warming

**Winter ‘11**

Ralph, BSc (UBC), MA, PhD (Berkeley) Canada Research Chair in Business Economics and Policy Professor of Strategy, Business Economics and Finance Strategy & Business Economics, Finance Division, “Innovation and the Dynamics of Global Warming”, draft paper, 4/8/11, <http://www.cbe.anu.edu.au/schools/eco/seminars/documents/Winter.pdf>

The proposition, unfortunately, is false. Innovation in clean energy can set global temperatures on a permanently higher path. The subsidy of innovation, as a naked policy instrument unsupported by carbon pricing, is not merely suboptimal policy. Clean energy innovation can make global warming worse. To develop this point, I start with a paradox familiar to environmental economists. Fossil fuels are an exhaustible resource. Suppose that tomorrow a clean, inexhaustible energy substitute were universally available at a cost equivalent to 60 dollars per barrel of oil. The owner of any conventional fuel deposit with low extraction costs would prefer to sell at 59.99 or less rather than share the energy market with the substitute. Oil from these deposits will therefore be sold before clean energy captures any market share and at lower prices as a result of the innovation. The effect of the innovation in clean energy is that fuel will be exhausted ñ and carbon emitted more intensively and at an earlier date. This paradox is that carbon emissions are initially higher as a result of clean energy innovation. 1 As set out in the existing literature on the paradox, however, the theory predicts that in the long run clean energy innovation helps in the battle against global warming. Innovation in clean energy has two effects on carbon emissions. First, as in the example above, carbon is released earlier into the atmosphere as a result of innovation. In existing models, this early release of carbon into the atmosphere is neutral or beneficial in terms of the long run temperature trend as the atmospheric carbon is reabsorbed into the earth’s surface at a steady rate. The environment, represented by a single state variable, is able to improve over time. The second effect of innovation is that fossil fuel deposits with high extraction cost (above 60 dollars in 1 This prediction is too optimistic. The theory of innovation and global warming offered here represents carbon in the biosphere via two state variables: carbon in the atmosphere and carbon on the earth’s surface. This allows the inclusion of a fundamental feature of carbon cycle dynamics: positive feedback effects. As greater atmospheric carbon raises the global temperature, reactive ice-fields melt and methane gas is released from melting permafrost (to take just two examples), resulting in a higher rate of carbon to the atmosphere. The effect is that an initial increase in carbon emissions that raises global temperature will increase the rate at which carbon escapes from the earth’s surface and accumulates in the atmosphere. Innovation combined with the sufficiently strong feedback effects then yields higher temperature paths not just in the short run but permanently. The acceleration of carbon emissions (the Örst effect of innovation) may overwhelm even in the long run the benefit of reduced total carbon emissions (the second effect). Because of positive feedbacks, even a small innovation may lead the temperature path to a discretely higher steady-state temperature. Global warming is a long run problem and it is the long run consequences of global warming policies that are critical for policy. The theory here argues against clean energy subsidies as a naked policy instrument. As a component of a portfolio of policies, it is valuable: carbon pricing can eliminate the dark side of clean energy innovation. To do so, a carbon pricing policy must be reactive to innovation successes ñ and reactive in a non-obvious way. When an innovation succeeds in giving clean energy producers a new advantage over conventional energy, a reactive carbon price policy is one that magnifies this advantage, by raising the tax on fossil fuel use. Carbon pricing is thus an important complementary instrument to clean energy innovation, being necessary even to ensure that the net impact of innovation is positive. This complementarity is not well understood among policymakers. With carbon taxes seemingly impossible to implement given U.S. politics, clean-energy research and development is becoming the focus across a range of the political spectrum. Consider, for example, the recent joint call by the Brookings Institute and the American Enterprise Institute for an increase in clean energy investment from 4 billion to 25 billion annually (Hayward et al, 2010). In the popular press as well, clean energy subsidies have been touted as a superior instrument to carbon taxes and 2pricing and clean energy subsidies are substitutes in the battle against global warming. This is natural assumption, given that these are two instruments available to solve the same problem, but the assumption is misguided. Carbon pricing is even more essential when clean energy innovation is successful than when it is not

### Carbon Tax Counterplan—Avoids Politics

#### CP avoids politics and solves oil dependence and economy

Houser ‘11

Trevor, visiting fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, is partner at the Rhodium Group (RHG) and director of its Energy and Climate Practice. He is also an adjunct lecturer at the City College of New York and a visiting fellow at the school's Colin Powell Center for Policy Studies. During 2009 he served as senior advisor to the US Special Envoy on Climate Change, “American Eyes on Australia's Carbon Tax”, Australian Financial Review, 7/12/2011, accessed 7/23/2011, <http://www.iie.com/publications/opeds/oped.cfm?ResearchID=1873>

 Australia’s proposed carbon tax is attracting interest in some unlikely quarters of the American political landscape. Conventional wisdom in Washington is that the economic crisis coupled with the Republican takeover of the House of Representatives has killed the prospect of serious US climate change policy. Yet while American politicians don’t seem too concerned about rising global temperatures, they are definitely concerned about rising fiscal deficits. And the revenue raising potential of a carbon tax may become increasingly attractive in Washington in the years ahead. A carbon tax has long been the favorite tool among economists for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Imposing a tax on something that reduces welfare (like pollution) can allow policymakers to reduce taxes on things that increase welfare (like employment, investment or innovation). And it’s not just liberal economists that find a carbon tax attractive. Gregory Mankiw, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors under George W. Bush and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, senior economic advisor to Senator John McCain during the 2008 Presidential Campaign, have both argued the merits of taxing carbon and using the revenue to cut economically distorting corporate and payroll taxes. This economic logic has elicited support from some leading Republican politicians as well. Most notable is Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska (the highest ranking Senate Republican on energy policy issues) who, while opposing efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate greenhouse gas emissions, has publically supported a carbon tax. She is joined by ExxonMobil chief executive Rex Tillerson, who argues the economic certainty that comes with a carbon tax is more important than the environmental certainty you get with cap-and-trade. And for Americans increasingly concerned with the security of the country’s energy supply, a carbon tax could yield some unexpected benefits. A colleague and I recently analyzed all leading energy security proposals currently bouncing around Washington—from vehicle efficiency standards to expanded offshore oil drilling. And we threw a carbon tax in just for fun. To our surprise the carbon tax did more to reduce US dependence on foreign oil than almost any other proposal because it both reduced oil demand and increased domestic supply. The latter occurs thanks to a) an increase in natural gas liquids production, an oil substitute pumped alongside the natural gas used to replace coal-fired power plants, and b) CO2 captured from remaining coal-fired power plants used to coax more oil out of older domestic wells. Yet the economic or energy security merits alone aren’t enough to win most American politicians over, and in the current political environment the global climate benefits don’t help much either. It’s the deficit reduction potential of a carbon tax that could give US climate policy a new lease on life. For a recent fiscal solutions summit in Washington, six leading American think tanks put forward plans for cutting the US budget deficit. Four of the six suggested pricing carbon as a way to raise government revenue, including the conservative American Enterprise Institute (AEI), which recommended a carbon tax starting at $20 per ton and growing by over 5 percent per year after that. The AEI proposal would raise $161 billion per year by 2020, enough to reduce the federal budget deficit by 22 percent that year. That’s greater than the savings Washington would get from raising the national retirement age to 70 and equivalent to eliminating all foreign aid and federal funding for education.

### Deforestation Counterplan

The USFG should provide substantial tax incentives to individuals and corporations to solve deforestation.

#### Deforestation is key to prevent emission—solves 18% of global warming

The Economist 2009

( September 2009 "Last Gasp for the Trees," The Economist, http://www.economist.com/node/14492973)

Preventing deforestation is potentially one of the simplest ways to reduce global emissions. At the moment, carbon emissions from deforestation account for some 18% of global greenhouse-gas emissions, more than all the world's trains, cars, lorries, aeroplanes and ships combined. Reducing deforestation and land-degradation will be vital if temperature increases are to be kept to within safe levels (generally assumed to mean no more than about a 2°C increase). Some argue it would be a quicker and cheaper way of reducing emissions than many alternatives, such as weaning the world's vehicle fleet off fossil fuels, forcing people to cut back on energy use or switching to low-carbon forms of power generation, such as wind farms and nuclear power. All those things will be necessary too, but they will take a long time, will require new technologies and cause controversies of their own.

#### Incentives to solve deforestation work and avoid politics:

The Economist 2009

( September 2009 "Last Gasp for the Trees," The Economist, http://www.economist.com/node/14492973)

Paying people to not chop down trees looks easy by comparison. It does not depend on any elaborate or costly new technology and is likely to be able to garner the required political support. Achim Steiner, the head of the UN's environment programme, thinks avoided deforestation should be an easy thing to sell. As well as reducing carbon emissions, keeping forests standing also protects soil from erosion, improves the quality of water, helps regulate rainfall and ensures biodiversity. “How on earth can we not afford to make this work?” he asks.

### Hydrogen Counterplan

#### The United States Federal government should provide substantial investment for hydrogen as a fuel.

#### Hydrogen Fuel is clean energy that prevents air pollution and warming

REW NO Date, a group of Renewable Energy professionals who wanted their work to relate to their passion for renewable energy, No Date,http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/tech/hydrogen,Hydrogen Energy

Hydrogen is high in energy, yet an engine that burns pure hydrogen produces almost no pollution. NASA has used liquid hydrogen since the 1970s to propel the space shuttle and other rockets into orbit. Hydrogen fuel cells power the shuttle's electrical systems, producing a clean byproduct - pure water, which the crew drinks.¶ A fuel cell combines hydrogen and oxygen to produce electricity, heat, and water. Fuel cells are often compared to batteries. Both convert the energy produced by a chemical reaction into usable electric power. However, the fuel cell will produce electricity as long as fuel (hydrogen) is supplied, never losing its charge.¶ Fuel cells are a promising technology for use as a source of heat and electricity for buildings, and as an electrical power source for electric motors propelling vehicles. Fuel cells operate best on pure hydrogen. But fuels like natural gas, methanol, or even gasoline can be reformed to produce the hydrogen required for fuel cells. Some fuel cells even can be fueled directly with methanol, without using a reformer.¶ In the future, hydrogen could also join electricity as an important energy carrier. An energy carrier moves and delivers energy in a usable form to consumers. Renewable energy sources, like the sun and wind, can't produce energy all the time. But they could, for example, produce electric energy and hydrogen, which can be stored until it's needed. Hydrogen can also be transported (like electricity) to locations where it is needed.

#### Renewable energy has bipartisan support- avoids politics

Zichal 12, Deputy Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change, Heather, May 23, 2012, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2012/05/23/case-you-missed-it-broad-bipartisan-support-extend-production-tax-credit>,

In Case You Missed It: Broad Bipartisan Support to Extend the Production Tax Credit

As part of his Congressional To-Do List, the President will call on Congress to pass legislation that will extend the Production Tax Credit (PTC) – which provides an important tax credit to utility-scale wind producers in the United States – alongside an expansion of the 48C Advanced Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit that supports American-made clean energy manufacturing in towns and cities across the country. According to industry estimates, the wind industry supports nearly 20,000 direct jobs along with over 30,000 manufacturing jobs in its supply chain, and some in industry have estimated that without extending the PTC, as the President is calling for, up to 37,000 jobs could be lost.¶ That means real impacts for companies, communities, and families in states across the country. Given that, it’s no surprise that the actions that President is calling for have strong bipartisan support from governors, members of Congress, as well as industry. Let’s take a look:

### Tax Cuts Counterplan

**The USFG should substantially cut taxes on stock dividends and other capital gains.**

#### The counterplan solves their economy advantage--Tax cuts will boost the economy

abcnews 12( 05-22-12 <http://abcnews.go.com/WNT/story?id=129687&page=1> “Will You Benefit From the Tax Cuts?”)

Despite heavy criticism of the tax cuts, even critics say Washington needed to do something to help the economy, and given its fragile state at the moment, many concede the tax cut is well-timed.¶ ¶ The president hopes that the tax cut will boost the economy by putting money in people's pockets, which they will then go out and spend and keep the country out of a recession — a similar philosophy to the $300 to $600 tax rebate checks taxpayers got two years ago.¶ ¶ "This is at the very least important insurance to facilitate stronger growth in the second half of the year at a time when there's so much uncertainty about the future course of the economy," said Laurence Meyer, a former Federal Reserve governor and now a scholar at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.¶ ¶ Other economists see far less immediate benefit from the tax cut on stock dividends and other capital gains.¶ ¶ Billionaire investor Warren Buffett figures this provision could personally save him $310 million.¶ ¶ "If you want to stimulate the economy, you want to get it into the hands of the people who would spend it," Buffett told ABCNEWS' Nightline. "If you give $1,000 to poor families, they will spend it. There's no net gain in giving it to me in terms of stimulating the economy."

#### Tax Cuts solve the economy—less government action means people use more responsibility

Hurd 10 (Michael, psychotherapist, life coach and author of Effective Therapy (New York: Dunhill, 1997) and Grow Up America!, ”Why Tax Cuts are good for everyone” http://capitalismmagazine.com/2010/11/why-tax-cuts-are-good-for-everyone/)

Opponents of tax cuts, limited government and lower taxes generally love to call this approach to economics “trickle down.” What exactly is the alternative? Government does not “trickle” the money “down” or “up.” Government simply spends it, almost always wastefully. There’s a simple moral and psychological explanation for this. When you’re given money, or seize money by force — in the case of taxes it’s legalized plunder — then you don’t handle that money as responsibly as you would if it were your own. There’s no way to control wasteful government spending because government spending will always, by its nature, be largely wasteful and irresponsible. The only solution to this is to severely limit the role of government as much as possible. Lower taxes are a good thing not only because they leave wealth in the hands of the more productive; low taxes are also good because the government has less to do.¶ ¶ If you think America has been productive and prosperous up to now, just imagine how it would be if most of government as we know it went away. It’s bad enough that government takes income from the private sector and squanders it. Government is making decisions that people should be making for themselves. If something isn’t going to happen without government funds, then it quite likely should not happen in the first place. When people make decisions for themselves, they generally do a better job. And when they make a mistake, or perhaps act with deliberate irrationality, at least there are consequences for their actions. When government does something badly, it gets rewarded with more power, subsidies and control. Case in point: Public education. Everyone agrees public education is mediocre at best, and horrendous at worst. Yet every year the federal government taxes the productive more to pay for education that isn’t any good. Local governments tax property with the same purpose. In the private sector, stupid and incompetent behavior is punished. In government, it’s sustained and rewarded.¶ ¶ The fact that lower taxes make the government poorer is the best argument for lower taxes. Less government revenue means less government [intervention]. Less government means a freer, more prosperous, more interesting, more innovative and more self-responsible society.

### Tax Cuts Counterplan—Doesn’t Link to Politics

#### Republicans support reasonable tax cuts—going against governor Brownback proves

Rothschild 12 (Scott, Statehouse Reporter for Kansas,“Brownback says tax cuts will help the economy; critics say it will damage Kansas”http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2012/may/19/statehouse-live-brownback-says-tax-cuts-will-help-/)

A group called Traditional Republicans for Common Sense, composed of more than 55 former legislators, called on Brownback to veto the tax bill.¶ “We support tax cuts and have voted for a number of them over the years, but you have to pay for them and roll them out responsibly," said Rochelle Chronister, a former assistant House majority leader and chair of the Kansas Republican Party. "The governor’s tax plan does neither. Instead, it smacks of Washington-style irresponsible spending that places us on a dangerous path, which will have future generations paying for this mistake," she said.¶

## Kritik Links

### Capitalism Links

#### High speed rail distracts from efforts to challenge industrial culture:

Noam **Chomsky,** 1/18/20**11** (Professor (Emeritus) in the Department of Linguistics & Philosophy at MIT, “Downsize or Modify? A Conversation with Noam Chomsky,” Accessed 7/19/2012 at <http://chomsky.info/interviews/20110118.htm>)

Noam Chomsky: If I said the elections are a death knell, I went too far. But I think it's fair to say that they do threaten that outcome. Even the business press is concerned. Bloomberg Business Week reported that the elections brought into office dozens of climate change deniers, swelling support for Senator James Inhofe, who has declared global warming to be the "greatest hoax ever perpetuated on the American people" and feels "vindicated" by the election. He probably is also celebrating the ascendance of representative John Shimkus who assures us that God would prevent dire effects of climate change; analogues would be hard to find in other societies. And probably is also celebrating the fact that according to recent polls, barely a third of Americans now believe that human activities are a factor in climate change -- very likely the result of a major corporate propaganda offensive, openly announced, to achieve this result. It's important to bear in mind that those who orchestrate the campaigns know as well as the rest of us that the "hoax" is real and ominous, but they are pursuing their institutional role: maximizing short-term profit and putting aside "externalities," in this case the fate of the species. **Modifying the core institutions of the society** is no small challenge. This confluence of factors should serve as a grim warning. If the US continues to drag its feet on addressing these grave problems, the rest of the world will have even less incentive to proceed with serious measures. I don't think that entails downsizing industrial culture. Rather, converting it to sustainable form to serve human needs, not private profit. For example **high speed rail** and solar technology **do not downsize industrial culture.**

## Case NEG

### Warming NEG Answers—Warming Turns

#### Turn: High speed rail increases emissions—the electricity used to power the cars comes from fossil fuels:

Christopher **Mahoney, 11/20/2011** (staff writer, “High-Speed Rail’s Environmental Impact,”

<http://www.railroad.net/high-speed-rails-environmental-impact-394.html>, rwg)

A recent article by CNN asked experts to discuss the positive and possible negative impacts that high-speed rail will have in the near future. According to Dr. Anthony Perl, a professor of urban studies and political science, the fact that high-speed rail does not use fossil fuels is the most important aspect of its environmental impact. With most of the world dependent on a limited resource, Perl believes that “high-speed rail offers a proven means of reducing dependence on this increasingly problematic energy source.” Perl continues to point out that alternative energy technologies are slow to develop, but high-speed rail is technology widely available today. On the opposite side of the debate, transportation expert Richard Gilbert argues that the green benefits of high-speed rail are mitigated by **energy grids still powered by fossil fuels.** From that perspective, Gilbert believes in some situations high-speed rail could **cause more environmental harm than good** and that a notable environmental impact would be better found by creating grid-connected traction on a global scale. The point was also made that unless a significant amount of passengers switch to high-speed rail and abandon automobiles, the reduction in carbon footprint will be minimal.

#### Turn: construction of high-speed rail will emit enormous volumes of greenhouse gases:

Randal **O'Toole, 5/4/2009** (senior fellow with the Cato Institute, “High-Speed Rail Is No Solution,”

<http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/highspeed-rail-is-no-solution>, rwg)

**Construction of such high-speed rails** will consume **enormous amounts of energy** and emit **enormous volumes of greenhouse gases.** Since future cars and planes will be more energy efficient, there are likely to be no long-term environmental benefits from investment in high-speed rail. Electricity would power the California trains. But, **because most U.S. electricity comes from coal or other fossil fuels**, these high-speed trains won't reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. As we develop more renewable sources of electricity, we would do better using it to power plug-in hybrids or electric cars than high-speed rail.

#### Turn: high speed rail uses more energy than the cars or airplanes they replace:

Randal **O'Toole, 5/4/2009** (senior fellow with the Cato Institute, “High-Speed Rail Is No Solution,”

<http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/highspeed-rail-is-no-solution>, rwg)

According to the Department of Energy, the average Amtrak train uses about 2,700 British thermal units (BTUs) of energy per passenger mile. This is a little better than cars (about 3,400 BTUs per passenger mile) or airplanes (about 3,300 BTUs per passenger mile). But auto and airline fuel efficiencies are improving by 2 percent to 3 percent per year (for example, a Toyota Prius uses less than 1,700 BTUs per passenger mile). By contrast, Amtrak's fuel efficiency has increased by just one-tenth of 1 percent per year in the past 10 years. This means, over the lifetime of an investment in moderate-speed trains, the trains won't save any energy at all. In fact, to achieve higher speeds, moderate-speed trains will require even more energy than conventional trains and probably **much more** than the average car or airplane 10 or 20 years from now.

#### Because the trains run on electricity which comes from fossil fuels, they don’t solve warming:

Mark **Tutton,** 11/18/20**11** (staff writer, “How green is high-speed rail?” Accessed July 19, 2012 at

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>, rwg)

So what's stopping high speed rail being a major part of a greener transport future in Britain? Over two thirds of the world's electricity comes from fossil fuels so until (or unless) power stations are weaned off fossil fuels, electric trains will still have a significant climate impact. First there's the electricity to power the trains. Over two thirds of the world's electricity comes from fossil fuels so until (or unless) power stations are weaned off fossil fuels, electric trains will still have a significant climate impact -- although rail travel is still better than flying or driving.

### **Warming NEG Answers—Alt Causes From Other Countries**

#### **Alt cause to warming: China is the number one producer of CO2 emissions**

Watson 08 (Traci, staff writer for USA Today, China now No. 1 CO2 offender, USA Today Online, <http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2008-04-30-china-energy_N.htm>)

China has overtaken the USA to become the world's No. 1 industrial source of carbon dioxide, the most important global-warming pollutant, according to a scientific study to be published today.¶ The study and two others — one recently published and another coming — agree that China's carbon-dioxide emissions surpassed those in the USA in 2006. That's decades earlier than had been predicted by the International Energy Agency four years ago.¶ All three studies examine emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal. Energy usage is the most significant man-made source of carbon dioxide, which accumulates in the atmosphere and traps heat.¶ Unless China sharply cuts its emissions, "the situation is pretty bleak," says Richard Carson of the University of California, co-author of a study in today's Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. "There's a lot less time to do something than people previously thought."¶ China's total emissions in 2006 roughly tied U.S. emissions, according to another study in the April 24 issue of Geophysical Research Letters. But China's monthly production of carbon dioxide overtook the USA's in mid-2006, the study says. "Nobody could anticipate the rate of growth that's taken place in the last six or eight years in China," says Gregg Marland of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, one of the authors of that study.¶ Predictions about when China would overtake the USA were wrong because of China's "shocking" growth in energy-hungry industries, including cement and steel production, says Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory researcher Mark Levine.¶ Levine and a co-worker at the laboratory produced a study that will appear in July's issue of Annual Review of Environment and Resources. It is available online now.¶ Carson and Levine said they aren't aware of any similar studies published in academic journals. The Dutch government and the International Energy Agency said last year that China had surpassed the USA in carbon-dioxide emissions.¶ Each group relied on different methods and data sources, among them the United Nations, the Chinese environmental agency and the U.S. Geological Survey.¶ Earlier in his administration, President Bush cited Chinese emissions as one reason to end U.S. participation in a treaty to curb global warming by developed nations. China is not a party to the treaty.¶ The ascension of China to No. 1 polluter makes it more likely that global-warming legislation in Congress will include protection for U.S. industries, says Robert Stavins of Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. For example, Congress could impose import penalties on nations that haven't taken steps to control emissions.¶ Such "a provision could lead to a trade war" with China, Stavins says.¶ China's new status might provide fodder to opponents of U.S. attempts to address global warming, says Rep. Ed Markey, D-Mass., chairman of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming.¶ Instead, he says, it should add "to the urgency of the United States becoming a leader."

#### Alt cause to warming: India refuses to commit to emissions reductions

Lakshmi 09 (Rama, staff writer and researcher for the Washington Post, India Rejects Calls For Emissions Cuts, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/12/AR2009041202452.html>)

NEW DELHI -- Days after the Obama administration unveiled a push to combat climate change, Indian officials said it was unlikely to prompt them to agree to binding emission cuts, a position among emerging economies that many say derails effective action.¶ "If the question is whether India will take on binding emission reduction commitments, the answer is no. It is morally wrong for us to agree to reduce when 40 percent of Indians do not have access to electricity," said a member of the Indian delegation to the recently concluded U.N. conference in Bonn, Germany, which is a prelude to a Copenhagen summit in December on climate change. "Of course, everybody wants to go solar, but costs are very, very high."¶ India's position goes to the heart of the vexing international debate over how quickly nations should try to phase out carbon-spewing fuels such as coal and switch to renewable energy sources such as wind and solar. In India, the debate has been cast as a choice between pursuing urgently needed economic growth to reduce poverty and addressing climate change.¶ More than 60 percent of India's power is generated from coal. As India rapidly climbs the list of global polluters, analysts say coal will continue to fuel the economic demands of the country's 1.1 billion people for two decades. But India has repeatedly said that it will not compromise on growth by committing to emission reduction goals set by developed nations, which it deems bigger culprits when it comes to pollution.¶ President Obama's promise of a leading U.S. role in combating climate change is a clear departure from the stance of his predecessor, George W. Bush. A climate bill recently introduced by Democrats in the House calls for a 20 percent cut in carbon emissions from 2005 levels by 2020, along with a substantial increase in renewable-energy use.¶ "I am reasonably optimistic. But it is not entirely upon President Obama. He has to carry the Congress and the Senate with him," said Rajendra K. Pachauri, chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. He added that India is "very unlikely" to change its official position.¶ In a policy document released in January, India calls for industrialized countries to commit to significant emission reduction targets while aiding sustainable development in developing nations with funds and technology.¶ "But it was informally made very clear to us by the developed countries that there will be no money available for developing countries because of the global economic slump," said the Indian delegate to the Bonn meeting. About 2.5 percent of India's gross domestic product is spent on measures to address climate change, including introduction of cleaner technologies, energy-efficient consumer products and renewable energy.¶ Indian officials say it is unfair to group their country with the major emitters because, per capita, India's emissions are a tenth of those in the United States. Last week, India's special envoy on climate change, Shyam Saran, told reporters in Bonn that he opposed any attempt by the European Union and the United States to impose "carbon tariffs" on exports of Indian goods produced in energy-intensive industries such as steel, aluminum, cement and fertilizer.¶ Another issue raised was the controversial carbon capture and storage technology, or CCS. The expensive, unproven and environmentally contentious technique is intended to help combat climate change by injecting carbon dioxide emissions into deep underground reservoirs. The United States recently committed money to the technology in its economic stimulus package, and more funding may be proposed in the climate bill expected to be debated later this year. In January, India joined a handful of nations gingerly experimenting with CCS.¶ Scientists at India's National Geophysical Research Institute released preliminary findings from ongoing government-funded research that seeks to inject carbon dioxide into the basalt rock formation called the Deccan Traps, which is about 60 million years old. S. Nirmal Charan, a senior scientist at the institute, said researchers wanted to determine whether carbon dioxide can be trapped for tens of thousands of years within the basalt. He said more simulated laboratory tests are underway, but initial results show the process to be "environmentally benign."¶ Critics say it is a gimmick that allows carbon-spewing industries to carry on with business as usual.¶ "The idea of CCS allows our addiction to coal to remain. It ensures that we keep burning coal," said Chandra Bhushan, associate director of the Center for Science and Environment. "Who will monitor whether there are carbon dioxide leaks from underground storage?"¶ Norway and Canada have begun implementing various carbon-storage initiatives. Last week, Germany approved a draft law to develop the technology, and China has identified two sites for storage.¶ India has not formally committed to conducting CCS field experiments. But an official in the Power Ministry said it has the "potential to be an extremely important technology."¶ "But we are unsure about how it will work," the official said. "Let the world first demonstrate. We will learn from them.

Alt Cause to Warming: Fertilizer

Sanders, Journalist for the U.C. Berkely News Center, 4/2/12

(Robert,7/19/12, http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2012/04/02/fertilizer-use-responsible-for-increase-in-nitrous-oxide-in-atmosphere/, “Fertilizer us responsible for increase in nitrous oxide in atmosphere”. bcd)

University of California, Berkeley, chemists have found a smoking gun proving that increased fertilizer use over the past 50 years is responsible for a dramatic rise in atmospheric nitrous oxide, which is a major greenhouse gas contributing to global climate change.¶ The Cape Grim Baseline Air Pollution Station in Tasmania, where air samples have been collected since 1978. These samples show a long-term trend in isotopic composition that confirms that nitrogen-based fertilizer is largely responsible for the 20 percent increase in atmospheric nitrous oxide since the Industrial Revolution. Photo courtesy of CSIRO.¶ Climate scientists have assumed that the cause of the increased nitrous oxide was nitrogen-based fertilizer, which stimulates microbes in the soil to convert nitrogen to nitrous oxide at a faster rate than normal.¶ The new study, reported in the April issue of the journal Nature Geoscience, uses nitrogen isotope data to identify the unmistakable fingerprint of fertilizer use in archived air samples from Antarctica and Tasmania.¶ “Our study is the first to show empirically from the data at hand alone that the nitrogen isotope ratio in the atmosphere and how it has changed over time is a fingerprint of fertilizer use,” said study leader Kristie Boering, a UC Berkeley professor of chemistry and of earth and planetary science.¶ “We are not vilifying fertilizer. We can’t just stop using fertilizer,” she added. “But we hope this study will contribute to changes in fertilizer use and agricultural practices that will help to mitigate the release of nitrous oxide into the atmosphere.”¶ Since the year 1750, nitrous oxide levels have risen 20 percent – from below 270 parts per billion (ppb) to more than 320 ppb. After carbon dioxide and methane, nitrous oxide (N2O) is the most potent greenhouse gas, trapping heat and contributing to global warming. It also destroys stratospheric ozone, which protects the planet from harmful ultraviolet rays.¶ Not surprisingly, a steep ramp-up in atmospheric nitrous oxide coincided with the green revolution that increased dramatically in the 1960s, when inexpensive, synthetic fertilizer and other developments boosted food production worldwide, feeding a burgeoning global population.¶ Tracking the origin of nitrous oxide in the atmosphere, however, is difficult because a molecule from a fertilized field looks identical to one from a natural forest or the ocean if you only measure total concentration. But a quirk of microbial metabolism affects the isotope ratio of the nitrogen the N2O microbes give off, producing a telltale fingerprint that can be detected with sensitive techniques.¶ Archived air from Cape Grim¶ Boering and her colleagues, including former UC Berkeley graduate students Sunyoung Park and Phillip Croteau, obtained air samples from Antarctic ice, called firn air, dating from 1940 to 2005, and from an atmospheric monitoring station at Cape Grim, Tasmania, which has archived air back to 1978.¶ Law Dome, Antarctica. Air trapped in the consolidated snow from this region provides historical air samples going back to 1940.¶ Analysis of N2O levels in the Cape Grim air samples revealed a seasonal cycle, which has been known before. But isotopic measurements by a very sensitive isotope ratio mass spectrometer also displayed a seasonal cycle, which had not been observed before. At Cape Grim, the isotopes show that the seasonal cycle is due both to the circulation of air returning from the stratosphere, where N2O is destroyed after an average lifetime of 120 years, and to seasonal changes in the ocean, most likely upwelling that releases more N2O at some times of year than at others.¶ “The fact that the isotopic composition of N2O shows a coherent signal in space and time is exciting, because now you have a way to differentiate agricultural N2O from natural ocean N2O from Amazon forest emissions from N2O returning from the stratosphere,” Boering said. “In addition, you also now have a way to check whether your international neighbors are abiding by agreements they’ve made to mitigate N2O emissions. It is a tool that, ultimately, we can use to verify whether N2O emissions by agriculture or biofuel production are in line with what they say they are.”

### Warming NEG—Warming False

#### Warming is false—Earth is in a cooling trend:

Vancouver Sun, frontrunner in reliable Canadian news, 5/29

(5-29-12, http://www.vancouversun.com/technology/Climate+change+hoax/6693283/story.html#ixzz215BDthme, “Climate Change is a Hoax”, TVB)

Why is The Sun still pushing global warming hysteria on the public when the Earth's climate is in a cooling trend, as verified by temperature readings around the globe? There has been no global warming for a decade, and even a slight decline in temperature, despite increasing carbon emissions.¶ If carbon emissions were causing global warming the dire predictions of alarmist climatologists a decade ago would be borne out. Their highly speculative climate models are constantly being disproven by temperature readings around the globe.¶ This is a hoax of monumental pro-portions that benefits certain political and academic interests at the expense of the Canadian economy and our standard of living.¶ Polls consistently show most Canadians haven't been taken in by this hoax in spite of all the false propaganda leveled at them.

#### Climate change not anthropogenic and isn’t real

Newsmax, major American news provider, 3/27

(3-27-12, http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/Global-Warming-Journal-Happer/2012/03/27/id/433983, “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again”, TVB)

World temperatures have remained virtually unchanged in the past 10 years despite predictions of global warming and America’s mildest winter in decades, Princeton physics professor William Happer contends.¶ Weather patterns worldwide over the past few months were very similar to those in 1942 when the continental United States basked in a warm winter at the same time that Alaska and Asia were slammed with severe weather and “General Frost” stalled the German army’s advance into Russia, Happer wrote in a Wall Street Journal Op-Ed.¶ And any changes that have occurred should not be attributed to a rise in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, Happer, a prominent opponent of climate change theory, wrote in an article headlined “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again.”¶ “CO2 is not a pollutant,” he wrote. “Life on earth flourished for hundreds of millions of years at much higher CO2 levels than we see today. Increasing CO2 levels will be a net benefit because cultivated plants grow better and are more resistant to drought at higher CO2 levels, and because warming and other supposedly harmful effects of CO2 have been greatly exaggerated.”¶ Global temperatures have increased by around four-fifths of one degree Celsius since the “Little Ice Age” of the early 1800s, he wrote. “Some of that warming has probably come from increased amounts of CO2, but the timing of the warming — much of it before CO2 levels had increased appreciably — suggests that a substantial fraction of the warming is from natural causes that have nothing to do with mankind.”¶ Recent severe tornadoes in the United States also prove nothing, Happer wrote. “Like winter temperatures, the numbers, severity and geographical locations of tornadoes fluctuate from year-to-year in ways that are correlated with the complicated fluid flow patterns of the oceans and atmosphere, the location of the jet stream, El Niño or La Niña conditions of the tropical Pacific Oceans, etc.¶ “As long as the laws of nature exist, we will have tornadoes,” he added. “But we can save many more lives by addressing the threat of tornadoes directly — for example, with improved and more widely dispersed weather radars, and with better means for warning the people of endangered areas — than by credulous support of schemes to reduce ‘carbon footprints,’ or by funding even more computer centers to predict global warming.”¶ Happer has become one of the most outspoken skeptics of global warming. He told Congress in 2009 that the increase in carbon dioxide “will be good for mankind.” The same year, he likened those who believe carbon dioxide is causing climate change to Nazis. “This is George Orwell. This is the ‘Germans are the master race. The Jews are the scum of the earth.’ It’s that kind of propaganda,” he said.¶ “What used to be science has turned into a cult.”

### Warming NEG—Warming False

#### 50% of Global Waming is false, and overhyped

Duhamel 7-18

(Jonathan, Reporter for the Tuscon Citizen 7-18-12 <http://tucsoncitizen.com/wryheat/2012/07/18/new-study-shows-that-50-of-warming-claimed-by-ipcc-is-fake/>, VN)

“The IPCC reports global warming to have increased from +0.7°C to +0.8°C over the past century. But a new peer reviewed study determines that real global warming was closer to +0.4°C, with the remaining IPCC amount claimed to be a result of man-made adjustments.”

#### Norwegian research shows that current warming is not unusual

Duhamel 7-18

(Jonathan, Reporter for the Tuscon Citizen 7-18-12 <http://tucsoncitizen.com/wryheat/2012/07/18/new-study-shows-that-50-of-warming-claimed-by-ipcc-is-fake/>, VN) .

Researchers from the University of Bergen and the University of Colorado studied marine sediment cores from the Norwegian continental margin. They were able to get accurate dates from lead isotope dating of interspersed volcanic rocks in the core. They examined oxygen-18 isotopes from the calcium carbonate in the shells of planktonic foraminifera to reconstruct temperature. (Oxygen-18 is a proxy for temperature, see NASA’s Earth Observatory explanation of the method here.)? This allowed the researchers to come up with what they call “”near surface water summer temperature.” for the past 2,000 years. The following graph depicts their temperature reconstruction:? The graph shows that the current warm period is cooler than the Medieval and Roman warm periods. The researchers report a statistically significant correlation with the Gleissberg solar cycle. This is more evidence that the forces of natural variability overcome the effect, if any, of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions, and it shows that current warming is neither unprecedented nor unusual.

#### Global warming false, 97% occurs naturally

Cubby 12

(Ben, Reporter for the Great Lakes Advocate 7-2-12, <http://www.greatlakesadvocate.com.au/news/national/national/general/climate-change-a-hoax-jones-tells-tax-protesters/2609378.aspx>, VN)

About 2000 people marched from Hyde Park to Belmore Park to hear Bronwyn Bishop speak against the government's Clean Energy Bill, while a much smaller group in Melbourne heard the broadcaster Alan Jones refer to climate change science as ''propaganda''.? ''The notion of global warming is a hoax,'' Jones told a group of about 150 people on the steps of the Victorian Parliament. ''This is witchcraft. Commonsense will tell you it's rubbish; 97 per cent of all carbon dioxide occurs naturally … 3 per cent around the world is created by human beings.''

### Warming NEG—Warming False

#### Global Warming is a Hoax

**Caruba 12** (Alan, member of the Society of Professional Journalists, the American Society of Journalists and Authors, and the National Association of Science Writers “The Mother of All Hoaxes” <http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/48129>)

There was a brief flurry of stories in the media at the beginning of what has become a historic summer of hot weather across the U.S. that global warming was to blame. They faded swiftly because the public has concluded that global warming is the mother of all hoaxes, because we are in the midst of a failing economy and the political campaigns that will decide if the nation literally lives or dies.¶ Recently, my friend Joseph L. Bast, the president of The Heartland Institute, wrote an article, “IPCC Admits Its Past Reports Were Junk”, posted on AmericanThinker.com.¶ It struck me that very few people even know that IPCC is the acronym for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Few people know that the entire global warming hoax was generated by the IPCC, let alone know what it is.¶ Most people associate global warming with Al Gore who has been among its most prominent advocates, warning that “the Earth has a fever” and that we were doomed if we didn’t stop generating carbon dioxide. Gore and his collaborators wanted to sell “carbon credits” in exchanges around the world and for a while he greatly enriched himself.¶ In Australia, the government has imposed a tax on carbon dioxide which it likely to destroy its manufacturing base along with the extraction of coal and other minerals.¶ Here in the U.S. the Environmental Protection Agency continues to assert that carbon dioxide must be regulated as a “pollutant” under the Clean Air Act and, if successful, will likewise destroy what is left of our manufacturing base and all other industries that generate or use energy to function.¶ And the man in the street remains completely clueless about the impending ruin of the nation based on the reports of the IPCC which the Inter-Academy Council (IAC), a group created by the world’s science academies to provide advice to international bodies, has long since concluded were utterly false and baseless.¶ On June 27, the IPCC issued a statement saying it had completed the process of implementation of the recommendations that an August 2010 IAC analysis had made after examining who was contributing to their reports, who was reviewing their content (the same people!), and the astonishing, utterly false, claim of “a consensus” that global warming was happening.¶ As Bast points out, “It means that all of the ‘endorsements’ of the climate consensus made by the world’s national academies of science—which invariably refer to the reports of the IPCC as their scientific basis—were based on false or unreliable data and therefore should be disregarded or revised.”¶ “It means that the EPA’s ‘endangerment finding’—with its claim that carbon dioxide is a pollutant and threat to human health—was wrong and should be overturned.”¶ The poles are not melting, the glaciers are growing, the oceans rise mere millimeters over centuries, and right now planet Earth is cooling.

#### **Global Warming isn’t happening, Climate change natural and CO2 levels not to blame**

Elliot 12

(Tony Elliot 7-3-12, http://www.international.to/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=6350:global-warming-climate-change-fraud&catid=66:oped&Itemid=151 “Global warming climate change fraud” International News Magazine, tas)

¶ ¶ USA 3 July 2012. Aside from the fact that no one is qualified at any of the United Nations climate organizations to present anything in the genre of climate, weather or atmospheric physics. The daily dose of disinformation is getting easier to dispute every time it comes out.¶ ¶ The term global warming had to be changed to climate change since no actual physical evidence exists proving it. The term climate change was re-titled global climate disruption when no actual proof of the world's climate in flux could be found. GCD will also invariably have to be changed as well, because no massive disruption in climate will be found either.¶ ¶ Every claim ever made by these "enviroclowns" masquerading as climate scientists can be proven false when actual recorded temperatures, weather data, and climate records are examined.¶ ¶ All the hype about rising CO2 levels is a joke when one takes into consideration that the total amount of carbon dioxide in all the earth's atmosphere is less than 1% of 1% of the entire volume of gasses in it. At this percentage level there isn't enough CO2 in the atmosphere to create a greenhouse effect.¶ ¶ There is absolutely no scientific evidence in existence proving that CO2 levels in the atmosphere have in the past or presently contributed to an overall warming of the planet. Ice cores supposedly show six Global Warming periods, which have occurred over the past half a million years. Yet, these same ice cores show temperatures rose some 800 years before any rise in CO2 levels took place.¶ ¶ The planet Mars is a prime example of a world where the atmosphere consists of over 95% CO2. Although Mars has an average distance from the Sun of 142 million miles, compared to Earth’s 93 million miles atmospheric comparisons can be made on the effects of a completely CO2 based atmosphere.¶ ¶ Mars has an overall cold climate with the warmest temperature estimated to be around 80 degrees Fahrenheit in the height of summer during the day. Overall, the planet has temperatures well below zero in most areas and experiences sub zero temperatures every night of the year on all areas of the planet.¶ ¶ Although the planet is very far from the Sun as compared to earth, it should be much warmer than it is, given its atmosphere is almost entirely made of CO2. Taking into consideration the differences in size and overall atmosphere of Mars as compared to Earth, the distance from the Sun, the void of plant life and differences in gravity; the overall temperatures on the Martian surface should be much warmer than they actually are.¶ ¶ Since the Martian surface is primarily rocky, which would absorb more heat energy from the Sun than a surface made of mainly soil or one having plant life, the opportunity for a Greenhouse effect is very great.¶ ¶ All the ingredients and opportunities are there even, the thin layer of dust covering the planet, which is responsible for the reddish color of the atmosphere. Yet, it isn’t happening and the amount of energy from the Sun is almost completely radiated back into space very quickly.¶ ¶ The reality is water vapor is the only true atmospheric gas here on earth that has a high enough percentage in the overall atmosphere to act as a greenhouse gas.¶ ¶ Their claim that the decade of 2000 to 2010 as being the hottest on record which was based on manipulated data had to be revised to the 1930s simply because actual recorded temperatures proved otherwise.¶ ¶ The claim that the hottest year on record occurred in the decade of 2000 to 2010 (they named several years during this time so one actual year cannot be indicated) had to be revised due to the fact that actual weather records proved 1934 to be the hottest year ever since weather records were kept.¶ ¶ The decade old warning of glacier melt in the Himalayan Mountains in particular was proven false when a team of scientists recently examined the ice for thickness and area using actual data as well as physical observations and found the glaciers to be unchanged. The claims of glaciers melting the world over have been proven false as well, since most in question have regained the ice today that was lost in recent years. What this means in reality is glaciers will decline and advance over many years, all part of a natural cycle.¶ ¶ The claims of polar ice melting can be seen as false when actual physical evidence showed more ice in both area and thickness at both poles in NASA's own images in 2011.¶ ¶ Polar ice also grows and declines in cycles as seen with the surfacing of war ships in the North Pole by both the United States and the USSR in the late 1950s and early 1960s during a time of very thin ice where normally this would have been impossible.¶ ¶ Absolutely no sea level rise has been recorded anywhere in the world, flying in the face of the false claims it is. Al Gore buying a multimillion dollar beach home in southern California is a prime example that he doesn't think sea levels are rising anytime soon.¶ ¶ Recently, an attempt has been made to make 2011 the hottest year on record in Oklahoma, citing overall average temperatures. This is absurdly false when the mid 1930s was actually the hottest for this state in general and 1934 was the hottest in particular. As usual, in getting to say that 2011 was Oklahoma's hottest year, they are using overall average temperatures to come up with a number. However, even using average temperatures over a year's time or averaging the temperatures during the summer months still doesn't even come close to the heat experienced in Oklahoma in 1934 in particular, and the 1930s in general.¶ ¶ What we do not hear anything about is the abnormally cold winter experienced in Europe and most of the rest of the world. While we were warm here in many parts of the US in the winter of 2011 most of the rest of the world was setting records for cold temperatures and extreme winter weather conditions.¶ ¶ I could fill books with information proving global warming/climate change to be a total lie. Suffice to say that everything we have ever been told from the GW/CC fanatics is a total farce.¶ ¶ What is really at play here is globalists with a political agenda who desire to use climate as a tool to frighten the masses into accepting their vision of a New World Order to assure their success in green investments and carbon stocks.

### **Warming NEG—Not Human-Causes**

Natural Causes Contribute to Climate Change

Godoy, Journalist for the Guatemala Times, 7/9/12,

(Julio, 7/19/12, http://www.guatemala-times.com/science-environment/environment/3180--norwegian-study-calls-for-research-on-natural-causes-of-climate-change.html, “Norwegian Study Calls for Research on Natural Causes of Climate Change”. bcd)

While there is no doubt that global warming is primarily a consequence of human activities, it is also true that there are natural phenomena contributing to climate change as well. ¶ These natural causes include terrestrial events such as volcanic activity, orogenesis, variations in ocean and air currents, and continental drift, which all play a part in raising average global temperatures. ¶ There are also extraterrestrial factors, such as variations in the solar constant, which is the total radiation energy received from the sun per unit of time per unit of area.¶ These causes, particularly solar constant variations, are stressed by those who deny that climate change is an anthropogenic or “man-made” problem and insist that if global warming exists, it is due to natural causes, which means that any environmental policies aimed at mitigating it are doomed to failure. ¶ But some of these phenomena, including solar constant variability, are cyclical, and their effects on the average temperature of the earth’s atmosphere are marginal and cannot explain the changes that take place over long periods, according to Stefan Brönnimann, a professor of climatology at the University of Bern. ¶ “Thanks to satellite observations, we know that the variability of the solar constant during the 11-year sunspot cycle is too small to account for the dimensions of terrestrial climate change,” Brönnimann told Tierramérica.¶ The climatologist commented that another natural phenomenon, the circulation of the oceans, also contributes to the movement of heat in the earth’s climate system. “Unfortunately, scientific observation of this circulation is relatively recent, which means it is not possible to formulate reliable predictions of its future effects,” he said.¶ Correcting this shortage of data on the natural causes of climate change is one of the recommendations of an evaluation report commissioned by the Research Council of Norway, which appointed a committee of international experts to evaluate the climate research conducted to date by scientists in this northern European country. ¶ The evaluation report, released in June in Oslo, observes that less effort has been devoted to studying and explaining the natural causes of climate change because these have been regarded as having a relatively minor impact on the earth’s climate system as compared to anthropogenic causes. ¶ These anthropogenic causes include greenhouse gas emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, industry, deforestation and agriculture. ¶ But the report, “Norwegian Climate Research: An Evaluation”, stresses that a good understanding of the climate system cannot be reached without a dedicated effort to understand the contribution of natural processes to climate change.¶ Geological history very clearly documents a strong climate forcing associated with solar variability, although the exact mechanism has not been identified, the report notes.¶ These circumstances should have led to an international effort to study these natural processes, the report continues, “but surprisingly, the worldwide scientific effort to increase our understanding of the natural variations is very limited, and this is most probably related to the limited funding available for basic, not agenda-driven research.”¶ While the report’s authors do not specify the “agenda” to which they are referring, the wording chosen could be interpreted as an attempt to discredit scientific research on the human causes of climate change, as well as a denunciation of a supposed international refusal to study the natural causes of the phenomenon. ¶ The European scientific sources consulted by Tierramérica did not wish to comment on the report, although they were clearly suprised by its tone and the reference to an alleged research “agenda”. ¶ Norwegian climate researchers are well known and collaborate with their European peers on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).¶ The evaluation report recognized that Norwegian climate research has been in harmony with the mainstream of international climate science, but recommends “an increased effort” in research on the natural causes of climate change, in particular “the activity variations of the sun, the mechanism of cloud formation, and the multi-decadal variations in ocean current systems.”¶ Such criticisms appear to ignore the scientific evidence that the amount of solar energy received by the earth since 1750 has remained almost constant. Yet during this same period, and particularly since 1850, coinciding with the Industrial Revolution and the growing use of fossil fuels, there has been a continuous increase in global average temperatures and the concentration of carbon dioxide, methane and other greenhouse gases in the earth’s atmosphere. ¶ Moreover, if global warming were caused by a higher solar constant, the average temperatures in all the layers of the atmosphere would be higher. However, while temperatures in the exosphere and ionosphere are lower today than in the last 150 years, the warming of the troposphere has been extensively documented. ¶ This difference in temperature in the different layers of the atmosphere is a result of the greenhouse effect: gases like carbon dioxide trap the heat of the sun’s rays in the layer closest to the earth’s surface. ¶ This is why, according to Brönnimann, “climate models based on the solar constant cannot reproduce the real increase in the earth’s temperature observed over the last 50 years if they do not take into account the greenhouse gas emissions caused by humans.”

### Solvency NEG—No Ridership

#### Japan and France prove: high speed rail will have low ridership rates:

Randal **O'Toole, 5/4/2009** (senior fellow with the Cato Institute, “High-Speed Rail Is No Solution,”

<http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/highspeed-rail-is-no-solution>, rwg)

Americans who have ridden French or Japanese high-speed trains often wonder why such trains won't work here. The problem is, they don't work that well in France or Japan. France and Japan have each spent roughly (after adjusting for inflation) the same amount of money per capita on high-speed rail as the United States spent on the interstate highway system. Americans use the interstates to travel nearly 4,000 passenger miles and ship more than 2,000 ton-miles of freight per person per year. By comparison, high-speed rail moves virtually no freight and carries the average resident of Japan less than 400 miles per year, and the average resident of France less than 300 miles per year. It is likely that **a few people use them a lot**, and **most rarely or not at all**.

#### London proves: ridership will be minimal for high speed rail:

Mark **Tutton,** 11/18/20**11** (staff writer, “How green is high-speed rail?” Accessed July 19, 2012 at

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>, rwg)

Secondly, will high speed rail entice people off the roads and short-haul flights? French TGVs and the Channel Tunnel rail link have succeeded, but official calculations estimate that only 16 per cent of anticipated passengers for the London to Birmingham line will have swapped from planes or cars.

#### High cost will deter ridership of high speed rail:

Mark **Tutton,** 11/18/20**11** (staff writer, “How green is high-speed rail?” Accessed July 19, 2012 at

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>, rwg)

One of the main factors is cost. Despite soaring fuel prices, motoring and flying are still expected to be cheaper than high speed rail. If faster rail travel is to become a realistic alternative it must be affordable too.

#### Ridership estimates are overstated- original riding time estimates too optimistic- California proves

Moore et. al, vice president of research at Reason Foundation, 12

(Adrian T.,Wendell Cox, *the principal of Wendell Cox Consultancy/Demographia,* and *Joseph Vranich, an Irvine, Calif.-based business consultan,* July 2, 2012, “5 Reasons the California High-Speed Rail Project Shouldn’t Get More Money”, <http://reason.org/news/show/california-high-speed-rail-funding>, lkh)

3. The Train Trip That Keeps Getting Longer¶ When voters approved the bonds in 2008 they were promised a train trip from Los Angeles to San Francisco in 2 hours and 40 minutes or less. The new business plan is surprisingly silent on travel times but an HSRA document circulated to the board of directors says the fastest “express” trip will take three hours.¶ Even that time is highly unlikely because it depends on trains operating at a peak speed of 220 mph, faster than any train in the world, and an average speed of 198 mph. Such average speeds are going to be next to impossible to reach because trains won’t always be running on dedicated tracks designed for high speeds and, as the plan admits, they would be forced to slow down to 100-150 mph in Los Angeles and the Bay Area for safety reasons. Hence, it’s likely that non-stop express trains will take three hours and forty minutes.¶ Travelers will also find that most of the trains will make local stops and be slower than that. The business plan doesn’t provide times but it’s likely that San Francisco-Los Angeles travel times would be between four and six hours, depending upon the number of stops made.¶ 4. Shrinking Ridership Numbers¶ The estimated costs have gone way up since 2008 but the HSRA keeps lowering the number of people it claims will ride the trains.¶ As the Legislative Analyst’s report notes, “Specifically, the HSRA estimates that the projected ridership would be about 30 percent lower than estimated in the November 2011 draft business plan.” For example, the earlier plan projected between 29.6 million and 43.9 million one–way trips per year in 2040 while the latest plan assumes between 20.1 million and 32.6 million one–way trips per year.”¶ The Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California at Berkeley says the HSRA ridership estimates are way off the mark. “We found that the model that the rail authority relied upon to create average ridership projections was flawed at key decision-making junctures,” said study principal investigator Samer Madanat, director of ITS Berkeley and UC Berkeley professor of civil and environmental engineering. “This means that the forecast of ridership is unlikely to be very close to the ridership that would actually materialize if the system were built.”¶ The current plan claims people will choose the trains over driving. It makes this assertion by arbitrarily doubling the real costs of driving from Northern to Southern California. But the new rail plan’s reliance on blended tracks would mean slower travel speeds. Add in the time it will take getting to and from train stations and to final destinations, and it’s clear that the trains would not offer a significant time or cost savings for people driving.¶ Similarly, even factoring in airport security hassles and the time it takes to get to and from airports, air travel will continue to offer most travelers a faster trip from LA to San Francisco - and there won’t be a major cost difference. The rail system would find it difficult to attract large numbers of people who would normally fly between Northern and Southern California.¶ 5.

### Solvency NEG—No Ridership

#### Other countries prove: no ridership:

O'Toole 09 (Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Fail,” August, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/high-speed-fail/>)

¶ In a four-part series on the New York Times Economix blog, Harvard economist Edward Glaeser scrutinized high-speed rail and concluded that the benefits are overwhelmed by the costs. After making generous assumptions regarding the costs, user benefits, environmental benefits, and effects on urban development, Glaeser concludes that all the benefits of high-speed rail would still be less than half the costs.¶ ¶ As Washington Post writer Robert Samuelson observes, the Obama administration’s vision of high-speed rail is “a mirage. The costs of high-speed rail would be huge, and the public benefits meager.” Yet even Samuelson falls victim to the common assumption that high-speed rail “works in Europe and Asia” because population densities in those places are higher than in the United States.¶ ¶ The truth is that high-speed rail doesn’t work in Europe or Asia either. Japan and France have both spent about as much on high-speed rail as they have on their intercity freeway systems, yet the average residents of those countries travel by car 10 to 20 times as much as they travel by high-speed rail. They also fly domestically more than they take high-speed rail. While the highways and airlines pay for themselves out of gas taxes and other user fees, high-speed rail is heavily subsidized and serves only a tiny urban elite.¶ ¶ Obama uses the fact that France, Japan, and a few other countries are racing one another to have the fastest high-speed trains to argue that we need to join the race. That’s like saying we need to spend billions subsidizing buggy whip or horse collar manufacturers or some third-world country will beat us in those technologies. The fact is that high-speed trains will never be as fast as flying on long trips and never be as convenient as driving on short trips, and there is no medium-length trip in which high-speed rail can compete without heavy subsidies.¶ ¶ The rail advocates go ballistic whenever anyone questions their fantasies, mostly engaging in ad hominem attacks (“you must be paid by the oil companies!”) or accusing skeptics of lying about rail. The reality is that Glaeser (like me) “almost always prefer trains to driving.” If anything, he was too generous in many of his assumptions about high-speed rail.¶ ¶ For example, Glaeser built his case around a hypothetical high-speed line between Dallas-Ft. Worth and Houston, the nation’s fifth- and sixth-largest urban areas which together house close to 10 million people and are located about 240 miles apart, supposedly an ideal distance for high-speed trains. If the numbers don’t work for this market, how are they going to work for Eugene-Seattle, Tulsa-Oklahoma City, New Orleans-Mobile, St. Louis-Kansas City, or any of the other much smaller city pairs in the Obama high-speed rail plan?¶ ¶ The rail nuts don’t want to hear Glaeser’s (or Cato’s) numbers because they fantasize the Field of Dreams “build it and they will come” myth; that building rail will “create the demand for the rail lines.” That may have been true in nineteenth-century America, when no alternative forms of transportation could compete with rail. But it wasn’t true in twentieth-century France or Japan (where heavily subsidized high-speed rail carries only 4 to 6 percent of passenger travel), and it won’t be true in twenty-first-century America.¶ ¶ Building high-speed rail will be like standing in the chilly vestibule of an Amtrak train in mid-winter Chicago and burning million-dollar bills to keep warm. But that’s what happens when you base your transportation policies on a slogan from a Kevin Costner movie rather than on real data.

#### China proves—no ridership

Wolf ‘11(David, staff writer for silicon hutong, “Dissecting China’s High-Speed Rail Fail”, March, <http://siliconhutong.com/2011/03/07/dissecting-chinas-high-speed-rail-fail/>

In the face of recent revelations around irregularities at the top China’s Rail ministry there is a growing meme afoot suggesting that we have been too quick to praise China’s high-speed rail system. In reality, we are told, the PRC’s high-speed rail system is a corruption-ridden white elephant that the people cannot afford to ride.¶ Reading from his copy of the South China Morning Post, Tim Ferguson of Forbes.com writes:¶ The larger issue with the vast (16,000 kilometers planned by 2020) endeavor is that it isn’t, in fact, so appropriate to China’s needs. Rather, it may be another symptom of a bubble economy in which vast sums are misspent on underutilized assets.¶ Not So White An Elephant¶ My father always taught me to be skeptical of blanket condemnations of this flavor, as they reek of demagoguery and are often wrong. In fairness, let us grant to Mr. Ferguson and like-minded folks like Joel Kotkin two points: first, that there has been waste, possibly massive, in the development of China’s high speed rail system. Second, until we run out of ways to economically fuel passenger aircraft, or until the US population quadruples, that high-speed rail is probably not an panacea for North American intercity travel. Still, neither of these factors militate against the viability of–and the long-term need for–high-speed passenger rail in China.¶ China has had for some time examples of high-speed intercity rail lines that are both successful and popular. Indeed, one could argue that it was the success of the Hong Kong–Guangzhou, Beijing–Tianjian, and Shanghai–Hangzhou lines that provided proof-points for the expansion of China’s own bullet trains.¶ The lines mentioned above are limited examples of routes with extraordinary situations. The distances between the city pairs is too great or too traffic-laden for taxi, bus, or personal automobile, and are too near to justify air travel. There is also already a great deal of traffic between the two cities, with one sometimes serving as a satellite to the other. Other city pairs like this would include Chongqing–Chengdu, Shanghai–Nanjing, Wuhan–Changsha, Jinan–Qingdao, and Shenyang–Dalian. There is an argument to be made that China should have limited its high-speed intercity rail to just such city pairs, and if China were a developed country, I would be making that very point.¶ The issue, however, is not what Ferguson thinks it is. He suggests that the problem in China is that the market mechanism is missing, and that all of this money spent on high-speed rail is a “massive misallocation of resources that is a hallmark of top-down systems such as in Communist China.”¶ Taking the time to rebut Mr. Ferguson with a catalogue of the massive misallocations of resources that take place in America, Britain, Japan, and the E.U. would be both pedantic and off-topic. Suffice to say that the historical record gives ample proof that “top-down systems” like those in China enjoy no monopoly over expensive government boondoggles.¶ It is worth pointing out, however, that one of the few downsides of market mechanisms is that they occasionally stand in the way of solutions that make more sense when the full costs of implementation are considered. I grew up in a Los Angeles choked by its forced dependence on the automobile, the results of a local government abetted by automotive interests that abandoned a viable interurban rapid transit system because it didn’t want to pay for upgrades. Half a century later, a new generation of southern Californians confronting the limitations of automotive transport is footing the bill to rebuild it completely. This kind of market mechanism China can afford far less than America could.¶ Do we need to be careful about building costly high-speed rail systems in the U.S.? Definitely. Are there problems in the way China is laying high-speed rail lines? Almost certainly.

### Solvency NEG—Richard Florida is Wrong

#### Florida’s “theories” proven wrong by multiple studies

Bures 6/15

(Frank, Frank Bures is a writer whose stories have appeared in Harper’s, Esquire, Outside, Bicycling, Wired and have been included in the Best American Travel Writing 2004 and Best American Travel Writing 2009. He is a contributing editor at World Hum and Poets & Writers, speaks a few languages and has spent time in a few countries. He currently lives in Minneapolis, 6-15-12, <http://thirtytwomag.com/2012/06/the-fall-of-thecreative-class/>, “The Fall of the Creative Class” WL)

Jamie Peck is a geog­ra­phy pro­fes­sor who has been one of the fore­most crit­ics of Richard Florida’s Cre­ative Class the­ory. He now teaches at the Uni­ver­sity of British Colum­bia in Van­cou­ver, but at the time Florida’s book was pub­lished in 2002, he was also liv­ing in Madi­son. “The rea­son I wrote about this,” Peck told me on the phone, “is because Madison’s mayor started to embrace it. I lived on the east side of town, prob­a­bly as near to this lifestyle as pos­si­ble, and it was bull­shit that this was actu­ally what was dri­ving Madison’s econ­omy. What was dri­ving Madi­son was pub­lic sec­tor spend­ing through the uni­ver­sity, not the dynamic Florida was describing.”¶ In his ini­tial cri­tique, Peck said The Rise of the Cre­ative Class was filled with “self-indulgent forms of ama­teur microso­ci­ol­ogy and crass cel­e­bra­tions of hip­ster embour­geoise­ment.” That’s another way of say­ing that Florida was just describ­ing the “hip­ster­i­za­tion” of wealthy cities and con­clud­ing that this was what was caus­ing those cities to be wealthy. As some crit­ics have pointed out, that’s a lit­tle like say­ing that the high num­ber of hot dog ven­dors in New York City is what’s caus­ing the pres­ence of so many invest­ment bankers. So if you want bank­ing, just sell hot dogs. “You can manip­u­late your argu­ments about cor­re­la­tion when things hap­pen in the same place,” says Peck.¶ What was miss­ing, how­ever, was any actual proof that the pres­ence of artists, gays and les­bians or immi­grants was caus­ing eco­nomic growth, rather than eco­nomic growth caus­ing the pres­ence of artists, gays and les­bians or immi­grants. Some more recent work has tried to get to the bot­tom of these ques­tions, and the find­ings don’t bode well for Florida’s the­ory. In a four-year, $6 mil­lion study of thir­teen cities across Europe called “Accom­mo­dat­ing Cre­ative Knowl­edge,” that was pub­lished in 2011, researchers found one of Florida’s cen­tral ideas—the migra­tion of cre­ative work­ers to places that are tol­er­ant, open and diverse—was sim­ply not happening.¶ “They move to places where they can find jobs,” wrote author Sako Mus­terd, “and if they can­not find a job there, the only rea­son to move is for study or for per­sonal social net­work rea­sons, such as the pres­ence of friends, fam­ily, part­ners, or because they return to the place where they have been born or have grown up.” But even if they had been pour­ing into places because of “soft” fac­tors like cof­fee shops and art gal­leries, accord­ing to Ste­fan Krätke, author of a 2010 Ger­man study, it prob­a­bly wouldn’t have made any dif­fer­ence, eco­nom­i­cally. Krätke broke Florida’s Cre­ative Class (which includes accoun­tants, real­tors, bankers and politi­cians) into five sep­a­rate groups and found that only the “sci­en­tif­i­cally and tech­no­log­i­cally cre­ative” work­ers had an impact on regional GDP. Krätke wrote “that Florida’s con­cep­tion does not match the state of find­ings of regional inno­va­tion research and that his way of relat­ing tal­ent and tech­nol­ogy might be regarded as a remark­able exer­cise in simplification.”¶ Per­haps one of the most damn­ing stud­ies was in some ways the sim­plest. In 2009 Michele Hoy­man and Chris Far­icy pub­lished a study using Florida’s own data from 1990 to 2004, in which they tried to find a link between the pres­ence of the cre­ative class work­ers and any kind of eco­nomic growth. “The results were pretty strik­ing,” said Far­icy, who now teaches polit­i­cal sci­ence at Wash­ing­ton State Uni­ver­sity. “The mea­sure­ment of the cre­ative class that Florida uses in his book does not cor­re­late with any known mea­sure of eco­nomic growth and devel­op­ment. Basi­cally, we were able to show that the emperor has no clothes.” Their study also ques­tioned whether the migra­tion of the cre­ative class was hap­pen­ing. “Florida said that cre­ative class presence—bohemians, gays, artists—will draw what we used to call yup­pies in,” says Hoy­man. “We did not find that.”

#### Mega-regions aren’t a driver of economic growth – Florida is wrong

Krugman 8(Paul, professor of economics and international affairs at Princeton, “Mega Skepticism,” May 12, http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/04/12/mega-skepticism/)

Interesting contrast. Yesterday I read Glaeser and Gottlieb, on what models of economic geography can tell us about appropriate government interventions. Their answer, in short, is not much: there are cross-cutting effects, and simple ideas like “help weak regions” or “promote density” are poor guides. Today I read Richard Florida, who knows. Overall, I’ll go with ignorance. It’s not at all clear to me that world competition is between mega-regions. I’d say that there are two things that arguably define an economic unit for the purposes of economic geography. One is labor mobility: a region over which there’s high mobility of labor will be a region in which everyone with the same set of skills is paid more or less the same real wage (which may differ in money terms because of differences in the cost of living etc.). By that definition, the United States as a whole is the relevant unit: workers are as mobile between Chicago and Boston as they are between Baltimore and Boston. The other definition is the reach of spillovers — positive externalities, for the econowonks. That’s probably much more localized: there’s a reason investment bankers cluster in expensive Wall Street or City of London locations. But again, it’s hard to see that this makes the Northeast Corridor, as opposed to individual metro areas within the corridor, a relevant unit. So much as I might like to assert that I belong to a truly defining entity called Aceleland, I don’t think that’s a case you can make.

### Solvency NEG—Richard Florida is Wrong

#### More evidence, Florida’s theories wrong

Malanga 4

(Steven, Steven Malanga is a contributing editor to City Journal and a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, which publishes City Journal. His primary area of focus is economic development within dense urban centers, with a particular emphasis on those areas in and surrounding New York and the Tri-State Area, <http://www.city-journal.org/html/14_1_the_curse.html>, “The Curse of the Creative Class” WL)

If Florida’s cities can’t produce jobs or high-growth companies at a rapid rate, you would think they would at least do a good job of attracting and retaining people, given the professor’s notion of the importance of place in the new economy, as a magnet not just for the talented but for residents of all kinds. But Florida is wrong again. Many of his “talent magnets” are among the worst at attracting and, more importantly, hanging on to residents. Just look at the 2000 census reports on domestic migration, which follow the movements in and out of metro areas by U.S. residents. That report found that New York, among Florida’s top talent magnets, lost 545,000 more U.S. residents than it gained in the latter half of the 1990s, the worst performance of any U.S. city. The greater San Francisco metro area was close behind, with a negative domestic migration of more than 200,000 people. In fact, five of the ten places atop Florida’s creativity index had steep losses of U.S. residents during that period, while some of Florida’s creative losers—including Las Vegas, Memphis, and Tampa Bay—were big winners.

### Solvency NEG—Long Time-Frame

#### Long time frame for solvency of high speed rail:

Fawn **Johnson, 1/17/2012** (staff writer, “High-Speed Rail in a Coma,” Accessed 7/19/2012 at

<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php>, rwg)

High-speed rail investments aren't like economic stimulus programs, which are intended to jump start shovel-ready projects that can immediately inject money into a local economy while delivering jobs and paved roads. The initial costs of developing high-speed rail lines are high, and the **yield time is years or decades**. Is the country ready for long-term investments like that? Or would it make sense to take a break and allow the economy to recover before proposing big new rail projects? What would make policymakers more receptive to high-speed rail? What critiques of high-speed rail are the most in need of a response? Evidence